



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

Bruno Pigott
Commissioner

January 06, 2020

Via Email to: robert.maciel@arcelormittal.com

Mr. Rob Maciel, Environmental Manager
ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor, LLC
250 West US Highway 12
Burns Harbor, Indiana 46304

Dear Mr. Maciel:

Re: Inspection Summary/ Enforcement Referral
ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor LLC
NPDES Permit No. IN0000175
Burns Harbor, Porter County

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

Date(s) of Inspection: November 07, 2019 , November 08, 2019 , November 27, 2019
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection
Inspection Results: Violations were observed and will be referred to the Enforcement Section.

The following concerns were noted:

1. The permit evaluation review generated an unsatisfactory result. ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor's Outfall 002 discharge authorization is limited to non-contact cooling water, treated process wastewater from the lagoon recirculating pump station, building dewatering, groundwater, miscellaneous non-process waters and storm water. ArcelorMittal personnel stated the lagoon recirculating pump station has not been used in a number of years, though it is maintained. As referenced in the August, September, and October 2019 Reconnaissance inspection report, there are concerns that an unpermitted wastewater stream is entering Lake Michigan through Outfall 002, based on the periodic detections of cyanide in grab samples initiated at IDEM's direction in August of 2019.

On September 24, 2019, the IDEM Wastewater Compliance Branch Chief directed ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor to conduct daily 24-hour composite sampling at ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor Outfall 002 for Ammonia as Nitrogen in addition to Cyanide. Due to periodic low level detections of both parameters, on October 24, 2019, the IDEM Wastewater Compliance Branch Chief directed ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor to initiate expanded daily

24-hour composite sampling at ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor Outfall 002, to include the following parameters: Total Phenols, Total Fluoride, Total Recoverable Zinc, Total Recoverable Lead, Total Recoverable Silver, Total Recoverable Copper, Total Recoverable Boron, Dissolved Iron, Chemical Oxygen Demand, and Available Cyanide.

ArcelorMittal personnel have conducted sampling at various manholes to determine the source of the cyanide and ammonia. As of the time of the inspection, ArcelorMittal personnel stated that they have not yet determined the source of the cyanide or ammonia at Outfall 002.

Outfall 002 is not permitted for cyanide or ammonia laden wastes, with the exception of the use of the lagoon recirculating pumps. Per 327 IAC 5-2-2, the discharge of pollutants is prohibited unless in conformity with a valid NPDES permit. Due to cyanide and ammonia detections in the Outfall 002 discharge, an unsatisfactory rating is assigned to the permit evaluation category because the discharge is not in conformity with the permit.

- 2 Operation was rated as marginal. On November 7, 2019, water was observed discharging from the north side of a grated drain immediately north of the C Thickener. The water appeared to surface from the north side of the drain structure, rather than from the drain itself. Refer to the attached photograph. The water drained, by gravity, into an adjacent recently dug diked area, indicating the water surge was expected or anticipated. On-site staff were unable to identify the source of the water, though seal water was suspected. On-site staff were uncertain as to where the drain discharges. At the time of the writing of the report, there has been no definitive answer as to the source of the water or to where the drain discharges.
- 3 The Laboratory evaluation generated an unsatisfactory rating. ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor has established a practice of reanalyzing samples in cases in which initial sample analysis, which passes all quality assurance/quality control checks, indicates a permit effluent limit exceedance, and using the results of the re-analysis to re-calculate or replace results, including those already reported to IDEM. This practice is not allowable, for reasons that include the following:
 - (1) There is no justification for rescinding a violation that is based on a result obtained via analysis of a representative, validly collected sample, analyzed using an approved analytical method, that has passed all quality assurance/quality control checks.
 - (2) The practice is not authorized by the NPDES permit rules or provisions. NPDES permit rules and provisions allow, for most parameters subject to a daily maximum effluent limit for which grab sampling is the required sample type, multiple grab samples to be collected over the course of the day and for the analytical results of the individual grab samples to be averaged, as long as the grab sampling is conducted in a manner that is representative of the monitored discharge. The NPDES

permit rules and provisions also allow the permittee to monitor pollutants more frequently than required by the permit, and call for the results to be reported to IDEM, when approved analytical methods are used. However, neither the NPDES permit rules or provisions state that the permittee may re-analyze a particular sample, grab or composite, for which a valid analytical result (one that passes quality assurance/quality control measures) is obtained, and use that result in place of or along with the initial, valid analytical result.

(3) The practice is selective, as only samples for which initial analysis indicates a violation are re-analyzed, and therefore cannot be viewed as a general added layer of quality assurance/quality control.

(4) The practice undermines the integrity of compliant results that are reported based upon one analysis of a given sample. If ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor maintains that it cannot credibly report noncompliant results based upon one analysis of a given sample (that passes all quality assurance/quality control checks), then IDEM cannot feel confident in compliant results reported by ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor that are based on one analysis of a given sample (that passes all quality assurance/quality control checks). ArcelorMittal's self-monitoring program is either capable of generating valid results based upon one analysis of a given sample or it is not.

4. The Effluent Limits Compliance area was rated **unsatisfactory** due to the following self-reported violations of the limits detailed in Part I. A. of the NPDES Permit:

Month	Year	Outfall	Parameter	Type	Conc./Loading	#
Jul	2017	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		3
Aug	2017	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
Sep	2017	001	Phenol	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Feb	2018	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		2
Feb	2018	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Mar	2018	001	Oil & Grease	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Apr	2018	111	2,3,7,8 TCDF	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
May	2018	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	1
May	2018	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Loading	1
Jul	2018	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		2
Jul	2018	001	2,3,7,8 TCDF	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	2

Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Loading	2
Aug	2018	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		9
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Concentration	7
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	7
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Daily Maximum	Concentration	5
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Daily Maximum	Loading	5
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	4
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Loading	4
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Monthly Avg.	Concentration	1
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Monthly Avg.	Loading	1
Aug	2019	011	Total Cyanide	Daily Maximum	Loading	5

The effluent exceedances for August 2017 to July 2018 were also cited in the IDEM September 12, 2018 CEI inspection report. The August 2019 exceedances were also cited in the IDEM August, September, and October 2019 Reconnaissance inspection report. Please refer to these inspection reports for more information.

This matter is being referred to the OWQ Enforcement Section for appropriate action. Please direct any questions to Nicolas Ream at 219-730-1691 or nream@idem.IN.gov. A copy of the NPDES Industrial Facility Inspection Report is enclosed for your records.

Sincerely,

Rick Massoels, Deputy Director
Northwest Regional Office

Enclosure

Cc: Jason House, IDEM Wastewater Compliance
Ryan Bahr and Joan Rogers, U.S. EPA Region 5
Samantha Groce, IDEM Enforcement



NPDES Industrial Facility Inspection Report

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

NPDES Permit Number: IN0000175	Facility Type: Industrial Major	Facility Classification: D	TEMPO AI ID 12029
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

Date(s) of Inspection: November 07, 2019 , November 08, 2019 , November 27, 2019

Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection

Name and Location of Facility Inspected: ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor LLC 250 West US Highway 20 Burns Harbor IN 46304	County: Porter	Receiving Waters/POTW: East Branch of the Little Calumet River and Lake Michigan	Permit Expiration Date: 6/30/2021
			Design Flow: NA

On Site Representative(s):				
First Name	Last Name	Title	Email	Phone
Theresa	Kirk	Environmental Engineer	theresa.kirk@arcelormittal.com	219-214-2363
Morgan	Swanson	Environmental Engineer	morgan.swanson@arcelormittal.com	
Lynn	Vo	Environmental Engineer	lynn.vo@arcelormittal.com	
Dan	Amling	Engineer of Solid Waste	dan.amling@arcelormittal.com	

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

Certified Operator:	Number:	Class:	Effective Date:	Expiration Date:	Email:
---------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	------------------	--------

Cyber Security Contact
Name: _____ Email: _____

Responsible Official: Mr. Rob Maciel, Environmental Manager 250 West US Highway 12 Burns Harbor, Indiana 46304	Permittee: ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor, LLC Email: robert.maciel@arcelormittal.com Phone: _____ 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	S	Self-Monitoring	S	Compliance Schedules
S	Effluent/Discharge	M	Operation	S	Flow Measurement		
U	Permit	S	Maintenance	U	Laboratory	U	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 streams were free of notable foam, algae or solids during the time of inspection on November 7, 2019.

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.

Evaluation of Multiple Outfalls:

Outfall #	Insp. Date	Outfall Inspection Comments
001	11/7/2019	Effluent was clear and odorless.
002	11/7/2019	Effluent was clear and odorless.
003	11/7/2019	Effluent was clear and odorless.
011	11/7/2019	Effluent was clear and odorless.
111	11/7/2019	No problems were visually observed at the time of the inspection.

Comments:

The effluent from the external outfalls was clear and free of color at the time of the inspection on November 7.

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?
- N 3. Receiving waters are accurately described in the permit.
- N 4. The permit has been properly transferred if there is a new owner.

Comments:

ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor's Outfall 002 discharge authorization is limited to non-contact cooling water, treated process wastewater from the lagoon recirculating pump station, building dewatering, groundwater, miscellaneous non-process waters and storm water. ArcelorMittal personnel stated the lagoon recirculating pump station has not been used in a number of years, though it is maintained. As referenced in the August, September, and October 2019 Reconnaissance inspection report, there are concerns that an unpermitted wastewater stream is entering Lake Michigan through Outfall 002, based on the periodic detections of cyanide in grab samples initiated at IDEM's direction in August of 2019 .

On September 24, 2019, the IDEM Wastewater Compliance Branch Chief directed ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor to conduct daily 24-hour composite sampling at ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor Outfall 002 for Ammonia as Nitrogen in addition to Cyanide. Due to periodic low level detections of both parameters, on October 24, 2019, the IDEM Wastewater Compliance Branch Chief directed ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor to initiate expanded daily 24-hour composite sampling at ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor Outfall 002, to include the following parameters: Total Phenols, Total Fluoride, Total Recoverable Zinc, Total Recoverable Lead, Total Recoverable Silver, Total Recoverable Copper, Total Recoverable Boron, Dissolved Iron, Chemical Oxygen Demand, and Available Cyanide.

ArcelorMittal personnel have conducted sampling at various manholes to determine the source of the cyanide and ammonia. As of the time of the inspection, ArcelorMittal personnel stated that they have not yet determined the source of the cyanide or ammonia at Outfall 002.

Outfall 002 is not permitted for cyanide or ammonia laden wastes, with the exception of the use of the lagoon recirculating pumps. Per 327 IAC 5-2-2, the discharge of pollutants is prohibited unless in conformity with a valid NPDES permit. Due to cyanide and ammonia detections in the Outfall 002 discharge, an unsatisfactory rating is assigned to this category because the discharge is not in conformity with the 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 appeared well maintained at the time of the inspection.

Operation:

- M 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.

N 3. Solids handling procedures were adequate.

N 4. Documentation of solids removal, handling, and disposal was adequate.

Comments:

Operation was rated as marginal. On November 7, 2019, water was observed discharging from the north side of a grated drain immediately north of the C Thickener. The water appeared to surface from the north side of the drain structure, rather than from the drain itself. Refer to the attached photograph. The water drained, by gravity, into an adjacent recently dug diked area, indicating the water surge was expected or anticipated. On-site staff were unable to identify the source of the water, though seal water was suspected. On-site staff were uncertain as to where the drain discharges. At the time of the writing of the report, there has been no definitive answer as to the source of the water or to where the drain discharges.

Maintenance:

S 1. A maintenance record system has been established and includes maintenance/repair history and preventative maintenance plan.

N 2. Facility maintenance activities appeared adequate.

Comments:

Maintenance was rated as satisfactory based solely on the wastewater treatment equipment, including the Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant, lagoons, and RSB filters, being operational at the time of the inspection. It could not be determined, at the time of the inspection, if the cyanide and ammonia presence at Outfall 002 or the water emerging from the drain structure near C Thickener (as noted in Operation) are related to maintenance deficiencies.

Sludge:

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

Comments:

A records review during the inspection, specifically for July 2019 to September 2019, showed adequate wasting, handling, and disposal of sludge.

Self-Monitoring:

S 1. Samples were found to be taken at pre-designated locations and were found to be representative.

S 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:

No sampling deficiencies were identified at the time of the inspection. This rating is based only on the sampling data for October 2019. The deficiencies noted in the USEPA report issued on September 2019, which highlighted improper Total Residual Chlorine and Oil and Grease sampling procedures, have since been corrected. There are concerns, however, with the overall sufficiency of the Self Monitoring Program. Please refer to comments under Laboratory

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.

Comments:

The facility's flow measurement program for Outfalls 001, 003, and 011, including all documentation, is adequate and representative. The flow monitoring for Outfall 002 was not evaluated at the time of the inspection.

Laboratory:

The following laboratory records were reviewed:

- N 1. The laboratory practices and protocol reviewed were adequate, including:
- A written laboratory QA/QC manual was available.
 - Samples were found to be properly stored.
 - Approved analytical methods were used.
 - Calibration and maintenance of instruments was adequate.
 - QA/QC procedures were adequate.
 - Dates of analyses (and times, where required) were recorded.
 - Name of person performing analyses was recorded.

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

Contract Lab Information

ALS and Microbac

Comments:

The Laboratory evaluation generated an unsatisfactory rating. ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor has established a practice of reanalyzing samples in cases in which initial sample analysis, which passes all quality assurance/quality control checks, indicates a permit effluent limit exceedance, and using the results of the re-analysis to re-calculate or replace results, including those already reported to IDEM. ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor has not provided an explanation for this practice. This practice is not allowable, for reasons that include the following:

- (1) There is no justification for rescinding a violation that is based on a result obtained via analysis of a representative, validly collected sample, analyzed using an approved analytical method, that has passed all quality assurance/quality control checks.
- (2) The practice is not authorized by the NPDES permit rules or provisions. NPDES permit rules and provisions allow, for most parameters subject to a daily maximum effluent limit for which grab sampling is the required sample type, multiple grab samples to be collected over the course of the day and for the analytical results of the individual grab samples to be averaged, as long as the grab sampling is conducted in a manner that is representative of the monitored discharge. The NPDES permit rules and provisions also allow the permittee to monitor pollutants more frequently than required by the permit, and call for the results to be reported to IDEM, when approved analytical methods are used. However, neither the NPDES permit rules or provisions state that the permittee may re-analyze a particular sample, grab or composite, for which a valid analytical result (one that passes quality assurance/quality control measures) is obtained, and use that result in place of or along with the initial, valid analytical result.
- (3) The practice is selective, as only samples for which initial analysis indicates a violation are re-analyzed, and therefore cannot be viewed as a general added layer of quality assurance/quality control.
- (4) The practice undermines the integrity of compliant results that are reported based upon one analysis of a given sample. If ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor maintains that it cannot credibly report noncompliant results based upon one analysis of a given sample (that passes all quality assurance/quality control checks), then IDEM cannot feel confident in compliant results reported by ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor that are based on one analysis of a given sample (that passes all quality assurance/quality control checks). ArcelorMittal's self-monitoring program is either capable of generating valid results based upon one analysis of a given sample or it is not.

Records/Reports:

The following records/reports were reviewed:

DMRs for the period of October 2016 to September 2019 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:
- "No Ex" column was accurate.
 - Signatory requirements were met.
 - Reports were prepared by or under the direction of a certified operator.
- S 3. Bypass and Noncompliance reporting are adequate.

Comments:

The requested records were available and appeared complete. Please note, this does not include

records/reporting issues addressed in IDEM's August/September/October 2019 report. Please see that report for additional information.

Compliance Schedules:

- S 1. The NPDES Permit Schedule of Compliance monitoring and reporting milestones have been met.
- S 2. Agreed Order compliance milestones have been met.

Comments:

The facility is on schedule with all requirements of the Schedule of Compliance in the permit.

Effluent Limits Compliance:

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

DMRs for the period of October 2016 to September 2019 were reviewed as part of the inspection.

Yes 2. Were violations noted during the review of DMRs?

The Effluent Limits Compliance area was rated unsatisfactory due to the following self-reported violations of the limits detailed in Part I. A. of NPDES Permit:

Month	Year	Outfall	Parameter	Type	Conc./Loading	Number
Jul	2017	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		3
Aug	2017	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	1
Aug	2017	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
Sep	2017	001	Phenol	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Feb	2018	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		2
Feb	2018	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Mar	2018	001	Oil & Grease	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Apr	2018	111	2,3,7,8 TCDF	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
May	2018	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	1
May	2018	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Loading	1
Jul	2018	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		2
Jul	2018	001	2,3,7,8 TCDF	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Concentration	1
Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	1
Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	2
Jul	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Loading	2
Aug	2018	001	Temperature	Daily Maximum		9
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Concentration	7
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Daily Maximum	Loading	7
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Daily Maximum	Concentration	5
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Daily Maximum	Loading	5
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Concentration	4
Aug	2019	001	Ammonia Nitrogen	Seven Day Average	Loading	4
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Monthly Avg.	Concentration	1
Aug	2019	001	Free Cyanide	Monthly Avg.	Loading	1
Aug	2019	011	Total Cyanide	Daily Maximum	Loading	5

Comments:

The effluent exceedances for August 2017 to July 2018 were also cited in the IDEM September 12, 2018 CEI inspection report. The August 2019 exceedances were also cited in the IDEM August, September, and October 2019 Reconnaissance inspection report. Please refer to these inspection reports for more information.

IDEM REPRESENTATIVE

Inspector Name: Nicholas Ream Email: nream@idem.IN.gov Phone Number: 219-730-1691

IDEM MANAGER REVIEW

IDEM Manager: Rick Massoels Date: 12/9/2019

Inspection Photographs



Facility:

ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor LLC

Photographer:

Nicholas Ream

Date: 11/07/2019

Time: 12:20 PM

Others Present:

Joan Rogers, Robert Lugar, Teri Kirk,
Morgan Swanson, Lynn Vo

Location/Description:

Down and north view from the C Thickener showing water emerging from the north side of the grate structure. The water flowed to the left (west) into a diked area. On-site staff were uncertain of the water source, but suspected it was seal water, which should drain back into the blast furnace recycle water system.