



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: dwandersee@town.centerville.in.us
Mr. Dan Wandersee, Town Council President
Town of Centerville
204 E Main St
Centerville, Indiana 47330

Dear Mr. Wandersee:

Re: Inspection Summary Letter
Centerville WWTP
NPDES Permit No. IN0022535
Centerville, Wayne 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: Potential problems were discovered or observed.

The following concerns were noted:

1. Maintenance was rated as marginal. The permittee does not have a written preventative maintenance plan. This written plan should include recommended maintenance activities and frequencies for each piece of treatment equipment.
2. Self Monitoring was rated as marginal. Influent samples were only a single grab and therefore were not representative. Either a four part manual composite or 24 hour composite with an auto sampler can be used to fulfill the requirements. Effluent composite sample is collected with an auto sampler. Start time/date and end date/time should be documented.
3. The Laboratory evaluation generated a marginal rating. The following methods or documentation must be improved.
 - a. Chlorine - analysis time must be documented
 - b. Ammonia and Phosphorus - a standard must be analyzed periodically
 - c. CBOD - blank depletions have improved, continue troubleshooting
 - d. E. coli - accurate setup and read out times must be documented,

- incubation time is 24-28 hours
- e. TSS - desiccant must be recharged or replaced
 - f. Documentation - all bench sheets must be permanent records, no white-out can be used, all errors must be corrected with a single strikethrough and a correction written nearby
4. The Records/Reports evaluation generated a marginal rating. The March 2024 CSO MRO and CSO DMR did not include overflow data that was available from the flow meter and in the file at the WWTP. These reports must be revised and resubmitted with complete data.

Effective immediately, IDEM is initiating a program strongly encouraging domestic wastewater utilities to perform cybersecurity vulnerability assessments, and to take actions to mitigate identified vulnerabilities and increase the cybersecurity resilience of Indiana's water sector. Utilities can choose any assessment tool appropriate for the water sector, but IDEM is highlighting the following websites for information and helpful vulnerability assessment tools made available from the U.S. EPA and the American Water Works Association: <https://www.epa.gov/waterresilience/epa-cybersecurity-water-sector> and <https://www.awwa.org/Resources-Tools/Resource-Topics/Risk-Resilience/Cybersecurity-Guidance>. IDEM will continue to share important updates on the cybersecurity of the water sector.

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 Becky Ruark at 317-691-1909 or by email to bruark@idem.IN.gov.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Kim Rohr in black ink.

Kim Rohr, Chief
Wastewater Inspection Section
Office of Water Quality

Enclosure



NPDES Wastewater Facility Inspection Report

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

NPDES Permit Number: IN0022535		Facility Type: Municipality		Facility Classification: Major		TEMPO AI ID III	
Date(s) of Inspection: June 19, 2024							
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection							
Name and Location of Facility Inspected: Centerville WWTP 816 N McMinn Road Centerville IN 47330				Receiving Waters: Noland's Fork Creek		Permit Expiration Date: 3/31/2029	
County: Wayne						Design Flow: 1.0MGD	
On Site Representative(s): First Name: Donnie Last Name: Miller Title: Operator Email: centervillewastewater@gmail.com Phone: _____							
Was a verbal summary of findings presented to the on-site representative? Yes							
Certified Operator: Jeff Lohmoeller		Number: 20327	Class: IV	Effective Date: 7-1-21	Expiration Date: 6-30-24	Email: jlohmoeller@richmondindiana.gov	
Cyber Security Contact: Name: _____ Email: _____							
Responsible Official: Mr. Dan Wandersee, Town Council President 204 E Main St Centerville, Indiana 47330				Permittee: Town of Centerville Email: dwandersee@town.centerville.in.us Phone: _____ Fax: _____		Contacted? 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							
<i>(S = Satisfactory, M = Marginal, U = Unsatisfactory, N = Not Evaluated)</i>							
S	Receiving Waters	S	Facility/Site	M	Self-Monitoring	N	Enforcement
S	Effluent	S	Operation	S	Flow Measurement	S	Pretreatment
S	Permit	M	Maintenance	M	Laboratory	S	Effluent Limits Compliance
N	Collection System	S	Sludge Disposal	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:							
S 1. Final effluent was free of excessive solids, floating debris, oil, scum, or billowy foam.							
Comments: The effluent was 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 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.

N 2. There were * maintenance-related (clogged or blocked lines) overflow events in last 12 months.

N 3. There were * 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.

N 7. Collection system maintenance activities appeared to be adequate.

Comments:

The Collection System was not evaluated during this CEI inspection. A Sanitary Sewer Survey (SSS) inspection will be conducted on 6-20-24.

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 and the outfall were accessible for inspection. A standby generator is exercised weekly and serviced twice annually. A SCADA system alerts operators via phone calls when equipment failure occurs.

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 operated efficiently. Good color and mixing was noted in the SBR treatment units that were in aerate mode. Good settling was noted in the unit that was in decant mode. The chlorine contact tank was clear.

Maintenance:

M 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:

Maintenance was rated as marginal. The permittee does not have a written preventative maintenance plan. This written plan should include recommended maintenance activities and frequencies for each piece of treatment equipment.

Preventative maintenance activities are conducted and documented on calendars. Repairs are recorded on calendars and invoices are filed when outside contractors are used for repairs.

Sludge Disposal:

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

Comments:

Sludge is dewatered using a belt filter press. Dewatered sludge is hauled by Best Way to Randolph Farms Landfill for disposal. Between January and April 2024 approximately 30 dry tons of sludge was landfilled.

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.

M 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:

Self Monitoring was rated as marginal. Influent samples were only a single grab and therefore were not representative. Either a four part manual composite or 24 hour composite with an auto sampler can be used to fulfill the requirements.

Effluent composite sample is collected with an auto sampler. Start time/date and end date/time should be documented.

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 on May 21, 2024 by Maxim Automation.

Laboratory:

The following laboratory records were reviewed:

DO Bench Sheets	Chlorine Bench Sheets	pH Bench Sheets
Ammonia Bench Sheets	CBOD Bench Sheets	TSS Bench Sheets
Phosphorus Bench Sheets	Total Nitrogen Bench Sheet	E. coli Bench Sheet

M 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.

M 2. Review of lab records and/or on-site field testing equipment and protocols was found to be adequate.

Comments:

The Laboratory evaluation generated a marginal rating. The following methods or documentation must be improved.

Chlorine - analysis time must be documented

Ammonia and Phosphorus - a standard must be analyzed periodically

CBOD - blank depletions have improved, continue troubleshooting

E. coli - accurate setup and read out times must be documented, incubation time is 24-28 hours

TSS - desiccant must be recharged or replaced

Documentation - all bench sheets must be permanent records, no white-out can be used, all errors must be corrected with a single strikethrough and a correction written nearby

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.

M 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 marginal rating. The March 2024 CSO MRO and CSO DMR did not include overflow data that was available from the flow meter and in the file at the WWTP. These reports must be revised and resubmitted with complete data.

Enforcement:

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

2002-11852-W

Comments:

The Agreed Order 2002-11852-W relevant to implementation of the CSO LTCP was not evaluated during this 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 operator indicated no evidence of interference from toxic substances entering the WWTP.

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 effluent limit violations were noted on DMRs reviewed for this inspection.

IDEM REPRESENTATIVE

Inspector Name:	Email:	Phone Number:
Becky Ruark	bruark@idem.IN.gov	317-691-1909
Other staff participating in the inspection:		
Name(s)	Phone Number(s)	
Lauren Duffy	Summer Intern	

IDEM MANAGER REVIEW

IDEM Manager:

Date:

Kim Rohr

6/21/2024