



2GC0158120090715

RICHLAND MANSFIELD SPEEDWAY

2GC01581 2009/07/15 HABLITZEL, LYNETTE MANSFIELD



State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Northwest District Office

347 North Dunbridge Road
Bowling Green, OH 43402-9398

TELE: (419) 352-8461 FAX: (419) 352-8468
www.epa.state.oh.us

Ted Strickland, Governor
Lee Fisher, Lieutenant Governor
Chris Korleski, Director

Re: Richland County
Mansfield Speedway
Construction
Storm Water

July 15, 2009

Mr. Michael Dzurilla
Mansfield Motor Sports
100 Crall Road
Mansfield, Ohio 44903

Dear Mr. Dzurilla:

On May 19, 2009, Walter Ariss, Danielle Meienburg and I inspected Mansfield Speedway at 100 Crall Road, Mansfield, Ohio (photos taken). The purpose of our visit was to evaluate compliance of the site with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for storm water associated with construction activity, Facility ID No. 2GC01581*AG. The inspection was conducted under the provisions of Ohio's water pollution control statutes, Ohio Revised Code (ORC) Chapter 6111. Bill Conn, Mansfield Motorsports Park, provided information at the end of our visit and we discussed several of our findings with him.

As a result of the inspection, I have the following comments:

1. At the time of inspection, a small bull dozer was sitting idle on the north end of the site. Rough grading appeared to have been recently done on less than one acre of the north end of the site. Fill material appeared to have been added to the ground southeast of the sediment settling basin. It is my understanding from Mr. Conn that Deer Creek was bringing additional fill material from the Gorman Rupp property to this project. No earth moving equipment was present on the south portion of the site (off Piper Road.).
2. Copies of the SWP3 and inspection logs were requested in my January 16, 2009, letter. I did not receive a response to that letter. The SWP3 and inspection logs were requested and not available onsite. *Failure to have the SWP3 available onsite is a violation of Part III.C.2.a. of the permit. Failure to provide a copy of the SWP3 within 10 days of a written request is a violation of Part III.C.2.b. of the permit. Failure to maintain inspection logs is a violation of Part III. G. 2.i. of the permit.* These items were discussed with Mr. Conn.
3. A stone construction entrance was in place off State Route 545. No tracking was evident. However, a proper stone construction entrance remains absent for the access point off Piper Road. *This is a violation of Part III.G.2.g.ii. of the permit.* This violation is a continuation from my January 16, 2009, letter.

4. On the south end of the site, drainage to the west appeared to be at least partially addressed by silt fence. Due to the percent slope, it appears that the maximum drainage area for silt fence has been exceeded. *This is a violation of Part III.G.2.d.ii. of the permit.* This violation is a continuation from my January 16, 2009, letter. There appeared to be no structural sediment control to address runoff from the southeast side. Silt fence was no longer in place near the culvert on the northwest side of the site. This last item was discussed with Mr. Conn. *This is a violation of Part III.G.2.d. of the permit.* Sediment controls must be installed prior to grading and within seven (7) days of grubbing. They must remain functional until the upslope area is stabilized. Where the maximum drainage area for silt fence has been exceeded, a diversion which directs runoff to a sediment settling pond is required.
5. On the south end of the site, the silt fence to the west was down in some locations and in need of repair. *Permit Requires: All control practices shall be maintained and repaired as needed to assure continued performance of their intended function. This is a violation of Part III.G.2.h. of the permit.* This was discussed with Mr. Conn.
6. Most of the north portion of the site drained to the west, where a diversion berm carried runoff into a sediment settling basin. The sediment basin was filled almost to the top of the riser pipe with sediment. *This is a violation of Part III.G.2.d.ii. and Part III.G.2.h. of the permit.* This violation is a continuation from my January 16, 2009, letter. Sediment must be removed from the sediment settling pond. It must continue to be removed when the design capacity has been reduced by 40%. This is typically reached when the sediment occupies one-half the depth of the basin. The need for maintenance was discussed with Mr. Conn.
7. My July 3, 2008, letter noted that the sediment basin was holding water on May 13, 2008, and did not appear to have a significant discharge at its outlet. My letter requested that you assess the outlet structure for clogging. The letter also asked for written verification by July 13, 2008, that the pond currently met the design requirements of the permit and was operating as designed. No written response has been received. *Permit Requires: Sediment settling ponds must be maintained within 10 days of inspection. This is a violation of Part III.G.2.i.i. of the permit. I am also concerned that with the reduced capacity of the basin, its lack of an emergency spillway, and unstabilized embankments, there is a potential for a significant failure of this impoundment structure.* This may include the overtopping and washout of the embankment creating the basin.
8. The drainageway to the sediment basin remained unstabilized. It has formed a large gully, approximately 6 feet deep near the basin. I observed rills and large gullies leading to the drainageway. The need for stabilization and erosion control measures on this channel was noted in my July 3, 2008, and January 16, 2009, letters. *Permit Requires: Operators shall undertake special measures to stabilize channels and outfalls.*

The SWP3 shall incorporate measures which control flow so as to prevent erosion. *These are violations of Parts III.G.2.b.ii. (stable conveyance channel) and III.G.2.c. (Check dams) of the permit.* Channels must be stabilized, which may also require reshaping.

9. Weathered soil and rills were observed in the southern portion of the site. Based on the gullies present and information in our files, some portions of the northern end of the site appear to have been idle and bare for three (3) years. Areas appear unchanged from May 2008 and, in some cases, March 2007 (see attached photos). The presence of vegetation and weathered soil indicated the majority of the northern portion of the site had been idle since my May 13, 2008, visit. The timeframes for stabilization have been exceeded.

Permit Requires: Portions of the construction site which will be inactive for more than 21 days must have temporary stabilization initiated within the first seven. Temporary stabilization is required prior to the onset of winter weather for ground that will be idle over winter. Permanent stabilization is required within seven (7) days on any portion of the site that has reached final grade or will be idle for longer than one (1) year. Soil stabilization practices shall be initiated within two (2) days on inactive, barren areas within 50 feet of a stream. Permanent seeding and mulching is required before construction activity is completed throughout the entire site. If seasonal conditions prohibit the establishment of vegetative cover, other means, such as mulching and matting, must still be used and maintained until more permanent methods can be implemented. *Failure to do so is a violation of Part III.G.2.b.i. of the permit.* This item was discussed with Mr. Conn. This violation is a continuation from my January 16, 2009, letter.

10. Woody vegetation had been placed in the east end of the sediment settling basin. Other debris, including a large wood box, pallets, painted posts, and a paint can were observed in the southeast side of the basin. *This is a violation of Part III.G.2.g. of the permit.* This item was discussed with Mr. Conn. Practices must be implemented to prevent the discharge of non-sediment pollutants to the drainage system of the site. State and local waste disposal laws must be followed. I recommend that the residual waste be removed and properly disposed.
11. During the March 23, 2007, visit to discuss proposed stream impacts related to the drag strip, Jeff Boyles, Ohio EPA, and James Spence, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, observed indications of historic unauthorized impacts to onsite streams. This included the detention area south of the oval track constructed under coverage of the Construction General Permit, Facility ID No. OHR112245, granted on March 13, 2003. Discussion occurred on March 23, 2007, and on May 13, 2008, about how to address both past and future impacts. It is my understanding that no additional information or Clean Water Act Section 404 or Section 401 applications have been submitted to the Corps or to Ohio EPA at this time. **Please note that the issue of previous unauthorized impacts and stabilization of the detention area must be resolved in order to be in compliance with the Construction General Permit.**

Mr. Andrew Paulson
July 15, 2009
Page 4

Within 10 days of the date on this letter, please submit to this office **written notification** as to the actions taken or proposed to prevent any future violations. Your response should include the dates, either actual or proposed, for the completion of the actions as well as a current copy of the site's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, including inspection logs. Many of these violations were cited in previous inspections. The agency has received no reply to previous inspection letters and requests for documentation. **Failure to address these issues will result in escalated enforcement action.** If there are any questions, please contact me at (419) 373-3009.

Sincerely,



Lynette M. Hablitzel, P.E.
Division of Surface Water
Storm Water Program

//lr

pc: ~~DSW-NWDO File~~
Jeff Boyles, CO-DSW, 401/Isolated Wetlands Program
James B. Spence, Biologist, Regulatory Project Manager
James De Santo, P.E., Mansfield City Engineer
Bill Conn, Mansfield Motorsports Park