



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: beth.lang@rtx.com
Ms. Elizabeth Lang, EHS Director
RTX Corporation
9 Farm Springs Rd
Farmington, CT 06032

Dear Ms. Lang:

Re: Inspection Summary Letter
RTX Corporation
NPDES Permit No. IN0062651
Andrews, Huntington County

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

Date(s) of Inspection: June 19, 2024
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection
Inspection Results: Conditions evaluated were found to be satisfactory at the time of the inspection.

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 Waite at 317-691-1914 or by email to jwaite@idem.IN.gov.

Sincerely,

Kim Rohr, Chief
Wastewater Inspection Section
Office of Water Quality

Enclosure



NPDES Industrial Facility Inspection Report
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

NPDES Permit Number: IN0062651	Facility Type: Industrial	Facility Classification: Minor	TEMPO AI ID: C
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------

Date(s) of Inspection: June 19, 2024

Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection

Name and Location of Facility Inspected: RTX Corporation 303 N. Jackson St. Andrews	County: Huntington	Receiving Waters/POTW: Unnamed drain to Wabash River	Permit Expiration Date: 10/31/2026 Design Flow: .072MGD
---	-----------------------	---	--

On Site Representative(s): First Name: Susan Last Name: Hall Title: Environmental Services Email: susan.hall@stantec.com Phone: (317)294-7292
--

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

Certified Operator: Brad Fix	Number: 019343	Class: D	Effective Date: 7-1-22	Expiration Date: 6-30-25	Email:
---------------------------------	-------------------	-------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	--------

Cyber Security Contact
Name: _____ Email: _____

Responsible Official: Ms. Elizabeth Lang, EHS Director 9 Farm Springs Rd Farmington, CT 06032	Permittee: RTX Corporation Email: beth.lang@rtx.com Phone: (248)310-9261 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	M	Self-Monitoring	N	Enforcement
S	Effluent/Discharge	S	Operation	S	Flow Measurement		
S	Permit	S	Maintenance	S	Laboratory	S	Effluent Limits Compliance
		S	Sludge	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 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.
 Comments:
 The effluent was clear and free of color at the time of the inspection.

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.
- S 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 and access to the ground remediation facility was adequate. During power outages, the operation of the ground remediation treatment stops. The treatment system is monitored by an SCADA system that notifies personnel of malfunctioning units and power outages. Personnel has remote access to monitor and operate equipment.

Operation:

- S 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.
- 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 were adequate.
- S 4. Documentation of solids removal, handling, and disposal was adequate.

Comments:

The treatment facility consists of an air stripper, bag filtration and activated carbon polishing. The facility is regularly checked and maintained by Stantec. Paper filters are replaced on a regular basis and disposed of as special waste. At the time of inspection, all units of treatment appear to be operated efficiently.

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 adequate.

Comments:

Maintenance records for treatment facility reviewed during inspection. Maintenance activities, such as cleaning and minor repairs, are documented on operator's daily log. Santec personnel perform all PM maintenance on an annual schedule. All maintenance appeared to up to date and all documented activities appeared adequate.

Sludge:

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

Comments:

A records review during the inspection showed adequate handling, and disposal of sludge. The facility has bag filtering, and when replace, the old filters are stored in a holding container until the waste is picked up by a special waste company. The last pick up was made by Clean Harbors.

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.
- M 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 evaluation generated a marginal rating due to the facility needing to improve the documentation of sample times for pH. The facility needs to document all sample times for pH each day these parameters are analyzed.

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:

pH Bench 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 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.

Contract Lab Information

SGS Laboratory	Dayton, NJ
----------------	------------

Comments:

The pH 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 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 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.

N 3. Bypass and Noncompliance reporting are adequate.

Comments:

The requested records were available and appear complete and accurate.

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 May 2023 to April 2024 were reviewed as part of the inspection.

No 2. Were violations noted during the review of DMRs?

Comments:

No violations were noted on DMRs reviewed for this inspection.

IDEM REPRESENTATIVE

Inspector Name:

Email:

Phone Number:

Jeremy Waite

jwaite@idem.IN.gov

317-691-1914

IDEM MANAGER REVIEW

IDEM Manager:

Date:

Andy Schmidt

6/21/2024

Inspection Photographs



Facility: RTX Corporation
Photographer: Jeremy Waite
Date: 06/19/2024 Time:
Others Present:
Location/Description: Outfall into unnamed ditch to Wabash River