

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

JUN 2 2 2010

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

SC-6J

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Donald L. Mennel Mennel Milling Company 1128 W. Cricker Street Fostoria, Ohio 44830

RE: Complaint and Expedited Settlement Agreement

ESA Docket No. RMP-10-ESA-009

Docket No CAA-05-2010-0028

BD#

2751003A028

Dear Mr. Mennel:

Enclosed please find a copy of the fully executed Expedited RMP Settlement Agreement (ESA). The ESA is binding on EPA and Respondent. EPA will take no further action against Respondent for the violations cited in the ESA. The ESA requires no further action on your part.

Please feel free to contact Monika Chrzaszcz at (312) 886-0181, or Chrzaszcz.monika@epa.gov, if you have any questions regarding the enclosed document or if you have any other question about the program. Thank you for your assistance in resolving this matter.

Sincerely,

Mark J. Horwitz, Chief

Chemical Emergency

Preparedness & Prevention Section

Enclosure



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

2018 JUN 22 AM 11: 02

AGREEMENT (ESA) PLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

DOCKET NO: RMP-10-ESA-009

This ESA is issued to: The Mennel Milling Company At: 301 South Mill Street, Dowagiac, Michigan 49047

for violating Section 112(r)(7) of the Clean Air Act.

CAA-05-2010-0028

BOTT

2751003A028

This Expedited Settlement Agreement (ESA) is being entered into by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 5, by its duly delegated official, the Director, Superfund Division, and by Respondent pursuant to Section 113(a)(3) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(a)(3) and (d), and by 40 C.F.R. § 22.13(b). On February 23, 2009, EPA obtained the concurrence of the U.S. Department of Justice, pursuant to Section 113(d)(1) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. §7413(d)(1), to pursue this administrative enforcement action.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

On February 19, 2010, EPA sent a Request for Information Pursuant to Section 114(a) of the Clean Air Act to the subject facility (Respondent) to determine compliance with the Risk Management Plan (RMP) regulations promulgated at 40 C.F.R. Part 68 under Section 112(r) of the Act. EPA found that the Respondent had violated regulations implementing Section112(r) of the Act by failing to comply with the regulations as noted on the attached RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist (FORM) which is hereby incorporated by reference.

SETTLEMENT

In consideration of Respondent's size of business, its full compliance history, its good faith effort to comply, and other factors as justice may require, and upon consideration of the entire record, the parties enter into this ESA in order to settle the violations, described in the attached FORM, for the total penalty amount of \$300.00

This settlement is subject to the following terms and conditions:

The Respondent, by signing below, waives any objections that it may have regarding jurisdiction, neither admits nor denies the specific factual allegations contained herein and in the FORM, and consents to the assessment of the penalty as stated above. Respondent waives its rights to a hearing afforded by Section 113(d)(2)(A) of the Act, 42 U.S.C §7413(d)(2)(A), and to appeal this ESA. Each party to this action shall bear its own costs and fees, if any. Respondent also certifies, subject to civil and criminal penalties for making a false submission to the United States Government, that the Respondent has corrected the violations listed in the attached FORM and has sent a cashier's check or certified check (payable to the "Treasurer, United States of America") in the amount of \$300.00 in payment of the full penalty amount to the following address:

US Environmental Protection Agency Fines and Penalties Cincinnati Finance Center PO Box 979077 St. Louis, MO 63197-9000

The DOCKET NUMBER OF THIS ESA must be included on the check. (The DOCKET NUMBER is located at the top left corner of this ESA.)



2010 JUN 22 AN H: 02

This original ESA and a copy of the check must be sent by certified mail to:

Monika Chrzaszcz Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Section (SC-6J) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 77 West Jackson Boulevard Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590

Upon Respondent's submission of the signed original ESA, EPA will take no further civil action against Respondent for the alleged violations of the Act referenced in the FORM. EPA does not waive any other enforcement action for any other violation of the Clean Air Act or any other statute.

If the signed original ESA with an attached copy of the check is not returned to the EPA Region 5 office at the above address in correct form by the Respondent within 45 days of the date of Respondent's receipt of it (90 days if an extension is granted), the proposed ESA is withdrawn, without prejudice to EPA's ability to file an enforcement action for the violations identified herein and in the FORM.

This ESA is binding on the parties signing below.

This ESA is effective upon filing with the Regional Hearing Clerk.

FOR RESPONDENT:	
Signature: 64 , DONALD L. MENNEL	Date: 4/16/10
Name (print): DONALD L. MENNEL	
Title (print): PRESIDENT	
The Mennel Milling Company	
FOR COMPLAINANT: 40 F. K Richard C. Karl, Director Superfund Division	Date: <u>5/27/10</u>
I hereby ratify the ESA and incorporate it herein by reference. I	t is so ORDERED.
Bharat Mathur, Susan Hedman Acting Regional Administrator	Date: <u>6/4/10</u>

CAA-05-2010-0028



16426337

TEGIOVAL BEARING CLERK U.S. EPAApril 16, 2010

CASHIER'S CHECK - Customer Receipt

Pay to the

Order of: TREASURY UNITED STATES OF AMERICA***

\$*********300.00

Amount: THREE HUNDRED 00/100 US DOLLARS

CAA-05-2010-0028

Memo:

CUSTOMER PURCHASE

Purchased by:

MENNEL MILLING CO

Transaction #:

444917938

Cost Center:

0966

Method of Purchase: Transfer

AA-05-2010-0020

BB# 2751003A028

NON-NEGOTIABLE

The purchase of a Surety Bond may be required before any Cashier's Check on this bank will be replaced or refunded in the event it is lost, misplaced, or stolen.

VERIFY THE AUTHENTICITY OF THIS MULTI-TONE SECURITY DOCUMENT

CHECK BACKGROUND AREA CHANGES COLOR GRADUALLY FROM TOP TO BOTTOM

73-119

16426337

FIFTH THIRD BANK

CASHIER'S CHECK

10-ESA-009

April 16, 2010

Pay to the

Order of: TREASURY UNITED STATES OF AMERICA***

\$*******300.00

Amount THREE HUNDRED 00/100 US DOLLARS

Drawn on:

Fifth Third Bank, Kentucky, Inc.

Transaction Number: 444917938

Lexington, KY

st Center: 096

Cost Center:

0966

Memo:

CUSTOMER PURCHASE

Purchased by: MENNEL MILLING CO

The purchase of a Surety Bond may be required before any Cashier's Check on this bank will be replaced or refunded in the event it is lost, misplaced, or stolen.

Authorized Signature

#1642633?# #042101190# 0082510054#

THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT HAS A WHITE REFLECTIVE WATERMARK ON THE BACK.

HOLD AT AN ANGLE TO SEE THE MARK WHEN CHECKING THE ENDORSEMENTS.

	MP Program Level 3 rocess Checklist CAA-05-2010-0028 Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Co EPA Facility ID: 10000014122 AL HE ARI	ompai	ny Carr	
Se	ction A – Management [68.15] 22 68	M: n	2	
			□U	⊠N/A
Has	s the owner or operator:		-	
1.	Developed a management system to oversee the implementation of the risk management program elements? [68.15(a)]	□Y	ΠN	⊠N/A
2.	Assigned a qualified person or position that has the overall responsibility for the development, implementation, and integration of the risk management program elements? [68.15(b)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
3.	Documented other persons responsible for implementing individual requirements of the risk management program and defined the lines of authority through an organization chart or similar document? [68.15(c)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
Se	ction B: Hazard Assessment [68.20-68.42]	•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	zard assessment conducted and documented as provided in 40 CFR 68.20-68.42?	lM	□U	⊠N/A
На	zard Assessment: Offsite consequence analysis parameters [68.22]			
1.	Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for a worst-case scenario: [68.22(a)] ☐ For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)] ☐ For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]; or ☐ For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)] ☐ For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
2.	Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for an alternative release scenario: [68.22(a)] □ For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)] □ For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)] □ For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)] □ For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
3.	Used appropriate wind speeds and stability classes for the release analysis? [68.22(b)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
4.	Used appropriate ambient temperature and humidity values for the release analysis? [68.22(c)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
5.	Used appropriate values for the height of the release for the release analysis? [68.22(d)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
6.	Used appropriate surface roughness values for the release analysis? [68.22(e)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
7.	Do tables and models, used for dispersion analysis of toxic substances, appropriately account for dense or neutrally buoyant gases? [68.22(f)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
8.	Were liquids, other than gases liquefied by refrigeration only, considered to be released at the highest daily maximum temperature, based on data for the previous three years appropriate for a stationary source, or at process temperature, whichever is higher? [68.22(g)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Company Process Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122				
Process Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122				
Hazard Assessment: Worst-case release scenario analysis [68.25]				
9. Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario estimated to create the greatest distance to an endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated toxic substance from covered processes under worst-case conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(i)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A	
10. Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario estimated to create the greatest distance to an endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated flammable substance from covered processes under worst-case conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(ii)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A	
11. Analyzed and reported in the RMP additional worst-case release scenarios for a hazard class if the worst-case release from another covered process at the stationary source potentially affects public receptors different from those potentially affected by the worst-case release scenario developed under 68.25(a)(2)(i) or 68.25(a)(2)(ii)? [68.25(a)(2)(iii)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A	
12. Has the owner or operator determined the worst-case release quantity to be the greater of the following: [68.25(b)]	□Y	ΠN	⊠N/A	
☐ If released from a vessel, the greatest amount held in a single vessel, taking into account administrative controls that limit the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(1)]				
☐ If released from a pipe, the greatest amount held in the pipe, taking into account administrative controls that limit the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(2)]				
13.a. Has the owner or operator for toxic substances that are normally gases at ambient temperature and handled as a gas	or liquio	l under	pressure:	
13.a.(1) Assumed the whole quantity in the vessel or pipe would be released as a gas over 10 minutes? [68.25(c)(1)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A	
13.a.(2) Assumed the release rate to be the total quantity divided by 10, if there are no passive mitigation systems in place? [68.25(c)(1)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A	
13.b. Has the owner or operator for toxic gases handled as refrigerated liquids at ambient pressure:				
13.b.(1) Assumed the substance would be released as a gas in 10 minutes, if not contained by passive mitigation systems or if the contained pool would have a depth of 1 cm or less? [68.25(c)(2)(i)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A	
13.b.(2) If released substance would be contained by passive mitigation systems in a pool with a depth > 1 cm;	□Y	□N	⊠N/A	
Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe (as determined per 68.25(b)) would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]				
Calculated the volatility rate at the boiling point of the substance and at the conditions specified in 68.25(d)? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]				
13.c. Has the owner or operator for toxic substances that are normally liquids at ambient temperature:	-			
13.c.(1) Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(d)(1)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A	
13.c.(2) Determined the surface area of the pool by assuming that the liquid spreads to 1 cm deep, if there is no passive mitigation system in place that would serve to contain the spill and limit the surface area, or if passive mitigation is in place, was the surface area of the contained liquid used to calculate the volatilization rate? [68.25(d)(1)(i)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A	
13.c.(3) Taken into account the actual surface characteristics, if the release would occur onto a surface that is not paved or smooth? [68.25(d)(1)(ii)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A	
13.c.(4) Determined the volatilization rate by accounting for the highest daily maximum temperature in the past three years, the temperature of the substance in the vessel, and the concentration of the substance if the liquid spilled is a mixture or solution? [68.25(d)(2)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A	
13.c.(5) Determined the rate of release to air from the volatilization rate of the liquid pool? [68.25(d)(3)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A	

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Con EPA Facility ID: 10000014122						
13.c.(6)	Determined the rate of release to air by using the method Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that a industry as applicable as part of current practices, or promay be used provided the owner or operator allows the imodel features and differences from publicly available in [68.25(d)(3)]	ccount for the modeling cor prietary models that accoun mplementing agency access	ditions and are recognized by t for the modeling conditions to the model and describes	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
	What modeling technique did the owner or operator use?	? [68.25(g)]				
13.d.	Has the owner or operator for flammables:					
13.d.(1)	Assumed the quantity in a vessel(s) of flammable gas he released to an undiked area vaporizes resulting in a vapor			ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
13.d.(2)	For refrigerated gas released to a contained area or liquid assumed the quantity volatilized in 10 minutes results in		ospheric boiling point,	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
13.d.(3)	Assumed a yield factor of 10% of the available energy is the explosion endpoint, if the model used is based on TN			ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
14. Use	ed the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to	the endpoints? [68.25(g)]		ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
any app pro	ermined the rate of release to air by using the methodolog other publicly available techniques that account for the milicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models wided the owner or operator allows the implementing agent erences from publicly available models to local emergence	nodeling conditions and are that account for the modeling access to the model and	recognized by industry as ag conditions may be used describes model features and	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
Wh	at modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.	25(g)]				
	ured that the passive mitigation system, if considered, is chario and will still function as intended? [68.25(h)]	capable of withstanding the	release event triggering the	ŪΥ	ΠN	⊠N/A
17. Cor	sidered also the following factors in selecting the worst-c	ase release scenarios: [68.2	5(i)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
	Smaller quantities handled at higher process temperature	or pressure? [68.25(i)(1)]				
	Proximity to the boundary of the stationary source? [68.	25(i)(2)]				
Hazard	Assessment: Alternative release scenario analysis [68.2	28]	1			
pro	ntified and analyzed at least one alternative release scenario cess(es) and at least one alternative release scenario to rep cesses? [68.28(a)]			ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
19. Sel	ected a scenario: [68.28(b)]			ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
	That is more likely to occur than the worst-case release s	cenario under 68.25? [68.25]	B(b)(1)(i)]			
	That will reach an endpoint off-site, unless no such scena	ario exists? [68.28(b)(1)(ii)]				

R	g Com	par	ıy		
Pı	rocess Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122				
20.	Considered release scenarios which included, but are not limited to, the following: [68.28(b)(2)]		JΥ	□N	⊠N/A
	☐ Transfer hose releases due to splits or sudden hose uncoupling? [68.28(b)(2)(i)]				
	Process piping releases from failures at flanges, joints, welds, valves and valve seals, and drains or bleeds? [68.28(b)(2)(ii)]				
	□ Process vessel or pump releases due to cracks, seal failure, or drain, bleed, or plug failure? [68.28(b)(2)(iii)]				
	□ Vessel overfilling and spill, or overpressurization and venting through relief valves or rupture disks? [68.28(b)(2)(iv)]				
	☐ Shipping container mishandling and breakage or puncturing leading to a spill? [68.28(b)(2)(v)]				
21.	Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the endpoints? [68.28(c)]	С	ĴΥ	□N	⊠N/A
22.	Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features a differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.28(c)]	14	ĴΥ	□N	⊠N/A
	What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]				
23.	Ensured that the passive and active mitigation systems, if considered, are capable of withstanding the release event triggering the scenario and will be functional? [68.28(d)]		ΊΥ	□N	⊠N/A
24.	Considered the following factors in selecting the alternative release scenarios: [68.28(e)]		ĴΥ	□N	⊠N/A
	☐ The five-year accident history provided in 68.42? [68.28(e)(1)]				
	☐ Failure scenarios identified under 68.50? [68.28(e)(2)]				
Ha	zard Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Population [68.30]		_		
25.	Estimated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the point of release at the center? [68.30(a)]	Е	ΙΥ	□N	⊠N/A
26.	Identified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial building in the RMP? [68.30(b)]	ıgs E	ΙΥ	□N	⊠N/A
27.	Used most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)]	С	ÌΥ	□N	⊠N/A
28.	Estimated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)]	Е	ΙΥ	□N	⊠N/A
Ha	zard Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Environment [68.33]				_
29.	Identified environmental receptors that would be included in the distance to the endpoint based on a circle with the point of release at the center? [68.33(a)]	[lΥ	□N	⊠N/A
30.	Relied on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify environmental receptors? [Source may have used LandView to obtain information] [68.33(b)]	Е	lΥ	□N	⊠N/A
Haz	zard Assessment: Review and update [68.36]				
31.	Reviewed and updated the off-site consequence analyses at least once every five years? [68.36(a)]		lΥ	□N	⊠N/A
32.	Completed a revised analysis and submit a revised RMP within six months of a change in processes, quantities store or handled, or any other aspect that might reasonably be expected to increase or decrease the distance to the endpoint by a factor of two or more? [68.36(b)]		lY	□N	⊠N/A

	RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Company Process Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122					
	occis Checkist					
Ha	zard Assessment: Documentation [68.39]					
33.	For worst-case scenarios: a description of the vessel or pipeline and substance selected, assumptions and parameters used, the rationale for selection, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and passive mitigation on the release quantity and rate? [68.39(a)]	ШΥ	□N	⊠N/A		
34.	For alternative release scenarios: a description of the scenarios identified, assumptions and parameters used, the rationale for the selection of specific scenarios, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and mitigation on the release quantity and rate? [68.39(b)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A		
35.	Documentation of estimated quantity released, release rate, and duration of release? [68.39(c)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
36.	Methodology used to determine distance to endpoints? [68.39(d)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
37.	Data used to estimate population and environmental receptors potentially affected? [68.39(e)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
Ha	ard Assessment: Five-year accident history [68.42]					
38.	Has the owner or operator included all accidental releases from covered processes that resulted in deaths, injuries, or significant property damage on site, or known offsite deaths, injuries, evacuations, sheltering in place, property damage, or environmental damage? [68.42(a)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		
39.	Has the owner or operator reported the following information for each accidental release: [68.42(b)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A		
	□ Date, time, and approximate duration of the release? [68.42(b)(1)]					
	☐ Chemical(s) released? [68.42(b)(2)]					
	☐ Estimated quantity released in pounds and percentage weight in a mixture (toxics)? [68.42(b)(3)]					
	□ NAICS code for the process? [68.42(b)(4)]					
	☐ The type of release event and its source? [68.42(b)(5)]	ļ				
	☐ Weather conditions (if known)? [68.42(b)(6)]					
	☐ On-site impacts? [68.42(b)(7)]					
	☐ Known offsite impacts? [68.42(b)(8)]					
	☐ Initiating event and contributing factors (if known)? [68.42(b)(9)]					
	☐ Whether offsite responders were notified (if known)? [68.42(b)(10)]					
	☐ Operational or process changes that resulted from investigation of the release? [68.42(b)(11)]					
Sec	tion C: Prevention Program					
_	lemented the Program 3 prevention requirements as provided in 40 CFR 68.65 - 68.87?	M I	□U	⊠N/A		

RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Company EPA Facility ID: 10000014122 **Process Checklist** Prevention Program- Safety information [68.65] Has the owner or operator compiled written process safety information, which includes information pertaining to the $\Box Y$ $\square N$ **⊠**N/A hazards of the regulated substances used or produced by the process, information pertaining to the technology of the process, and information pertaining to the equipment in the process, before conducting any process hazard analysis required by the rule? [68.65(a)] Does the process safety information contain the following for hazards of the substances: [68.65(b)] ☐ Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) that meet the requirements of the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard [29 CFR 1910.1200(g)]? [68.48(a)(1)] Toxicity information? [68.65(b)(1)] Permissible exposure limits? [68.65(b)(2)] Physical data? [68.65(b)(3)] Reactivity data? [68.65(b)(4)] Corrosivity data? [68.65(b)(5)] Thermal and chemical stability data? [68.65(b)(6)] Hazardous effects of inadvertent mixing of materials that could foreseeably occur? [68.65(b)(7)] Has the owner documented information pertaining to technology of the process? $\square Y$ $\square N$ ⊠N/A A block flow diagram or simplified process flow diagram? [68.65(c)(1)(i)] Process chemistry? [68.65(c)(1)(ii)] Maximum intended inventory? [68.65(c)(1)(iii)] Safe upper and lower limits for such items as temperatures, pressures, flows, or compositions? [68.65(c)(1)(iv)] An evaluation of the consequences of deviation? [68.65(c)(1)(iv)] Does the process safety information contain the following for the equipment in the process: [68.65(d)(1)] $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ⊠N/A Materials of construction? 68.65(d)(1)(i)] Piping and instrumentation diagrams [68.65(d)(1)(ii)] Electrical classification? [68.65(d)(1)(iii)] Relief system design and design basis? [68.65(d)(1)(iv)] Ventilation system design? [68.65(d)(1)(v)]

Design codes and standards employed? [68.65(d)(1)(vi)]

evaluated, and controlled the hazards involved in the process? [68.67(a)]

Safety systems? [68.65(d)(1)(viii)]

tested, and operating in a safe manner? [68.65(d)(3)]

Prevention Program- Process Hazard Analysis [68.67]

engineering practices? [68.65(d)(2)]

Material and energy balances for processes built after June 21, 1999? [68.65(d)(1)(vii)]

Has the owner or operator documented that equipment complies with recognized and generally accepted good

Has the owner or operator determined and documented that existing equipment, designed and constructed in

Has the owner or operator performed an initial process hazard analysis (PHA), and has this analysis identified,

accordance with codes, standards, or practices that are no longer in general use, is designed, maintained, inspected,

 $\Box Y$

 $\Box Y$

 \Box Y

 $\square N$

 $\square N$

 $\square N$

⊠N/A

⊠N/A

⊠N/A

	RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Company Process Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122					
7.		is the owner or operator determined and documented the priority order for conducting PHAs, and was it based on an propriate rationale? [68.67(a)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A	
8.	На	s the owner used one or more of the following technologies to conduct process PHA: [68.67(b)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A	
		What-if? [68.67(b)(1)]				
		Checklist? [68.67(b)(2)]				
		What-if/Checklist? [68.67(b)(3)]				
		Hazard and Operability Study (HAZOP) [68.67(b)(4)]				
		Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) [68.67(b)(5)]				
		Fault Tree Analysis? [68.67(b)(6)]				
_		An appropriate equivalent methodology? [68.67(b)(7)]	1			
9.	Die	d the PHA address:	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A	
		The hazards of the process? [68.67(c)(1)]		-	 -	
		Identification of any incident that had a likely potential for catastrophic consequences? [68.67(c)(2)]				
		Engineering and administrative controls applicable to hazards and interrelationships?[68.67(c)(3)]	1		!	
ļ		Consequences of failure of engineering and administrative controls? [68.67(c)(4)]			!	
ı		Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)]	ĺ			
		Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)]	1			
		An evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]	ĺ			
10.		as the PHA performed by a team with expertise in engineering and process operations and did the team include propriate personnel? [68.67(d)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A	
11.	11. Has the owner or operator established a system to promptly address the team's findings and recommendations; assured that the recommendations are resolved in a timely manner and documented; documented what actions are to be taken; completed actions as soon as possible; developed a written schedule of when these actions are to be completed; and communicated the actions to operating, maintenance, and other employees whose work assignments are in the process and who may be affected by the recommendations? [68.67(e)]		□Υ	□N	⊠N/A	
12.		s the PHA been updated and revalidated by a team every five years after the completion of the initial PHA to assure the PHA is consistent with the current process? [68.67(f)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A	
13.		s the owner or operator retained PHAs and updates or revalidations for each process covered, as well as the olution of recommendations for the life of the process? [68.67(g)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A	
Pre	vent	tion Program- Operating procedures [68.69]				
14.	Has for	s the owner or operator developed and implemented written operating procedures that provide instructions or steps conducting activities associated with each covered process consistent with the safety information? [68.69(a)]	□Y	ΠN	⊠N/A	

	RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: <u>The Mennel Milling Com</u> Process Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122					ıy	
15	Do the	procedures address the following: [68.69(a)]			□у	□N	⊠N/A
	Steps fo	or each operating phase: [68.69(a)(1)]					
		Initial Startup? [68.69(a)(1)(i)]					
		Normal operations? [68.69(a)(1)(ii)]					
		Temporary operations? [68.69((a)(1)(iii)]					
		Emergency shutdown including the conditions under which emergency s assignment of shutdown responsibility to qualified operators to ensure the in a safe and timely manner? [68.69(a)(1)(iv)]					
		Emergency operations? [68.69(a)(1)(v)]				50	
		Normal shutdown? [68.68(a)(1)(vi)]					
		Startup following a turnaround, or after emergency shutdown? [68.69(a)	(1)(vii	i)]			
	<u>Operati</u>	ing limits: [68.69(a)(2)]					
		Consequences of deviations [68.69(a)(2)(i)]					
		Steps required to correct or avoid deviation? [68.69(a)(2)(ii)]					
	Safety a	and health considerations: [68.69(a)(3)]					
		Properties of, and physical hazards presented by, the chemicals used in the	ne pro	ocess [68.69(a)(3)(i)]			
		Precautions necessary to prevent exposure, including engineering control personal protective equipment? [68.69(a)(3)(ii)]	s, adn	ministrative controls, and			
		Control measures to be taken if physical contact or airborne exposure occ	curs? [[68.69(a)(3)(iii)]			
		Quality control for raw materials and control of hazardous chemical inve	ntory	levels? [68.69(a)(3)(iv)]			
		Any special or unique hazards? [68.69(a)(3)(v)]	9				
	□ Sat	fety systems and their functions? [68.69(a)(4)]					
16.	Are ope	erating procedures readily accessible to employees who are involved in a pr	ocess'	? [68.69(b)]	ПΥ	ΠN	□N/A
17.	Has the have be	owner or operator certified annually that the operating procedures are current reviewed as often as necessary? [68.69(c)]	ent an	nd accurate and that procedures	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
18.		owner or operator developed and implemented safe work practices to prove operations, such as lockout/tagout? [68.69(d)]	ide fo	or the control of hazards during	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
Pre	vention	Program - Training [68.71]			<u> </u>		
19		ch employee involved in operating a process, and each employee before bei d process, been initially trained in an overview of the process and in the op			□У	□N	⊠N/A
20.		rial training include emphasis on safety and health hazards, emergency operactices applicable to the employee's job tasks? [68.71(a)(1)]	ations	s including shutdown, and safe	□У	□N	⊠N/A
21.	operator	of initial training for those employees already involved in operating a procest representation of may certify in writing that the employee has the required knowledge, skill es and responsibilities as specified in the operating procedures [68.71(a)(2))	ls, and		ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
22.	in opera	resher training been provided at least every three years, or more often if neating a process to assure that the employee understands and adheres to the case [68.71(b)]			ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
							_

R	RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Com				
Pr	ocess Checklist	EPA Facility ID: 10000014122			
<u> </u>					
23,	Has owner or operator ascertained and documented in record received and understood the training required? [68.71(c)]	that each employee involved in operating a process has	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
24.	Does the prepared record contain the identity of the employe that the employee understood the training? [68.71(c)]	e, the date of the training, and the means used to verify	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
Pre	vention Program - Mechanical Integrity [68.73]				
25.	Has the owner or operator established and implemented writt process equipment listed in 68.73(a)? [68.73(b)]	ten procedures to maintain the on-going integrity of the	ШΥ	□N	⊠N/A
26.	Has the owner or operator trained each employee involved in [68.73(c)]	maintaining the on-going integrity of process equipment?	□Y	ΠN	⊠N/A
27.	Performed inspections and tests on process equipment? [68.7]	73(d)(1)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
28.	Followed recognized and generally accepted good engineerin [68.73(d)(2)]	ng practices for inspections and testing procedures?	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
29.	Ensured the frequency of inspections and tests of process equence recommendations, good engineering practices, and prior ope		ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
30.	30. Documented each inspection and test that had been performed on process equipment, which identifies the date of the inspection or test, the name of the person who performed the inspection or test, the serial number or other identifier of the equipment on which the inspection or test was performed, a description of the inspection or test performed, and the results of the inspection or test? [68.73(d)(4)]		ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
31.	11. Corrected deficiencies in equipment that were outside acceptable limits defined by the process safety information before further use or in a safe and timely manner when necessary means were taken to assure safe operation? [68.73(e)]		ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
32.	Assured that equipment as it was fabricated is suitable for the construction of new plants and equipment? [68.73(f)(1)]	e process application for which it will be used in the	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
33.	Performed appropriate checks and inspections to assure that design specifications and the manufacturer's instructions? [6]	equipment was installed properly and consistent with 8.73(f)(2)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
34.	Assured that maintenance materials, spare parts and equipme would be used? $[68.73(f)(3)]$	nt were suitable for the process application for which they	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
Pre	ention Program - Management Of Change [68.75]				
35.	Has the owner or operator established and implemented writt technology, equipment, and procedures, and changes to static	en procedures to manage changes to process chemicals, onary sources that affect a covered process? [68.75(a)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
36.	Do procedures assure that the following considerations are ac	Idressed prior to any change: [68.75(b)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
	\Box The technical basis for the proposed change? [68.75(b)(1)])]			
	☐ Impact of change on safety and health? [68.75(b)(2)]				
	☐ Modifications to operating procedures? [68.75(b)(3)]				
	□ Necessary time period for the change? [68.75(b)(4)]				
	☐ Authorization requirements for the proposed change? [6]	3.75(b)(5)]			
37.	Were employees, involved in operating a process and mainter affected by a change in the process, informed of, and trained parts of the process? [68.75(c)]	nance, and contract employees, whose job tasks would be in, the change prior to start-up of the process or affected	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Comp EPA Facility ID: 10000014122				
				_
38.	If a change resulted in a change in the process safety information, was such information updated accordingly? [68.75(d)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
39.	If a change resulted in a change in the operating procedures or practices, had such procedures or practices been updated accordingly? [68.75(e)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
Pre	vention Program - Pre-startup Safety Review [68.77]	-		-
40.	If the facility installed a new stationary source, or significantly modified an existing source, (as discussed at 68.77(a)) did it perform a pre-startup safety review prior to the introduction of a regulated substance to a process to confirm: [68.77(b)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
	☐ Construction and equipment was in accordance with design specifications? [68.77(b)(1)]			
	☐ Safety, operating, maintenance, and emergency procedures were in place and were adequate? [68.77(b)(2)]			
	☐ For new stationary sources, a process hazard analysis had been performed and recommendations had been resolved or implemented before startup? [68.77(b)(3)]	 - -		
	☐ Modified stationary sources meet the requirements contained in management of change? [68.77(b)(3)]			
	☐ Training of each employee involved in operating a process had been completed? [68.77(b)(4)]			
Pre	vention Program - Compliance audits [68.79]	<u> </u>		
41.	Has the owner or operator certified that the stationary source has evaluated compliance with the provisions of the prevention program at least every three years to verify that the developed procedures and practices are adequate and being followed? [68.79(a)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
42.	Has the audit been conducted by at least one person knowledgeable in the process? [68.79(b)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
43.	Are the audit findings documented in a report? [68.79(c)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
44.	Has the owner or operator promptly determined and documented an appropriate response to each of the findings of the audit and documented that deficiencies had been corrected? [68.79(d)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
45.	Has the owner or operator retained the two most recent compliance reports? [68.79(e)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
Pre	vention Program - Incident investigation [68.81]			
46.	Has the owner or operator investigated each incident that resulted in, or could reasonably have resulted in a catastrophic release of a regulated substance? [68.81(a)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
47.	Were all incident investigations initiated not later than 48 hours following the incident? [68.81(b)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
48.	48. Was an accident investigation team established and did it consist of at least one person knowledgeable in the process involved, including a contract employee if the incident involved work of a contractor, and other persons with appropriate knowledge and experience to thoroughly investigate and analyze the incident? [68.81(c)]		□N	⊠N/A
49.	Was a report prepared at the conclusion of every investigation? [68.81(d)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
50.	Does every report include: [68.81(d)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
	☐ Date of incident? [68.81(d)(1)]			
	☐ Date investigation began? [68.81(d)(2)]			
	☐ A description of the incident? [68.81(d)(3)]			
	☐ The factors that contributed to the incident? [68.81(d)(4)]			
	Any recommendations resulting from the investigation? [68.81(d)(5)]			
	Any recommendations resulting from the investigation: [00.01(u)(3)]			

R	RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Company								
Pı	ocess Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122								
51.	Has the owner or operator established a system to address and resolve the report findings and recommendations, and are the resolutions and corrective actions documented? [68.81(e)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A					
52.	Was the report reviewed with all affected personnel whose job tasks are relevant to the incident findings including contract employees where applicable? [68.81(f)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A					
53.	Has the owner or operator retained incident investigation reports for at least five years? [68.81(g)]	□Y		⊠N/A					
Se	ction D - Employee Participation [68.83]	<u>.</u>							
1.	Has the owner or operator developed a written plan of action regarding the implementation of the employee participation required by this section? [68.83(a)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A					
2.	Has the owner or operator consulted with employees and their representatives on the conduct and development of process hazards analyses and on the development of the other elements of process safety management in chemical accident prevention provisions? [68.83(b)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A					
3.	Has the owner or operator provided to employees and their representatives access to process hazards analyses and to all other information required to be developed under the chemical accident prevention rule? [68.83(c)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A					
Se	ction E - Hot Work Permit [68.85]								
1.	Has the owner or operator issued a hot work permit for each hot work operation conducted on or near a covered process? [68.85(a)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A					
2.	Does the permit document that the fire prevention and protection requirements in 29CFR 1910.252(a) have been implemented prior to beginning the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A					
3.	Does the permit indicate the date(s) authorized for hot work and the object(s) upon which hot work is to be performed? [68.85(b]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A					
4.	Are the permits being kept on file until completion of the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A					
Se	ction F - Contractors [68.87]								
1.	Has the owner or operator obtained and evaluated information regarding the contract owner or operator's safety performance and programs when selecting a contractor? [68.87(b)(1)]	□Y	ΠN	⊠N/A					
2.	Informed contract owner or operator of the known potential fire, explosion, or toxic release hazards related to the contractor's work and the process? [68.87(b)(2)]	□У	ΠN	⊠N/A					
3.	Explained to the contract owner or operator the applicable provisions of the emergency response or the emergency action program? [68.87(b)(3)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A					
4.	Developed and implemented safe work practices consistent with §68.69(d), to control the entrance, presence, and exit of the contract owner or operator and contract employees in the covered process areas? [68.87(b)(4)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A					
5.	Periodically evaluated the performance of the contract owner or operator in fulfilling their obligations (as described at $68.87(c)(1) - (c)(5)$)? [$68.87(b)(5)$]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A					
Se	Section G - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.95]								
	reloped and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.95?	M	□U	⊠N/A					
1.	Is the facility designated as a "first responder" in case of an accidental release of regulated substances"	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A					
1.a.	If the facility is not a first responder:								

	RMP Program Level 3 Facility Name: <u>The Mennel Milling Con</u> Process Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122						
Process Checklist EPA Facility ID: 10000014122							
1.a	.(1)	For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A		
1.a	.(2)	For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities, has the owner or operator coordinated response actions with the local fire department? [68.90(b)(2)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
1.a	.(3)	Are appropriate mechanisms in place to notify emergency responders when there is need for a response? [68.90(b)(3)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
2.	An	emergency response plan is maintained at the stationary source and contains the following? [68.95(a)(1)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A		
		Procedures for informing the public and local emergency response agencies about accidental releases? [68.95(a)(1)(i)]					
		Documentation of proper first-aid and emergency medical treatment necessary to treat accidental human exposures? [68.95(a)(1)(ii)]					
		Procedures and measures for emergency response after an accidental release of a regulated substance? [68.95(a)(1)(iii)]					
3.	3. The emergency response plan contains procedures for the use of emergency response equipment and for its inspection, testing, and maintenance? [68.95(a)(2)]				⊠N/A		
4.		e emergency response plan requires, and there is documentation of, training for all employees in relevant cedures? [68.95(a)(3)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A		
5.	5. The owner or operator has developed and implemented procedures to review and update, as appropriate, the emergency response plan to reflect changes at the stationary source and ensure that employees are informed of changes? [68.95(a)(4)]		ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
6.	5. Did the owner or operator use a written plan that complies with other Federal contingency plan regulations or is consistent with the approach in the National Response Team's Integrated Contingency Plan Guidance ("One Plan")? If so, does the plan include the elements provided in paragraph (a) of 68.95, and also complies with paragraph (c) of 68.95? [68.95(b)]		□Y	ΠN	⊠N/A		
7.		the emergency response plan been coordinated with the community emergency response plan developed under CRA? [68.95(c)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
Se	Section H – Risk Management Plan [40 CFR 68.190 – 68.195]						
1.	sub mix	es the single registration form include, for each covered process, the name and CAS number of each regulated stance held above the threshold quantity in the process, the maximum quantity of each regulated substance or ture in the process (in pounds) to two significant digits, the five- or six-digit NAICS code that most closely responds to the process and the Program level of the process? [68.160(b)(7)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		
2.	Did	the facility assign the correct program level(s) to its covered process(es)? [68.160(b)(7)]	□Y	ΠN	⊠N/A		

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: The Mennel Milling Company EPA Facility ID: 10000014122				
3. Has the owner or operator reviewed and updated the RMP Reason for update:	and submitted it to EPA [68.190(a)]?	□У	⊠N	□N/A
☐ Five-year update. [68.190(b)(1)]		ļ		
☐ Within three years of a newly regulated substance listi	ing. [68.190(b)(2)]			
☐ At the time a new regulated substance is first present i [68.190(b)(3)]	n an already regulated process above threshold quantities.			
☐ At the time a regulated substance is first present in an	new process above threshold quantities. [68.190(b)(4)]			
☐ Within six months of a change requiring revised PHA	or hazard review. [68.190(b)(5)]			
☐ Within six months of a change requiring a revised OC.	A as provided in 68.36. [68.190(b)(6)]			
☐ Within six months of a change that alters the Program	level that applies to any covered process. [68.190(b)(7)]			
4. If the owner or operator experienced an accidental release t described at 68.42) subsequent to April 9, 2004, did the ow 68.170(j) and 68.175(l) within six months of the release or whichever was earlier. [68.195(a)]	mer or operator submit the information required at 68.168,	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
5. If the emergency contact information required at 68.160(b) operator submit corrected information within thirty days of		□Y	□N	⊠N/A