

STATE BIOSOLIDS SURVEY

2018 data conducted 2020-2021 biosolidsdata.org

Indiana

	In	frastructure &	Wastewater	
	2004 Data	2018 Data		
Total Number of WWTPs	193 (survey), 411 CWNS	769		
WWTP & Biosolids In	frastructure Totals			
Number of Separate Preparers (in- or out-of-state, receiving solids from your state):	7	7		
Total number of your state's WWTPs sending to those Separate Preparers:	36	96		
Number of operating sludge incinerators in your state (total):	1	4		
Fluidized bed:	0	0		
Multiple hearth:	1	4		
Number of Part 258 landfills in your state accepting sewage sludge:	data not requested for 2004	34		* NPDES Program at IDEM (in the water division) does not track some of this information . Biosolids are overseen by the IDEM solid
Number of WWTPs in your state with industrial pre-treatment programs:	data not requested for 2004	47		waste program. A Actual and design flow estimates are from IDEM list of active NPDES "severage systems." Separate preparers:
Number of WWTPs in your state with <i>sludge</i> lagoons:	data not requested for 2004	no data		There are 7 regional biosolids centers (RBCs) in the state, and these take in biosolids from 2 or more WWTPs, blend, and land apply
Wastewater F	low Totals			them. The state then considers them generators. 96 WWTPs sent solids to the 7 separate preparers in 2018, as counted by the IDEM expert who counted only domestic wastewater sludge generators and not the many industrial sludge generators that also send solids
Total statewide average daily wastewater flow (MGD):	data not requested for 2004	~1050		to some of the RBCs. Indianapolis is the one system that operates incineration; they have 4 sewage sludge incinerators at the
Total statewide WWTP design capacity for wastewater flow (MGD):	data not requested for 2004	1,200		Belmont treatment facility, where solids from that facility and the Southport facility are burned.
Total statewide average daily dry weather flow (MGD):	data not requested for 2004	no data		
Other To	otals			
Number of documented odor & nuisance complaints received by state in 2018 related to biosolids				
transportation and use or disposal outside of the gates of the WWTP:	data not requested for 2004	0		
Number of WWTPs involved in those complaints:	data not requested for 2004	0		
Percent of population served by on-site systems (e.g. septic systems):	no data	no data		

Biosolids Use and Disposal

	UNITS:	Dry U.S. tons	Dry U.S. tons		
	BIOSOLIDS USE	D OR DISPOSED, 20	18 (adjusted total):	200,000	
			Summa	ry	
	Number of Entities (WWTPs & Sep. Preparers) Going To	Quantity of Biosolids	Number of Entities (WWTPs & Sep. Preparers) Going To	Quantity of Biosolids	NOTE: Quantity of sewage sludge or biosolids used or disposed means the quantity that goes out the gate of the WWTPs. Use the units (the form of measurement) you chose above.
Beneficial Use (applied to soils, not including ADC)	145	106,099	96	72,739	
Disposal & Alternative Dispositions	48	90,864	38	94,036	The total number of entities overlap, as some who land apply may also dispose of some biosolids by landfill or alternate means when
Other*, likely landfilled (see Add'I Total Estimate Calculations, below)	0	0	no data	34,000	ground conditions are not suitable for land application.
TOTAL	193	196,963	134	200,775	
			Bonoficial	lleo	
	1	1	Beneficial	036	
	Number of Entities (WWTPs &	0 10 10 11	Number of Entities (WWTPs &	0 11 10 11	
	Sep. Preparers) Going To	Quantity of Biosolids	Sep. Preparers) Going To	Quantity of Biosolids	4
Agricultural (EQ, Class A, & Class B)	133	43,977	84	42,826	4
Porestiand (EQ, Class A, & Class B)	0	0	0	0	EPA ECHO biosolide data show 49.900 dov U.S. tons "land applied" (meaning out on soil either Class A or B) in 2018, of which
Reclamation (EQ, Class A, & Class B)	0	0	U	U	28 140 dry U.S. tons was class A. including, for example, Forth Wayne's compost-like product. The IDEM data are more complete and
Class A EQ Distribution (bagged or buik, public distribution, or unsure where it went)	10	62 122	12	20.012	of higher quality than the ECHO data. For example, ECHO data for Brownsburg indicates 474 dry U.S. tons land applied, but Merrell
Beneficial Lise Subtotal	145	106.099	96	72 739	Bros. reports that it may have gone to a nearby, low-cost landfill. • IDEM does not track long term storage. • For Class A EQ
Long-term storage	145	100,033	30	no data	Listribution, there were also 3 out-of-state facilities (Milorganite/Milwakikee, Louisville KY, and Chicago) that distributed 22,609 dry
	-	-	1		toris in indiana in 2010, but trese are not included in the data at left Acres applied to are only tracked for class b faird application.
Number of acres to which biosolids were applied:		14.976		18.178	
			Disposal & Altornativ	o Dispositions	
	1	1	Disposal & Alternativ	e Dispositions	
	Number of Entities (WWTPs & Sep. Preparers) Going To	Quantity of Biosolids	Number of Entities (WWTPs & Sep. Preparers) Going To	Quantity of Biosolids	
MSW landfill (total), including landfilled solids not reported to IDEM*	46	39,041	36	67,289	The number of facilities (36) that dispose by landfilling that are included here are only those facilities that hold a land application permit
Burial	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data	or have in the past and voluntarily continue to submit reports to the land application program. This number (36 facilities) does not
Alternative daily (ADC), intermediate, or final cover	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data	represent all facilities in the State of Indiana that dispose of their biosolids by methods other than land application or incineration. The
Surface Disposal	0	0	•	•	quantity of biosolids disposed includes 33,289 dry U.S. tons reported to the IDEM solid waste division by WWTPs that have land
Incineration	2	51,823	2	60,747	application permits but landflied some or all their solids in 2018. For example, as reported by Merrell Bros, regarding Richmond Class. B biosolida, "the wirth upday and their solids in 2018, For example, as reported by Merrell Bros, regarding Richmond Class.
Cement kiln or industrial furnace	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	*	•	is provided in the weight of the capacity being an ecces due to Construction) caused us to dewater for them using a per-press. The City works the landfill is one hauled if there for them due to the fields being too wet. The only reason IDFM knows of this tonnage
Deep well injection	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	*	•	is because Richmond has a land app permit; otherwise, there is no requirement to report landfill disposal through IDEM." • Additional
Gasification	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	*	•	solids - 34,000 dry U.S. tons assumed to be landfilled - were estimated by the NBDP team; see "Additional Total Estimate
Pyrolysis	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	*	•	Calculations," below. • Final cover is land application and would be tracked as land applied; not aware of any biosolids used for final
Disposal & Alternative Dispositions Subtotal	48	90,864	38	128,036	cover. Not aware of any IN facilities disposing of biosolids using any of these alternative methods. Indianapolis reported to this survey 55.124 drv metric tons (= 60.747 drv U. S. tons) generated & incinerated, which matches its report to EPA's ECHO

TOTAL	193	196,963	134	200,775	database. However, some small IN WWTP may send their solids to the Indianapolis incinerators

Biosolids Quality Summary

	Number of Entities (WWTPs & Sep. Preparers) Producing	Quantity of Biosolids	Number of Entities (WWTPs & Sep. Preparers) Producing	Quantity of Biosolids	NOTE: For "number of entities," the total may not match because some entities go to more than one use or disposal.
Class A EQ	11	61,197	15	52,522	
Other Class A	1	924	0	0	IDEM does not track all facilities or amount produced. They only track those with land application or marketing and distribution permits
Class B	135	45,753	129	76,114	and the volume out the gate (land applied, marketed/distributed, landified, hauled to other treatment works, etc.). In Outper (no data atc) is the 2 inclearation facilities at Indianazolis, plus an estimate likely dozene of WMTPC (not included at laft) that send an
Other (no data, etc.)	no data	90,864	2	72,139	data, etc.) is the 2 membration rate at included in the 72 139 toos shown at left) only to land fault her we no land application permit
TOTAL	147	198,738	146	200,775	

Biosolids Treatment Practices

	Estimated Number of WWTPs	Estimated Quantity of Biosolids	Estimated Number of WWTPs or	Estimated Quantity of Biosolids
	or Separate Preparers Using	Produced Using	Separate Preparers Using	Produced Using
	Stabiliza	ation		
Aerobic Digestion (total)	662	no data	91	no data
Class A (ATAD/Other)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	3	no data
Class B	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	88	no data
Anaerobic digestion (AD) (total)	94	no data	37	no data
Class A (e.g. thermophilic)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	2	no data
Class B (mesophilic)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	35	no data
WWTPs co-digesting (FOG, food, glycol, etc.)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	3	N/A
Biogas used (heating, electicity, fuel, etc.;scf/year)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	N/A
Lime/Alkaline (total)	19	no data	10	no data
Class A lime/alkaline	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	6	no data
Class B lime/alkaline	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	4	no data
Composting	3	no data	3	no data
Thermal (e.g. heat drying, not incineration/gasificatn/pyrol)	17	no data	3	no data
Gasification	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data
Pyrolysis	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data
Hydrolysis (thermal, chemical, etc.)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	N/A
Long-term (lagoons, reed beds, etc.)	4	no data	26	N/A
Oxidation ditch / extended aeration	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	N/A
Other stabilization technology	0	0	no data	no data
	Dewate	ring		
Belt Filter Press	no data	no data	no data	no data
Plate & Frame Press	no data	no data	no data	no data
Screw Press	no data	no data	no data	no data
Centrifuge	no data	no data	no data	no data
Vaccuum Filter	no data	no data	no data	no data
Drying beds (open-air)	no data	no data	45	no data
Solar drying (e.g. in greenhouse)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	1	no data
Other dewatering technology	no data	no data	no data	no data
	Thicker	ning		
Gravity thickener	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data
Gravity belt thickener (GBT)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data
Centrifuge	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data
Dissolved air flotation (DAF)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data
Other thickening technology	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data
	Othe	r		
Biosolids sold in bags (explain at right what size bags)	data not requested for 2004	data not requested for 2004	no data	no data

*Additional Total Estimate Calculations

IDEM data provided are based on reports on all land application and some lar when the WWTP does not have a land application permit. The for	ndfilling (when a facitily has or h blowing calculations were used	ad a land application permit and rep by the NBDP to independently esti	corts landfilling). However, IDEM knows it does not have data on additional solids landfilled mate the additional mass of solids landfilled in 2018, using other data sources.
2018 U. S. EPA electronic reporting data (ECHO), solids generated		160,303	U. S. dry tons
incinerated (Indianapolis, 2 WWTPs)	60,746		U. S. dry tons
other disposition	99,557		U. S. dry tons
3 additional WWTP's data from NBDP WWTP survey		348	U. S. dry tons
12 additional larger WWTPs that are ~19% of state avg. flow, 149.71 MGD		26,199	U.S. dt, assuming 175 U.S.dt solids/MGD (IN mean), 0% to other WWTPs
Total U. S. dry tons solids estimate for ~76% of flow (down to 4 MGD)		186,850	U. S. dry tons
Other major (1 - 4 MGD) WWTPs, per Seiple et al 2020, 157.69 MGD		13,798	U.S. dt, assuming 175 U.S.dt solids/MGD (IN mean), 50% to other WWTPs
Adjusted estimate of total solids used & disposed in IN	200,648	200,648	U.S. dry tons
beneficial use: IDEM number of tons beneficially used is accurate	72,739		U. S. dry tons
incineration data are accurate, from ECHO report by Indianapolis	60,746		U. S. dry tons
IDEM data on landfill disposal, accurate based on reports	33,289		U. S. dry tons
other - likely additional landfill disposal - NBDP estimate	33,874		U.S. dry tons

State Pollutant (trace metal, etc.) Concentration Limits in Biosolids Applied to Land, 2018

Enter numbers only where state limits differed in 2018 from U.S. EPA limits.

	Arsenic (As)	Cadmium (Cd)	Chromium (Cr)	Copper (Cu)	Lead (Pb)	Mercury (Ha)	Molybdenum (Mo)	Nickel (Ni)	Selenium (Se)	Zinc (Zn)
EPA Table 1 (mg/kg)	75	85		4300	840	57	75	420	100	7500
EPA Table 3 (mg/kg) & CPLR (kg/ha)	41	39		1500	300	17	40 mg/kg limit for Mo on past	420	36 (CPLR = 100)	2800
State ceiling limit (higher limit) (mg/kg)										
State high quality (lower number) limit (mg/kg)							75			
State CPLR (kg/ha)										
State APLR (kg/ha/365days)		0.504		ir	dustrial waste has a lowe	r Cd APLR than for b	osolids; generally not	a problem; most in	dustrial material is foo	d waste

TESTING

For each of the following constituents,	Is testing required for <i>all</i>	Or is testing required only for biosolids being	Frequency of testing (in must be done for	dicate how often testing each parameter):	If frequency depends on wastewater flow or
indicate if testing is required by your state, as of 2018.	sewage sludge or biosolids?	beneficially used as fertilizers and soil amendments?	In accordance with Part 503 requirements	In accordance with other frequency required by state (if applicable, please specify)	amount of biosolids used or disposed of, please explain:
Part 503 metals (As, Cu, Hg, etc.)	no	yes	yes	no	amount generated
Other metals (boron, silver)	no	no	not applicable (N/A)	no	
Dioxins/furans	no	no	not applicable (N/A)	no	
PCBs	no	yes	yes	no	amount generated
Priority pollutants (https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015- 09/documents/priority-pollutant-list-epa.pdf))	(please select)	(please select)	(please select)		
Other organic compounds (e.g. PDBEs, pharmaceutical)	(please select)	(please select)	(please select)		
Radioactive isotopes (alpha, beta, Ra 226, etc.)	(please select)	(please select)	(please select)		
Nutrients (NPK)	no	yes	(please select)		application occurs
Pathogen reduction (Class A or B)	no	yes	yes		
Vector attraction reduction (VAR)	no	yes	yes		
PFAS (as of 2018)	no	no	not applicable (N/A)		
Microplastics (as of 2018)	no	no	not applicable (N/A)		
TCLP (toxicity characteristic leaching procedure)	(please select)	no	not applicable (N/A)		
Paint Filter Liquids Test	(please select)	no	no		

not applicable (N/A)

(please select)

(please select)

yes

yes

yes

yes

yes not applicable (N/A)

s reporting to the state

required for these parameters?

ves

yes no

no

yes

no

yes

no

yes

yes

yes

yes

no

no

no

yes

(please select)

For each of the following, indicate what

WWTPs and/or biosolids preparers

The amounts of biosolids/ sewage sludge used or

(https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-

09/documents/priority-pollutant-list-epa.pdf) Other organic compounds (e.g. PDBEs, pharmaceutical) no

Radioactive isotopes (alpha, beta, Ra 226, etc.)

TCLP (toxicity characteristic leaching procedure)

How biosolids achieve vector attraction reduction (VAR) yes

Cumulative Pollutant Loading Rates (CPLR)

How biosolids achieve Class A or Class B

Solids stabilization process(es) used

Other biosolids treatments

End use or disposal practice

Microplastics (as of 2018)

Paint Filter Liquids Test

PFAS (as of 2018)

must report to the state:

Part 503 metals (As, Cu, Hg, etc.)

Other metals (boron, silver...)

disposed

Dioxins/furans PCBs

Priority pollutants

Nutrients (NPK)

0	not applicable (N/A)			
0	not applicable (N/A)			
0	not applicable (N/A)			
Ō	no			
	RE	PORTING		
Frequency of reporting (i must be done for	ndicate how often testing each parameter):	How are these data	Are data compiled by the state in reports or	
n accordance with Part 503 requirements	In accordance with other frequency required (if applicable, please specify)	 How are these data stored by the state? 	? summaries? Is so, please attach.	
0	monthly	electronic	no	
0	monthly when land apply	electronic	no	
ot applicable (N/A)	n/a	not applicable (N/A)	no	
ot applicable (N/A)	n/a	not applicable (N/A)	no	
0	with permit renewal	not applicable (N/A)	no	
please select)		(please select)	(please select)	
ot applicable (N/A)		(please select)	(please select)	
ot applicable (N/A)		(please select)	(please select)	
please select)		electronic	no	
ot applicable (N/A)	1	(please select)	(please select)	
es		(please select)	(please select)	

(please select)

en no disposal is reported. DES program. • Only facilities to report disposal method and ase and can be queried for various nd applied, landfilled, or taken to another treatment facility or regional center).

NPDES program requires testing for priority pollutants.