

## CHAPTER 3

### EPA SCREENER SURVEY

#### 3.1. SURVEY DESCRIPTION

In August 2001, EPA mailed a short screener survey, entitled “Screener Questionnaire for the Aquatic Animal Production Industry” to approximately 6,000 aquatic animal production facilities (EPA, 2001). The screener survey consisted of eleven questions that requested general facility information, including confirmation that the facility was engaged in aquatic animal production, the species and size category produced, type of production system, wastewater disposal method, and the total production at the facility in the year 2000. The Agency used the reported production information combined with price information from the Census to estimate revenues for each facility surveyed.

#### 3.2. DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEY MAILING LIST

The mailing list (sample frame) for EPA’s screener survey was developed by synthesizing facility information found in the Dunn and Bradstreet database, EPA’s Permit Compliance System (PCS), contacts with EPA regional permit writers, EPA site visits, state aquaculture contacts, assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs on tribal facilities, universities, recent issues of *Aquaculture Magazine*, and an extensive collection of web sites with aquaculture references. Additionally, EPA requested but was denied access to the facility identification data associated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s 1998 Census of Aquaculture (USDA, 2000). The mailing list EPA developed contained approximately 6,000 facilities. This number seemed to compare favorably with the roughly 4,000 facilities found in the 1998 Census of Aquaculture. EPA believes that this mailing population was as current as possible and reasonably complete.

### **3.3 RESPONSE TO THE SCREENER SURVEY**

EPA sent the screener survey to all 6,000 facilities on its mailing list. EPA received responses from 4,900 facilities, with about 2,300 facilities reporting that they do produce aquatic animals. The discrepancy between the number of surveys sent and the number of facilities reporting that they are aquatic animal producers is largely attributed to the fact that the list was compiled from general industry sources and included aquatic animal processors, retailers, etc.

EPA compared the number of direct discharging facilities identified in the NPDES permit compliance (PCS) data base with the number of direct dischargers identified in the EPA screener survey. EPA identified a total of 1,174 aquatic animal production facilities in the PCS database. Based on the NPDES permits found in the PCS database, EPA estimated that there are about 377 facilities with active permits. EPA identified a comparable number of direct discharging aquatic animal production facilities in the screener survey data.

### **3.4 SUMMARY**

The screener survey identified approximately 2,300 facilities in the aquatic animal production industry. This count encompasses the range of public and private ownership, production systems, water pollution control technologies in place prior to the regulation, species, and size (annual harvest). Of these, less than 400 facilities directly discharge wastewater into U.S. water bodies and have sufficiently large production levels to qualify as a “concentrated” aquatic animal production facility, i.e., need an NPDES permit under 40 CFR 122.24 and Appendix C. The screener data, then, provide the foundation for the engineering cost analysis, see Chapter 3 in the Development Document (EPA, 2002) for a more complete description.

### 3.5 REFERENCES

EPA. 2002. Development Document for the Proposed Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Aquatic Animal Production Industry. EPA-821-R-02-016. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water.

EPA. 2001. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Screener Questionnaire for the Aquatic Animal Production Industry. OMB Control Number 2040-0237. Washington, DC. July.

USDA. 2000. United States Department of Agriculture. National Agricultural Statistics Service. *1998 Census of Aquaculture*. Also cited as 1997 Census of Agriculture. Volume 3, Special Studies, Part 3. AC97-SP-3. February.