



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: townmanager@brownsburg.org

Ms. Deb Cook, Town Manager
Town of Brownsburg
61 N. Green St.
Brownsburg, Indiana 46112

Dear Ms. Cook:

Re: Inspection Summary Letter
Brownsburg Public Water Supply
NPDES Permit No. IN0050024
Brownsburg, Hendricks 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 26, 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 Jason Palin at 317-504-0007 or by email to japalin@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: IN0050024	Facility Type: Industrial Minor	Facility Classification: A-SO	TEMPO AI ID
------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

Date(s) of Inspection: June 26, 2024

Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection

Name and Location of Facility Inspected: Brownsburg Public Water Supply 5720 E. CR 700 N. Brownsburg IN 46112 County: Hendricks	Receiving Waters/POTW: West Fork of White Lick Creek	Permit Expiration Date: 10/31/2027
		Design Flow: NA

On Site Representative(s):
 First Name Last Name Title Email Phone
 Kathy Dillon Operator kdillon@brownsburg.org
 Was a verbal summary of the inspection given to the on-site rep? **Yes**

Certified Operator: Kathy Dillon	Number: 11461	Class: A	Effective Date: 7-1-22	Expiration Date: 6-30-25	Email: kdillon@brownsburg.org
-------------------------------------	------------------	-------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

Cyber Security Contact
 Name: _____ Email: _____

Responsible Official: Ms. Deb Cook, Town Manager 61 N. Green St. Brownsburg, Indiana 46112	Permittee: Town of Brownsburg
	Email: townmanager@brownsburg.org
	Phone: _____ Contacted? No
	Fax: _____

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	S	Self-Monitoring	S	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.
- N 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 there is adequate access to both the settling basin as well as the final outfall. No backup power is required because the facility can alter discharge times as needed to account for potential power failures.

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:

There is no mechanical treatment and a settling basin is the only treatment being utilized, but it appears to be operating efficiently. Solids are in the form of materials caught in the sand filter and are removed as necessary.

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 was rated as satisfactory. There is no mechanical treatment, so maintenance consists mainly of grounds keeping and replacing the filter media in the settling basin as necessary, but these tasks are completed on an as-needed basis.

Sludge:

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

Comments:

Sludge is not a direct byproduct of this facility, but solids are captured in the settling basin and the filter media is changed as needed.

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.
- S 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 Program was rated as satisfactory. All sampling practices are conducted accurately and at the frequency required by the permit.

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.

Comments:

The facility's flow measurement program, including all documentation, is adequate and representative.

Laboratory:

The following laboratory records were reviewed:

Chain-of-Custody Contract Lab Reports TSS 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

ESG Laboratory

Indianapolis, IN

Comments:

The bench sheets reviewed during the inspection appeared to be accurate and complete. The facility conducts all sampling at the Brownsburg WWTP except for Total Iron, which is sent to a contract facility due to the equipment required to meet the approved method.

Records/Reports:

The following records/reports were reviewed:

DMRs for the period of June 2023 to March 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. The facility is only required to sample quarterly, which accounts for the months reviewed for this inspection. All records were reviewed in NetDMR and VFC prior to arrival on site, but paper copies were also confirmed to be on site and completed correctly.

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 June 2023 to March 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:

Jason Palin

japalin@idem.IN.gov

317-504-0007

IDEM MANAGER REVIEW

IDEM Manager:

Date:

Andy Schmidt

6/27/2024