



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 27, 2024

Via Email to: benlaureys@hotmail.com

Mr. Ben Laureys, Owner
Craft Station Inc.
9378 W State Road 114
Rensselaer, Indiana 47978

Dear Mr. Laureys:

Re: Inspection Summary Letter
Grandma's Travel Center
NPDES Permit No. IN0053422
Rensselaer, Jasper 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 25, 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 Maggie Kroeger at 317-619-3639 or by email to mkroeger@idem.IN.gov.

Sincerely,

Kim Rohr, Chief
Wastewater Inspection Section
Office of Water Quality

Enclosure



NPDES Wastewater Facility Inspection Report

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

NPDES Permit Number: IN0053422		Facility Type: Mixed Ownership		Facility Classification: Minor		TEMPO AI ID 39618	
Date(s) of Inspection: June 25, 2024							
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection							
Name and Location of Facility Inspected: Grandma's Travel Center 9378 W State Road 114 Rensselaer IN 47978				County: Jasper		Receiving Waters: Unnamed Ditch to Yeoman Ditch	
						Permit Expiration Date: 10/31/2025	
						Design Flow: 0.0289MGD	
On Site Representative(s):							
First Name	Last Name	Title	Email		Phone		
Kent	Morphis	Contract Operator					
Derek	Gertzen	Contract Operator	dgertzen@utilityservicescorp.com				
Was a verbal summary of findings presented to the on-site representative?							
Certified Operator: Bill England		Number: 20160	Class: I	Effective Date: 7-1-21	Expiration Date: 6-30-24	Email: benland@utilityservicescorp.com	
Cyber Security Contact:							
Name:		Email:					
Responsible Official: Mr. Ben Laureys, Owner 9378 W State Road 114 Rensselaer, Indiana 47978				Permittee: Craft Station Inc.			
				Email: benlaureys@hotmail.com			
				Phone: 547-993-4555		Contacted?	
				Fax:		No	
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)							
N	Receiving Waters	M	Facility/Site	M	Self-Monitoring	N	Enforcement
S	Effluent	S	Operation	S	Flow Measurement	N	Pretreatment
S	Permit	M	Maintenance	S	Laboratory	M	Effluent Limits Compliance
S	Collection System	N	Sludge Disposal	S	Records/Reports	N	Other:
DETAILED AREA EVALUATIONS							
Receiving Waters:							
N 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 evaluated downstream of the outfall due to inaccessibility of the outfall. See additional comments under "Facility/Site". The facility's discharge did not appear to have caused adverse effects on the receiving stream.							
Effluent:							
S 1. Final effluent was free of excessive solids, floating debris, oil, scum, or billowy foam.							
Comments: The final effluent was observed from a grab sample and appeared clear and free of color 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 facility was found to have a valid permit and receiving stream, is accurate. The facility description will need to be updated during the next permit renewal to reflect the current units of treatment at the facility. The facility description in the permit details two secondary clarifiers but only one secondary clarifier was observed during the inspection. In addition, the flow schematic included in the permit shows one secondary clarifier.

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.
- S 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 facility's collection system is comprised of 100% separated sanitary sewers by design with no overflow or bypass points identified in the permit. The facility did not report any overflow or bypass events in the last twelve months. There are two lift stations in the collection system that service a Burger King and a Firework store. Due to the very small collection system, it is only maintained when problems occur. Notable grease was noted in the Burger King lift station that may require cleaning or maintenance in the near future.

Facility/Site:

- S 1. The facility was found to have standby power or equivalent provision.
- M 2. An adequate alarm or notification system for power or equipment failure was available for the treatment facility and lift stations.
- M 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:

Facility/Site was rated marginal due to inadequate access to the outfall. Facility personnel must locate and form a path to the outfall for easy visual inspection. In addition, there are visual alarms on blowers and pumps at the facility; however, the facility is only checked twice each week by facility personnel or the certified operator. It is recommended the facility is checked more frequently or additional alarms are installed to ensure the vital mechanical treatment units are in working condition.

The facility does not have a standby generator but the EQ is large enough to sustain flows during short power outages. Both lift stations in the collection system have visual and audible alarms.

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.
- S 4. The facility was found to be operated efficiently during wet weather events.

Comments:

All units of treatment appeared to be operating efficiently at the time of inspection. There was good mixing and color noted in the aeration tank. The secondary clarifier had notable pin floc on the surface but appeared to be clear and settling well. The chlorine disinfection system appeared to be operated efficiently. The post aeration system was operational and appeared to be operated efficiently. Sludge wasting appeared to be adequate and is determined by process control testing.

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 to be adequate.

Comments:

Maintenance was rated as marginal due to a line break in the post aeration system that caused five DO violations of the effluent limits detailed in Part I. A. 1 of the permit. The system was repaired within a week and the effluent DO returned to compliance.

Minor maintenance and repairs are documented on the daily operational logs. Major maintenance and preventative maintenance is documented through work orders.

Sludge Disposal:

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

Comments:

Sludge Disposal was not rated due to the facility not needing to haul sludge off-site. The digester appeared to be around 80% full. Due to the very low influent and wasting rates at the facility it may still be several months before solids will need to be hauled off-site.

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, 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.

M 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 Program was rated as marginal. Inconsistencies in sample time documentation was noted on July 2023 bench sheets for pH and Total Residual Chlorine (TRC). Sample times were adequately documented on the April 2024 bench sheets. In addition, Chain-of-custody forms must be completely filled out including who relinquished the samples and the date and time of doing so.

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 facility's flow measurement program, including all documentation, was found to be adequate and representative. The effluent flow meter was last calibrated May 31, 2024 by Utility Services.

Laboratory:

The following laboratory records were reviewed:

D. O. Bench Sheets

Chlorine Bench Sheets

pH Bench Sheets

Chain-of-Custody

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

Utility Services Corp.	Wanatah, IN
------------------------	-------------

Comments:

Analyses for pH, TRC, and DO are performed on-site with all other parameters performed at the contract lab. Bench sheets and contract lab reports from June 2023, July 2023, and April 2024 were reviewed during inspection. It is noted, the facility is required to participate in DMRQA 44 during 2024. The official study packet can be found using the following link: https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2024-05/dmr-qa_study-44_rev-0-24_re.pdf

Process control testing of 30-minute Settleability and Ammonia are also performed on-site at the facility.

Records/Reports:

The following records/reports were reviewed:

DMRs for the period of June 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 monthly records were available on-site, but the reports were reviewed on Virtual File Cabinet or NetDMR by the inspector before the on-site inspection. The monthly records reviewed on NetDMR appeared to be accurate and complete. The October 2023 through April 2024 MRO's were submitted using an outdated template from 2012. The facility should begin using the most updated version of the Monthly Report of Operation Package Type Wastewater Treatment Plant - Less than 0.05 MGD, State Form 53344, which can be found on IDEM's website. <https://www.in.gov/idem/forms/idem-agency-forms/>

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:

N 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 facility has no industrial sources.

Effluent Limits Compliance:

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

DMRs for the period of June 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
June	2023	001	Dissolved Oxygen	5

Comments:

The five DO self-reported effluent limit violations were due to a line break in the post aeration system during June 2023. The facility repaired the broken air line and the DO limits returned to compliance within a week.

IDEM REPRESENTATIVE

Inspector Name:

Email:

Phone Number:

Maggie Kroeger

mkroeger@idem.IN.gov

317-619-3639

IDEM MANAGER REVIEW

IDEM Manager:

Date:

Kim Rohr

6/27/2024