



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

June 21, 2024

Via Email to: wabakinc@gmail.com

Ms. Marny Fern, Owner
WABAK Inc.
4577 W. SR 56
Scottsburg, Indiana 47170

Dear Ms. Fern:

Re: Inspection Summary Letter
Raintree Lake Campground
NPDES Permit No. IN0052230
Scottsburg, Scott County

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

Date(s) of Inspection: June 18, 2024
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection
Inspection Results: Potential problems were discovered or observed.

A copy of the NPDES Wastewater Facility Inspection Report is enclosed for your records. Please direct any response to this letter and any questions to Andrew Dryden at 812-530-0429 or by email to adryden@idem.IN.gov.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Amick, Director
Southeast Regional Office

Enclosure



NPDES Wastewater Facility Inspection Report

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

NPDES Permit Number: IN0052230		Facility Type: Mixed Ownership		Facility Classification: Minor		TEMPO AI ID I-SP	
Date(s) of Inspection: June 18, 2024							
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection							
Name and Location of Facility Inspected: Raintree Lake Campground 4577 W. SR 56 Scottsburg IN 47170				Receiving Waters: Raintree Lake Spillway to Zion Run		Permit Expiration Date: 4/30/2027	
County: Scott				Design Flow: 0.01MGD			
On Site Representative(s):							
First Name	Last Name	Title	Email	Phone			
Chris	Boulet	Operator	runt@blueriver.net	812-620-8718			
Mark	Anderson	Secretary					
Was a verbal summary of findings presented to the on-site representative? Yes							
Certified Operator: Chris Boulet	Number: 17988	Class: I	Effective Date: 7-1-21	Expiration Date: 6-30-24	Email: runt@blueriver.net		
Cyber Security Contact:							
Name: NA Email:							
Responsible Official: Ms. Marny Fern, Owner 4577 W. SR 56 Scottsburg, Indiana 47170				Permittee: WABAK Inc. Email: wabakinc@gmail.com Phone: 812-882-2180 Fax:			
				Contacted? Yes			
INSPECTION FINDINGS							
<input type="radio"/> Conditions evaluated were found to be satisfactory at the time of the inspection. (5) <input type="radio"/> Violations were discovered but corrected during the inspection. (4) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Potential problems were discovered or observed. (3) <input type="radio"/> Violations were discovered and require a submittal from you and/or a follow-up inspection by IDEM. (2) <input type="radio"/> 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	M	Self-Monitoring	N	Enforcement
N	Effluent	S	Operation	S	Flow Measurement	S	Pretreatment
S	Permit	S	Maintenance	S	Laboratory	M	Effluent Limits Compliance
S	Collection System	S	Sludge Disposal	S	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 evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The receiving stream was free of notable foam, algae, and solids.							
Effluent:							
N 1. Final effluent was free of excessive solids, floating debris, oil, scum, or billowy foam.							
Comments: The facility was not discharging at the time of the inspection.							
Permit:							
S 1. Did the facility have a current copy of the permit available for reference?							

- N 2. If the permit expires within 180 days, has a renewal application been submitted?
- S 3. Receiving waters and Facility Description in the permit reflect actual conditions at the facility.
- 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 Permit evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The facility was found to have a valid permit and the facility description, including units of treatment and receiving stream, is accurate.

Collection System:

- N 1. CSO's were found to be adequately monitored and maintained.
- S 2. There were no reported maintenance-related (clogged or blocked lines) overflow events in last 12 months.
- S 3. There were no reported hydraulic (I&I) overflow events in last 12 months.
- N 4. Facility has met SSO and dry weather CSO reporting requirements
- N 5. Any adverse impacts from SSO and CSO events have been properly mitigated.
- N 6. Lift stations were found to be adequately inspected, cleaned, and maintained, with adequate documentation of activities.
- S 7. Collection system maintenance activities appeared to be adequate.

Comments:

The Collection System evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The collection system is comprised of 100% separate sanitary sewers with no overflow points, bypass points, or lift stations. There have been no reported overflows in the last 12 months.

Facility/Site:

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

Comments:

The Facility/Site evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The facility maintains a portable generator for use. The lagoons and outfalls were accessible during the inspection.

Operation:

- S 1. All facilities and systems necessary for achieving compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit were operated efficiently, including a report for an anticipated bypass report for steps of treatment taken out of service.
- S 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.
- S 3. Solids handling procedures include:
 - a. Sufficient solids wasted from the treatment system, in a timely manner, to maintain process efficiency.
 - b. Wasting of solids based on appropriate operational targets and valid process control testing.
 - c. Adequate documentation of solids removal, handling, or control was available for review.
- N 4. The facility was found to be operated efficiently during wet weather events.

Comments:

The Operation evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The lagoons appeared to be adequately operated. The treatment system is identified as a flow through system, but the flow between the two lagoons can be controlled to prevent unanticipated discharges from heavy rains. Influent flows into a 10,000 gallon septic tank prior to discharging to the first lagoon. The septic tank is pumped annually.

Maintenance:

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

Comments:

The Maintenance evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The facility maintains records of preventative and reactionary maintenance performed on the system.

Sludge Disposal:

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

Comments:

The Sludge evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The facility has sludge pumped from the septic tank annually. In the last 12 months, the facility has had 5,400 gallons of sludge pumped from the septic tank. The sludge was pumped and hauled away by VonFange Septic Pumping (Permit #1243).

Self-Monitoring:

M 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, were found to include:

- a. Samples refrigerated during compositing.
- b. Proper preservation techniques used.
- c. Containers and holding times conformed to 40 CFR 136.3.

S 5. Sample documentation was found to be adequate and included:

- 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 Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing requirements were found to be met.

Comments:

The Self Monitoring evaluation generated a marginal rating for inadequate sampling of D. O. The facility has been pulling one sample for D. O., but the permit requires two grabs over the course of the operator's attendance on site. The daily minimum concentration of D. O. in the effluent shall be reported as the arithmetic mean determined by the summation of the two daily grab samples results divided by the number of daily grab samples.

Flow Measurement:

S 1. Flow was found to be properly monitored as required by the permit.

S 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.

N 3. The stream flow gauging station is calibrated as often as necessary to provide accurate and reliable data, but at least once every 12 months.

N 4. A copy of the stream flow calibration curve or table is submitted to IDEM (OWQ Compliance Data Section) no later than October 1 of each year.

Comments:

The Flow Measurement evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The facility's flow measurement program, including all documentation, was found to be adequate and representative. The effluent flow meter was last calibrated March 29, 2024 by DEQ Electrical.

Laboratory:

The following laboratory records were reviewed:

Chain-of-Custody	Contract Lab Reports	pH Bench Sheets
pH Calibration Sheets	D. O. Bench Sheets	D. O. Calibration Sheets

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 found to be used.
- d. Calibration and maintenance of instruments was found to be adequate.
- e. QA/QC procedures were found to be 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.

Contract Lab Information

Astbury Water Technology

Clarksville, IN

Comments:

The Laboratory evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The bench sheets reviewed during the inspection appeared to be accurate and complete. The facility performs pH and D. O. analyses on site. All other parameters are performed by a contract lab.

Records/Reports:

The following records/reports were reviewed:

DMRs for the period of May 2023 to April 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.

S 2. DMRs and MROs were found to be 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.

N 3. Bypass and Noncompliance reporting were found to be adequate.

Comments:

The Records/Reports evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The requested records were available and appeared to be complete and accurate.

Enforcement:

N 1. Agreed Order and/or Compliance Plan milestones have been met.

Comments:

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

Pretreatment:

S 1. No evidence of interference from industrial or other sources of toxic substances was noted.

N 2. For both Delegated and Non-Delegated pretreatment programs:

- a. Industrial or commercial dischargers were found to be regulated as required.
- b. The permittee was found to enforce the Sewer Use Ordinance (SUO) and the Enforcement Response Plan (ERP).

N 3. If the non-delegated permittee accepts hauled waste:

- a. Does the POTW provide written permission to haulers?
- b. Does the POTW obtain samples from each hauled waste load and retain them for at least 48 hours?
- c. Does the POTW retain records of each load?

Comments:

The Pretreatment evaluation generated a satisfactory rating. The facility has no industrial users and it does not accept hauled waste.

Effluent Limits Compliance:

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

DMRs for the period of May 2023 to April 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
January	2024	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	4

Comments:

IDEM REPRESENTATIVE

Inspector Name:

Andrew Dryden

Email:

adryden@idem.IN.gov

Phone Number:

812-530-0429

IDEM MANAGER REVIEW

IDEM Manager:

Mark A. Amick

Date:

6/20/2024