REVIEW OF TOXICITY BIOMONITORING REPORT

Environmental Toxicology, NPDES Permitting Program/OWQ

| Biomonitoring R | eview Report | : IDEM | /100/29/33 | 1/ <mark>126-A</mark> /20 | 24 | Documen | t Date: | 03/27/ | /2024 |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|---|---|--------------|--|------------|--------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Speedway WW | | | NPDES | | The state of the s | 32972 | | |
| City: | Speedway | Coun | ty: <u>Marion</u> | | State: | <u>IN</u> | | Zip | <u>46222</u> |
| | I Rock | around I | nformatio | · (To be o | omnle | ated by the | tecting 1 | ah) | |
| A. Test Materia | | ground 1 | moimano | 1. (10 00 0 | ompie | ded by the | testing is | auj | |
| Effluent/W. W | | Effluent | | | | Ou | tfall No(| (c). | 001 |
| Grab/Compos | | | Date(s) H | ffluent Co | llecte | | | | |
| | is Used: Cont | | | | | | ion Facto | | 0.5 |
| Dilution Water | | eiving W | | | nstitu | | Perrier | | <u> </u> |
| Name of Receiv | | 200 | gle Creek | | | est Date(s) | | | 3/12/2024 |
| Traine of Receiv | ing water bot | лу. <u>гла</u> | SIC CICCK | | 1 | csi Daic(s) | | | 03/12/2024 |
| | | | | | | | 00/00/12 | 7021 | 371272021 |
| B. Testing Labo | oratory: B | IOMON | ITOR INC, | 8802 W. W | ashing | ton St. | | | |
| | | ndianapol | | | | | IN 2 | Zip | 46231 |
| Responsi | ble Person(s): | | | | | | | P | 10201 |
| _ | | | 3.61 1 13 | 2.44 | | | | | |
| | dy Director/M | anager: | Michael 1 | Britten | | | | | |
| | chnical Staff: | | Initials | 712 | | | | | |
| Pno | one No. | | 317-297-7 | /13 | | | | | |
| C. Toxicity Tes | st Conducted: | | | | | 4 | | | |
| | te Test: | | | | | Short-Ter | m Chro | nic Te | est: |
| ✓ 1. Cerioda | phnia dubia / | reticulate | a | ✓ 1. | Cerio | daphnia di | | | |
| | a magna or Da | | | | | val & Rep | | | |
| | ales promelas | | | ✓ 2. | | - | | | Minnow) |
| | | • | , | | | al Survival | | | , |
| | | | | 3. | | astrum ca | | | rowth |
| | | | | 4. | Other | r : | | | |
| D. Chemical A | nalyses Check | dist: | | | | - | | | |
| 111 | | | Da | ıy | | | | | |
| Parameter | 1 | 2 | 3 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Comme | ent | |
| 1. Control: | | | | | | | | | |
| D.O. In | itial <u>√</u> | \checkmark | <u>√</u> | \checkmark | \checkmark | ✓ | | | |
| Fi | nal <u>√</u> | ✓ . | \checkmark \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | |
| pH Init | | <u>v</u> · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | \frac{\sqrt}{\sqrt} \frac{\sqrt}{\sqrt} \frac{\sqrt}{\sqrt} | <u>/</u> / | $\frac{\checkmark}{\checkmark}$ | | | |
| Fina | al <u>√</u> | \checkmark | <u>√</u> <u>√</u> | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | |
| Alkalini | ty: 🗸 | _ | <u> </u> | <u>√</u> | | | | | |
| Hardne | ss: 🗸 | | <u> </u> | <u>√</u> | | | | | |
| Conduc | | _ | <u> </u> | <u>√</u> | | | | | |
| Chlorin | | - | | | | | | | |
| 2. Test Sample: | | , | , , | , | , | | | | |
| D.O. In | itial \checkmark | <u>~</u> | <u>v</u> <u>v</u> | <u>~</u> | <u>~</u> | <u>~</u> | | | |
| | nal 🗸 | <u>~</u> | <u>v</u> <u>v</u> | <u>~</u> | <u>~</u> | <u>v</u> | | | |
| pH Init | iai <u>v</u> | <u>~</u> <u>~</u> <u>~</u> | $\frac{\checkmark}{\checkmark}$ $\frac{\checkmark}{\checkmark}$ $\frac{\checkmark}{\checkmark}$ | <u>v</u> | <u>√</u> | <u>√</u> <u>√</u> <u>√</u> | | | |
| Fina | 41 <u>v</u> | <u>v</u> | <u>v</u> <u>v</u> | <u>v</u> | <u>v</u> | <u>v</u> | 74 | | |
| Alkalini | | — | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | ∀ | - | | | | |
| Hardne | | | v – | · · · · · · | - | _ | - | | |
| Conduc Chlorin | • — | | N D | N D | | | 100% (|)nlv | - |
| Chiorin | et IV I) | | IN II | N I) | | | 10070 | JIII V | |

II. Daphnia or <u>Ceriodaphnia</u> Toxicity Test Information (To be completed by the testing lab)

| A. Data Analyses: | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| Statistical Test M | ethod Used | Comment | |
| Normality test: | Chi-Square Test | | ormal Distribution for Reprod. |
| Homogeneity test: | Hartley Test | Passed. Indicates Ed | qual Variances for Reprod. |
| Significance test: | | | |
| 1. Parametric: | <u>Dunnett's test</u> | | Difference for Reprod. At 90.9%. |
| 2. Non-Parametric: | | | nt Difference for Survival. |
| | alues of Significance Pr | | |
| 4. Other: No calcu | lation for acute endpoin | t was necessary. | |
| B. Toxicity Test Results: | | | |
| 1. Acute: | | | |
| LC50 (48-hr): ≥ | 100% Effluent (<1 TUa |) | |
| 2. Chronic: | | | |
| NOEL: Surv | ival <u>100% (1 TUc)</u> | | 0.9% 1.1TU _c) Growth |
| | | <u>(1</u> | .3 TUc) |
| LOEL: Surv | 1000 TO 1000 T | | Growth |
| Chronic Value: Surv | ival | Reproduction _ | Growth |
| C. Permit Limits Require | ment: | | |
| 1. Acute: | | | |
| LC50 (48-hr): <u>10</u> | 0% Effluent (1 TUa) | | |
| 2. Chronic: | | | |
| NOEL: Survival | 90.9% (1.1 TU _c) Rep | roduction 90.9% (1 | 1.1 TUc) Growth |
| LOEL: Survival | Ţ. | roduction | Growth |
| | | | |
| D. Reference Toxicant Da | ta: | | |
| 1. Reference Toxicant | Copper chloride. Read | gent Grade, from Caroli | na Biological |
| 2. Test Date: | February 20 - 27, 20 | - 0 | |
| 3. Results: | • | | , LOEL (Reprod.) = 80 μg/L as Cu. |
| 4. Acceptable Range: | Within Laboratory (| | |
| E. Permit Limits Complia | nce: (To be comple | ted by IDEM Staff on | aly) |
| | \ | | <u>, </u> |
| Pass (LC ₅₀ [48-hr] | di anno di di anno di | Fail (LC ₅₀ [48-hr]) | |
| Pass (NOEL/Survi | | Fail (NOEL/Survi | |
| Pass (NOEL/Repr | ou.) v | Fail (NOEL/Repro | IC25= 78.5% (1.3 |
| Dans MOELIC | | Est MOET/C | TUe) |
| Pass (NOEL/Grow | | Fail (NOEL/Grow | |
| Is the Test Acceptable? | Yes No | ✓ Reason F | Failed for C. dubia Reprod. |

III. Fathead Minnow (Pimephales promelas) Toxicity Test Information (To be completed by the testing lab)

| A. Data A | .nalyses: |
|-----------|-----------|
|-----------|-----------|

| Statistical Test | Modhad Tived | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------|
| Normality test: | Method Used | Comment | |
| Homogeneity test: | Chi-Square Test Hartley Test | Passed. Indicates Normal Distribution for Growth. Passed. Indicates Equal Variances for Growth. | |
| Significance test: | Training rest | 1 assect. Indicates Equal Variances for Growth. | |
| 1. Parametric: | Dunnett's test | Passed. No Significant Difference for Growth. | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Passed. No Significant Difference for Survival. | |
| 2. Non-Parametri | ic: Steels Many-One Rank Test | | |
| | Il Values of Significance | ************************************** | |
| 4. Other: No ca | alculation for acute endpo | oint was necessary. | |
| B. Toxicity Test Result | ÷e• | | |
| 1. Acute: | | | |
| | > 100% Effluent (<1 T | Tla) | |
| | 10070 221110011 (1,11 | <u> </u> | |
| 2. Chronic: | | | |
| NOEL: S | urvival <u>100% (1 TU.)</u> | Reproduction Growth | 100% (1 TU |
| LOEL: S | urvival | Reproduction Growth | |
| Chronic Value: S | urvival | Reproduction Growth | |
| C. Permit Limits Requ | irement: | | |
| 1. Acute: | | | |
| LC ₅₀ (96-hr): | 100% Effluent (1 TUa) | | |
| , | | ı | |
| 2. Chronic: | | | |
| NOEL: Surviv | al 90.9% (1.1 TU _c) | Reproduction Growth 90.9% (1.1 TUc) | |
| LOEL: Surviv | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Reproduction Growth | |
| D. D. C | | <u></u> | |
| D. Reference Toxicant | Data: | | |
| 1. Reference Toxic | ant: Potassium chloride. | , Reagent Grade, from Sigma Aldrich | |
| 2. Test Date: | February 20 - 27, | | |
| 3. Results: | | NOEL (Growth.) = 1000 mg/L, LOEL (Growth.) = 2000 mg/L as KCl | |
| 4. Acceptable Ran | ge: Within Laborator | y Control Limits. | |
| E. Permit Limits Comp | pliance: (To be comp | oleted by IDEM Staff only) | |
| ✓ Pass (LC ₅₀ [96- | hr]) (1 TUa) | Fail (LC ₅₀ [96-hr]) | |
| Pass (NOEL/St | | Fail (NOEL/Survival) | |
| Pass (NOEL/R | , | TO IT OF TO SEE AND TO | |
| Pass (NOEL/G | | Fail (NOEL/Reprod.) Fail (NOEL/Growth) | |
| Is the Test Acceptab | , , , | | |
| is the rest Acceptar | 70; X CS Y 140 | U KCASUII | |

IV. GLP and QA/QC Compliance: (To be completed by IDEM Staff only)

| | A. Does the Biomonitoring Report provide? 1. GLP Compliance Statement: 2. QA/QC Compliance Statement: 3. Were the required GLPs followed? 4. If not, the Report lacks what major information: |
|-------------------|--|
| | B. Laboratory Raw Data Sheets: 1. Does the Report enclose raw data sheets? Yes ✓ No 2. Does the raw data sheets provide essential information? Yes ✓ No 3. If not, the Report lacks what major information: |
| | V. Comments and Recommendations: (To be completed by IDEM Staff only) |
| | In March 2024 in the Semi-Annual testing whole effluent from Speedway WWTP did not demonstrate any acute toxicity to Ceriodaphnia dubia or to Fathead minnow, Pimephales promelas. The 48-hr and the 96-h LC ₅₀ to both the test species was >100% effluent (<1 TUa), respectively and acceptable. Likewise, the NOEL (NOEC) for Pimephales promelas Survival and Growth was 100% effluent (1 TUc) and acceptable as compared to 90.9% effluent (1.1 TUc) WET compliance limit in the facility NPDES permit. |
| | Unlike the above, whole effluent demonstrated chronic toxicity to <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i> . The NOEC fo <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i> Survival was although 100% effluent (1 TUc) but for for Reproduction it was 90.9% effluent (1.1 TUc) with an IC ₂₅ = 78.5% effluent (1.3 TUc) and unacceptable as compared to 90.9% effluent (1.1 TUc) WET compliance limit in the facility NPDES permit. |
| | Note: Failure of the WET tests for chronic toxicity with Ceriodaphnia dubia for Reproduction requires the facility repeat the WET test with the same test species within 2 weeks of test failure. |
| Review Signatu | wed by: Syed GhiasUddin Date: Date: Environmental Toxicologist Date: Environmental Toxicologist Date: Date: |
| Electro | onic copy: Jerry Dittmer, BC, NPDES Permits Branch, OWQ Leigh Voss, SC, NPDES Permits Branch, OWQ |

Updated: SMG: 00/2016