



Indiana Department of Environmental Management
We Protect Hoosiers and Our Environment.

100 N. Senate Avenue • Indianapolis, IN 46204
(800) 451-6027 • (317) 232-8603 • www.idem.IN.gov

Eric J. Holcomb
Governor

Brian Rockensuess
Commissioner

July 10, 2024

Via Email to: meckert@holidayworld.com

Mr. Matt Eckert, President & CEO

Koch Development Corporation DBA Holiday World & Splashin' Safari

452 E. Christmas Blvd

P.O. Box 179

Santa Claus, Indiana 47579

Dear Mr. Eckert:

Re: Inspection Summary Letter
Holiday World & Splashin' Safari
NPDES Permit No. IN0063142
Santa Claus, Spencer County

An inspection of the above-referenced facility or location was conducted by a representative of the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Southwest Regional Office, pursuant to IC 13-18-3-9. A summary of the inspection is provided below:

Date(s) of Inspection: July 08, 2024
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection
Inspection Results: Potential problems were discovered or observed.

A copy of the NPDES Industrial Facility Inspection Report is enclosed for your records. Please direct any response to this letter and any questions to Jeremy Ferguson at 812-582-0696 or by email to jferguso@idem.IN.gov.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Carr, Director
Southwest Regional Office

Enclosure



NPDES Industrial Facility Inspection Report

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

NPDES Permit Number: IN0063142	Facility Type: Industrial	Facility Classification: Minor	TEMPO AI ID NA
------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	--------------------------

Date(s) of Inspection: **July 08, 2024**

Type of Inspection: **Compliance Evaluation Inspection**

Name and Location of Facility Inspected: Holiday World & Splashin' Safari 452 E. Christmas Blvd Santa Claus IN 47579	County: Spencer	Receiving Waters/POTW: UNT to Crooked Creek	Permit Expiration Date: 6/30/2028
			Design Flow: NA

On Site Representative(s):				
First Name	Last Name	Title	Email	Phone
John	Adkins	Director of Safety	jadkins@holidayworld.com	812-937-5269
Lori	Gogel	Director of Attractions	lgogel@holidayworld.com	812-937-5298
Jennifer	Rich	Manager of Attractions	jrich@holidayworld.com	812-937-5292

Was a verbal summary of the inspection given to the on-site rep? **Yes**

Certified Operator: N/A	Number:	Class:	Effective Date:	Expiration Date:	Email:
-----------------------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	------------------	--------

Cyber Security Contact
Name: **N/A** Email:

Responsible Official: Mr. Matt Eckert, President & CEO 452 E. Christmas Blvd P.O. Box 179 Santa Claus, Indiana 47579	Permittee: Koch Development Corporation DBA Holiday World Email: meckert@holidayworld.com Phone: 812-937-5210 Fax:
	Contacted? No

INSPECTION FINDINGS

- Conditions evaluated were found to be satisfactory at the time of the inspection. (5)
- Violations were discovered but corrected during the inspection. (4)
- Potential problems were discovered or observed. (3)
- Violations were discovered and require a submittal from you and/or a follow-up inspection by IDEM. (2)
- Violations were discovered and may subject you to an appropriate enforcement response. (1)

AREAS EVALUATED DURING INSPECTION

(S = Satisfactory, M = Marginal, U = Unsatisfactory, N = Not Evaluated)

S	Receiving Waters	S	Facility/Site	S	Self-Monitoring	N	Enforcement
S	Effluent/Discharge	M	Operation	S	Flow Measurement		
S	Permit	M	Maintenance	S	Laboratory	M	Effluent Limits Compliance
		N	Sludge	M	Records/Reports	N	Other:

DETAILED AREA EVALUATIONS

Receiving Waters:
S 1. The receiving stream was visibly free of excessive deposits of settled solids, floating debris, oil, scum, or billowy foam.
 Comments:
 The receiving stream was free of notable foam, algae or solids.

Effluent/Discharge:
S 1. Final effluent was essentially free of excessive solids, floating debris, oil, scum, or billowy foam.
N 2. Pretreatment discharge into sanitary sewers appeared free of excessive oils, grease, solids, or foam and did not appear to be in violation of the local Sewer Use Ordinance.
N 3. Pretreatment discharge into sanitary sewers did not contain materials that pass through or interfere with the

operation of the POTW.

Evaluation of Multiple Outfalls:

Outfall #	Insp. Date	Outfall Inspection Comments
001	7/8/2024	There was no discharge at the time of the inspection.
002	7/8/2024	The effluent was clear and free of color at the time of the inspection.
003	7/8/2024	There was no discharge at the time of the inspection. There was lake water going through the outfall to prep for the upcoming rain event.
003B	7/8/2024	The effluent was clear and free of color at the time of the inspection.
004	7/8/2024	The effluent was clear and free of color at the time of the inspection.
004B	7/8/2024	The effluent was clear and free of color at the time of the inspection.
005	7/8/2024	There was no discharge at the time of the inspection. However, storm water was going out the outfall.
005B	7/8/2024	There was no discharge at the time of the inspection.
006	7/8/2024	There was no discharge at the time of the inspection. However, storm water was going out the outfall.
007	7/8/2024	The effluent was clear and free of color at the time of the inspection.

Comments:

Permit:

- S 1. Did the facility have a copy of the current permit available for reference.
- N 2. If the permit expires within 180 days, has a renewal application been submitted?
- S 3. Receiving waters are accurately described in the permit.
- N 4. The permit has been properly transferred if there is a new owner.
- N 5. The NPDES Permit Schedule of Compliance monitoring and reporting milestones have been met.

Comments:

The facility has a valid permit.

Facility/Site:

- N 1. The facility was found to have standby power or equivalent provision, if required.
- N 2. An adequate alarm or notification system for power or equipment failure was available for the treatment facility.
- S 3. Safe and adequate access was provided for inspection of all treatment units and outfalls.
- S 4. Facilities and equipment did not appear beyond their useful life.
- 5. List any safety concerns noted during the inspection in the box below:

Comments:

The facility grounds are well maintained. Adequate access was provided during the inspection.

Operation:

- M 1. All facilities and systems necessary for achieving compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit were operated efficiently, including an anticipated bypass report for steps of treatment taken out of service.
- N 2. An adequate, qualified operating staff was found to be provided to carry out the operation of the facility, including:
 - a. Certified Operator's on-site attendance and/or qualified operations personnel attendance was adequate.
 - b. Adequate documentation of operational activities, including system monitoring and cleaning.
 - c. Adequate funding to ensure proper operation.
- N 3. Solids handling procedures were adequate.
- N 4. Documentation of solids removal, handling, and disposal was adequate.

Comments:

The Operations evaluation generated a marginal rating. During the file review, it was noted that a spill was reported to IDEM in July 2023 which contained high levels of chlorine due to a failed float system. The facility took appropriate steps to fixing the issue.

Maintenance:

- S 1. A maintenance record system has been established and includes maintenance/repair history and preventative maintenance plan.
- M 2. Facility maintenance activities appeared adequate.

Comments:

The Maintenance evaluation generated a marginal rating. This information is detailed further in Operations.

The facility uses a Mombaro electronic database program to record maintenance activities around the park.

Sludge:

- N 1. Sludges, screenings, and slurries were found to be handled and disposed of properly.

Comments:

The facility does not generated solids.

Self-Monitoring:

- S 1. Samples were found to be taken at pre-designated locations and were found to be representative.
- N 2. Flow-proportioned samples were found to be obtained where needed.
- S 3. The facility was found to conduct sampling of all waste streams, including type and frequency, as required in the permit.
- S 4. Sample collection procedures, including automatic sampling, include:
 - a. Samples refrigerated during compositing.
 - b. Proper preservation techniques used.
 - c. Containers and holding times conform to 40 CFR 136.3.
- S 5. Sample documentation was adequate and includes:
 - a. Dates, times, and locations of sampling.
 - b. Name of individual performing sampling.
 - c. Instantaneous flow for flow-weighted aliquots.
 - d. Chain of Custody records.
- N 6. NPDES Permit Total Toxic Organic (TTO) requirements were being met.
- N 7. NPDES Permit Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing requirements were being met.

Comments:

The Self Monitoring Program was rated as satisfactory. All sampling practices are conducted accurately and at the frequency required by the permit.

Flow Measurement:

- S 1. Flow was found to be properly monitored as required by the permit.
- N 2. Flow data and calibration records were available for review, and document that monitoring equipment has been calibrated at the frequency required in the permit.

Comments:

The facility's flow measurement program, including all documentation, is adequate and representative.

Laboratory:

The following laboratory records were reviewed:

TSS Bench Sheets	Chlorine Bench Sheets	pH Bench Sheets
pH Calibration Sheets	pH Standard Expirations	Chlorine Reagent Expiration
Scale Calibration	Temperature Log	

- S 1. The laboratory practices and protocol reviewed were adequate, including:
 - a. A written laboratory QA/QC manual was available.
 - b. Samples were found to be properly stored.
 - c. Approved analytical methods were used.
 - d. Calibration and maintenance of instruments was adequate.
 - e. QA/QC procedures were adequate.
 - f. Dates of analyses (and times, where required) were recorded.
 - g. Name of person performing analyses was recorded.
- S 2. Review of lab records and/or on-site field testing equipment and protocols was found to be adequate.

Comments:

The bench sheets reviewed during the inspection appeared to be accurate and complete.

Records/Reports:

The following records/reports were reviewed:

DMRs for the period of June 2023 to May 2024 were reviewed as part of the inspection.

- S 1. All facility records for the period including the previous three years were available for review.
- M 2. DMRs and MMRs were completed properly and accurately including:
 - a. "No Ex" column was accurate.

- b. Signatory requirements were met.
- c. Reports were prepared by or under the direction of a certified operator.

S 3. Bypass and Noncompliance reporting are adequate.

Comments:

The Records / Reports generated a marginal rating. During the file review, it was observed that the facility was not properly completing the DMRs due to leaving the No. of Exceedance column blank. Additionally, on the July 2023 DMR, the facility did not report the one effluent exceedance for total residual chlorine.

Enforcement:

N 1. Agreed Order compliance milestones have been met.

Comments:

There was no Agreed Order at the time of the inspection.

Effluent Limits Compliance:

Yes 1. Were DMRs reviewed as part of the inspection?

DMRs for the period of June 2023 to May 2024 were reviewed as part of the inspection.

Yes 2. Were violations noted during the review of DMRs?

The Effluent Limits Compliance area was rated marginal due to the following self-reported violations of the limits detailed in Part I. A. of the NPDES Permit:

Month	Year	Outfall	Parameter	Number
July	2023	004	Chlorine	1

Comments:

IDEM REPRESENTATIVE

Inspector Name:

Jeremy Ferguson

Email:

jferguso@idem.IN.gov

Phone Number:

812-582-0696

Other staff participating in the inspection:

Name(s)

Andrew Dryden

Phone Number(s)

IDEM MANAGER REVIEW

IDEM Manager:

Nicholas Carr

Date:

7/8/2024