

#### UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Region 8 1595 Wynkoop Street Denver, Colorado 80202 EXPEDITED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT Docket Number: CWA-08-2015-0001 NPDES No. NDR103826 TEAPING CLERK

Knife River Corporation (Respondent) is a "person," within the meaning of Section 502(5) of the Clean Water Act (Act), 33 U.S.C. 1362(5), and 40 C.F.R. 122.2.

Attached is an Expedited Settlement Offer Deficiencies Form (Form), which is incorporated by reference. By its signature, Complainant (EPA) finds that Respondent is responsible for the deficiencies specified in the Form.

Respondent failed to comply with its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit issued under Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. 1342.

EPA finds, and Respondent admits, that Respondent is subject to Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. 1311, and that EPA has jurisdiction over any person who discharges pollutants from a point source to waters of the United States. Respondent neither admits nor denies the deficiencies specified in the Form.

EPA is authorized to enter into this Consent Agreement and Final Order (Agreement) under the authority vested in the Administrator of EPA by Section 309(g)(2)(A) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. 1319(g)(2)(A), and by 40 C.F.R. 22.13(b). The parties enter into this Agreement in order to settle the civil violation(s) alleged in this Agreement for a penalty of \$7,650.00.

Respondent consents to the assessment of this penalty, A and waives the right to: (1) contest the finding(s) specified in the Form; (2) a hearing pursuant to Section 309(g)(2) of the Act,  $33 \\ U.S.C.$  1319(g)(2); and (3) appeal pursuant to Section 309(g)(8), 33 U.S.C. 1319(g)(8).

Additionally, Respondent certifies, subject to civil and criminal penalties for making a false statement to the United States Government, that any deficiencies identified in the Form have been corrected. Respondent shall submit a written report with this Agreement detailing the specific actions taken to correct the violations cited herein.

Respondent certifies that, within ten (10) days of receiving notice from EPA that the Agreement is effective (thirty (30) days from the date it is signed by the Regional Judicial Officer), Respondent shall submit a bank, cashiers or certified check, with case name and docket number noted, for the amount specified above payable to the Treasurer, United States of

America, via certified mail, to:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Fines and Penalties Cincinnati Finance Center P.O. Box 979077 St. Louis, MO 69197-9000 In the Matter of: Knife River Corporation

Docket No: CWA-08-2015-0001

This Agreement settles EPA's civil penalty claims against Respondent for the Clean Water Act violation(s) specified in this Agreement. EPA does not waive its rights to take any enforcement action against Respondent for any other past, present, or future civil or criminal violation of the Act or of any other federal statute or regulation. EPA does not waive its right to issue a compliance order for any uncorrected deficiencies or violation(s) described in the Form. EPA has determined this Agreement to be appropriate.

This Agreement is binding on the parties signing below and effective after forty (40) days have elapsed since the issuance of public notice pursuant to Section 309(g)(4)(A) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. 1319(g)(4)(A), and EPA has received no substantive comments concerning this matter.

APPROVED BY EPA:

r

Gwenette C. Campbell, Unit Chief NPDES Enforcement Unit Office of Enforcement, Compliance and Environmental Justice

San Harmy \_ Date:

James Eppers, Supervisory Attorney Regulatory Enforcement Unit Office of Enforcement, Compliance and Environmental Justice

Wishy

APPROVED BY RESPONDENT:

Name (print):	Andy Cramer	
Title (print):	Vize President	
Signature:	Date:	9/8/14

.....

Having determined that this Agreement is authorized by law, IT IS SO ORDERED:

.

\_ Date\_\_\_\_

Elyana R. Sutin Regional Judicial Officer

## Expedited Settlement Offer Worksheet

**Deficiencies Form** 

Consult instructions regarding eligibility criteria and procedures prior to use

version 10.3.4



	LEGAL NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF OPERATOR	Telephone Number	NPDES Permit Numbe	эг <sub>.</sub>
1	Greg Ranniger	701-774-3779	NDR105826	
	Knife River Corporation			
	5654 134th Ave NW	Inspector Name:	Michael Boeglin	
	Williston, ND 58801	Inspector Agency:	US EPA	
		Entrance Interview Co	onducted: Yes	
		Exit Interview Conduc	ted: Yes	
	LOCATION AND ADDRESS OF SITE	Exit Interview given to	Joe McLain, Project Ma	inager
2	Williston City Water, Sewer, Storm Drain and Street Improvements, District 13-10	Exit Interview time:	11:30 Date:	07/15/2014
	42nd Street between University Avenue and 11th Avenue			
	Bismarck, ND 58801 (Lat/Long: 48.183169N, -103.605131W )			

	 FACILITY DESCRIPTION / CONTACT NAMES
	Name of Site Contact (ESO Worksheet recipient): Greg Ranniger, Project Manager
	Name of Authorized Official (40 CFR 122.22): Greg Ranniger, Project Manager
	Inspection Date: 07/15/2014 Start Construction Date: 07/06/2013
	Estimated Completion Construction Date: 10/31/2014
	If Unpermitted, Number of Months Unpermitted:
1	Name of Receiving Water Body (Indicate whether 303(d) listed): Little Muddy River (impaired for Recreation due to f coliform
ł	Acres Currently Disturbed   Acres to be Disturbed in Whole Common Plan: 5.00 15.00
	Has Operator Requested Rainfall Erosivity or TMDL Walver per 44 CFR 122.26(b)(15)? No

<u></u>			Citation	R No. of C Deficien-	Dollar	
	PERMIT COVERAGE	Findings	Reference**	A* cies	Amount	Total
3	Operator unpermitted for one month (# months unpermitted equals number of violations). Discharge without a permit		CWA 301		\$500.00 =	
l	SWPPP REVIEW	· · · ·	<u> </u>	L	<u>1</u> <b>.......</b>	
4	SWPPP not prepared (If no SWPPP, leave		ND CGP I.C.1		\$5,000.00 =	
5	elements 5 - 30 blank) SWPPP prepared but prepared after construction start (# of months = # of violations)		ND CGP I.C.1		\$75.00 =	
6	SWPPP does not identify all potential sources of pollution to include: porta-pottys, fuel tanks, staging areas, waste containers, chemical storage areas, concrete cure, paints, solvents, etc		ND CGP II.C		\$250.00 =	
7	SWPPP does not identify all operators for the project site and the areas of the site over which each operator has control	<u></u>	ND CGP II.C		\$500.00 =	

8		SWPPP does not have site description, as follows:								
_  -			8F: The SWPP plan described, but the						<u>.</u>	
		Nature of activity in description	map did not show, the receiving water body (wetland area flowing into Little	ND CGP II.C.1.a ND CGP II.C.1.c	<u> </u>		Н	\$100.00 = \$100.00 =		
		Total disturbed acreage		ND CGP II.C.1.b	<u> </u>	· · · · ·		\$100.00		
	D General location map		the site, a designated location for	EPA CGP	<u> </u>	·····		\$100.00		
	"		concrete washout, or the location of	3 3.B.4				\$100.00		
	E	Site map	erosion control blankets and rock secks	ND CGP II.C.1 f	i –			\$500.00	֠	
		Site map does not show drainage patterns, slopes.	between the dewatering pipe outlet and	utlet and ND CGP Yes 5 \$50.00 =	\$25					
	areas of disturbance, locations of major controls,	the culvert under the 135th Avenue spur.	II.C.1.f.1-6							
		structural practices shown, stabilization practices,		}						
		offsite matenals, waste, borrow or equipment								
		storage ageas, surface waters, discharge points,		[						
		areas of final stabilization (count each omission		-						
		under 8F as 1 violation)		ļ						
- F			4 		<u> </u>		Ц		4	
		Location/description industrial activities, like		ND CGP	1			\$500.00	-	
9	-	concrete or asphalt batch plants		II.C.1.f.7	<u> </u>	···· · · · · · · ·			╺┼╍	
	Λ.	SWPPP does not: Describe all pollution control measures (e.g. BMPs)	An erosion control blanket was used in	ND CGP II.C.2	<u></u>	1		\$750.00	<u>-</u>	
	~	bescribe air poliution control measures (e.g. bivins)	the roadside ditch downstream from the dewatering pipe discharge, but it was not	A				\$750.00	-	\$75
			described in the SWPP plan or map.							
			described in the GVVPP plan of map.	1						
			1		i					
	긁		The plan identifies which control	ND CGP III.C.3			$\left  \cdot \right $		┉	
	ы	Describe sequence for implementation	• • • • • • • • • • • •	ND CGP III.C.3		1		\$250.00	=	\$25
			measures will be used but does not indicate the applicable phases of the	-						
			project for each.							
				ŧ						
-	ᆟ	Detail operator(s) responsible for implementation	· 	ND CGP II.C.2.a	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		\$250.00	+	
10		SWPPP does not describe interim stabilization	· · · ·	ND CGP II.C.3.b				\$250.00		······
	l	practices		ND 001 11.0.0.D				0200.00	-	
11	÷	SWPPP does not describe permanent stabilization		ND CGP II.C.3.6		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	$\left  \cdot \right $	\$250.00	<u>_</u> +	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11		practices						\$200.00		
	ł									
12		SWPPP does not describe a schedule to implement	* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ND CGP II.C.3			H	\$250.00	=	
		stabilization practices					. 1			
13		Following dates are not recorded: major grading		EPA CGP				\$250.00	=	
ł		activities, construction temporarily or permanently		3.4 C.1-3						
i	ł	ceased; stabilization measures initiated (count each								
1	ł	omission under 13 as 1 violation)								
	_				<b> </b>		<b>.</b>			•
14		SWPPP does not have description of structural		EPA CGP 3.4.C				\$500.00	-	
ł		practices to divert flows from exposed soils, retain flows, or limit runoff from exposed areas			i i					
15		SWPPP does not have a description of measures	The template used by the contractor to	EPA CGP 3.4.C	Yes	1 1	H	\$500.00	+	\$50
1	i	that will be installed during the construction process	develop the SWPP plan included a	EFA COF 3.4.0	105			\$500.00		400
		to control pollutants in storm water discharges that	section describing what should be						1	
		will occur AFTER construction operations have	considered when identifying post-		ł					
[		been completed	construction stormwater controls, but the						1	
1			SWPP plan did not describe any such		1		ł	:		
1			controls specific to this site.	l	1				1	
1.0		SWPPP does not describe measures to prevent		EPA CGP 3 4.C	}			\$500.00 -	=	
16		discharge of solid materials to waters of the US,			1	1.				
16		except as authorized by 404 permit			L	·				
		SWPPP does not describe measures to minimize off		ND CGP II.C.3.a				\$500.00	=	
16			1		1					
		site vehicle tracking and generation of dust								
17										
		SWPPP does not include description of construction		ND CGP II.C.3.b				\$250.00 =	=	
17		SWPPP does not include description of construction or waste materials expected to be stored on site		ND CGP II.C.3.b				\$250.00	=	
17		SWPPP does not include description of construction		ND CGP II.C.3.b				\$250.00	=	

				·····		
19	SWPPP does not have description of pollutant sources from areas other than construction (asphalt or concrete plants) w/ updates re: controls to reduce pollutants from these materials		ND CGP II.C		\$500.00	
	porotante nom mese materiale					
20	SWPPP does not identify allowable sources of non- storm water discharges listed in subpart 1.3.8 of the CGP		ND CGP ILA		\$500.00 =	
21	SWPPP does not identify/ensure implementation of	······································	ND CGP II.C		\$500.00 =	<u> </u> {
	pollution prevention measures for non-storm water discharges				3500.001-	
22	Endangered Species Act documentation is not in SWPPP		EPA CGP 3.7		\$500.00 =	-
23	Historic Properties (Reserved)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
24	Copy of permit and/or NOI not in SWPPP (count each omission under 24 as 1 violation)		ND CGP III.B		\$250.00]=	
25	SWPPP is not consistent with requirements specified in applicable sediment and erosion site plans or site permits, or storm water management plans or site permits approved by State, Tribal or local officials (e.g., MS4 requirements)		EPA CGP 3.9		\$750.00 =	
26	SWPPP has not been updated to remain consistent with changes applicable to protecting surface waters in State, Tribal or local erosion plans		EPA CGP 3.9		\$250.00 =	
27	Copies of inspection reports have not been retained as part of the SWPPP for 3 years from date permit coverage terminates	······································	ND CGP IV.A.5		\$500.00 =	
28	SWPPP has not been updated/modified to reflect change at site effecting discharge, or where inspections identify SWPPP/BMPs as ineffective, updates to SWPPP regarding modifications to BMPs not made within 7 days of such inspection (count each omission under under 28 as 1 violation)		ND CGP II.C.7.c		\$50.00 =	
29	Copy of SWPPP not retained on site		ND CGP II.C.7.a		\$500.00] =	
	A SWPPP not made available upon request		ND CGP II.C.7.5		\$500.00 =	
30	SWPPP not signed/certified		ND CGP II.C.7.a	<u>                                      </u>	\$500.00 =	+ <b> </b>
		······································	1	Subtotal SWID	PP Deficiencies	<u> </u>
r		<u></u>				31,30
<u> </u>	INSPECTIONS		· · · · ·			
31	Inspections not performed and documented at least a once every 14 days and within 24 hours after storm of	Knife River missed one site inspection during the two-week period between April 5 and April 20, 2014.	ND CGP III.A.1	No 1	\$250.00 -	\$250
ł						

Ì	No inspections conducted and documented (if True, then leave elements 32-39 blank)				FALSE		True or False	
ľ	Number of inspections expected if performed every 7 days:	40						
ľ	Number of Inspections expected if performed bi- weekly:	20						
	If known, number of days of rainfall of >0.5"							
32	Inspections not conducted by qualified personnel		ND CGP II.C.2.a				\$50.00 =	
33	All areas disturbed by construction activity or used for storage of materials and which exposed to precipitation not inspected		EPA CGP 3.10.E.				\$50.00 =	
34	All pollution control measures not inspected to ensure proper operation	Knife River did not inspect the dewatering discharge on a daily basis to monitor its potential effect on the management of sediment and erosion controls and on the downstream receiving water body. Dewatering occurred on at least three days when an EPA representative was present on or near the site: July 14, 15, and 17, 2014.	EPA CGP 3.10.E.	Yes	3		\$50.00 =	\$1
35	Discharge locations are not observed and inspected		EPA CGP 3.10.E.				\$50.00 =	
36	For discharge locations that are not accessible, nearby locations are not inspected		ÉPÀ CGP 3.10.E.				\$50.00 =	
37	Entrance/exit not inspected for off-site tracking		EPA CGP 3.10,E.				\$50.00 =	:
38	Site inspection report does not include: date, name and qualifications of inspector, weather information, location of sediment/pollutant discharge, BMP(s) requiring maintenance, BMP(s) that have failed, BMP(s) that are needed, corrective action required including changes/updates to SWPPP and schedule/dates (count each omission under 38 as 1 violation)		ND CGP III A.2				\$50.00 =	
39	Inspection reports not properly signed/certified (count each failure to to sign/certify as 1 violation)		EPA CGP 3.10.G				\$50.00 =	-
I - т	······································	······································	Sut	itotal	Inspecti	ons	Deficiencies	\$4
-	AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS		<u>.</u>			+		
40	Sign/notice not posted		EPA CGP 3.12.B			T	\$250 00 =	-
ſ	A Does not contain copy of complete NOI	1	EPA CGP 3.12.B		······································		\$50.00 =	
	B Location of SWPPP or contact person for scheduling viewing times where on-site location for SWPPP unavailable not noted on sign	] 	EPA CGP 3.12.B				\$50.00. =	
<u> </u>	·····		r	Subt	otal Reco	rds	Deficiencies	8
			<u></u>	┨	····		<mark> </mark> -	
41	BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES No velocity dissipation devices located at discharge locations or outfall channels to ensure non-erosive	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ND CGP II.C.4.6		····	+	\$500 00 =	

42	1	Control measures are not properly:	42A: Seven (7) stormwater inlets along		11. r.		I I			
	B	Selected, installed and maintained Maintenance not performed prior to next anticipated storm event	42nd Street E either lacked inlet protection or had a fabric lining beneath the inlet grate that was inadequate or not properly maintained; the length of 42nd Street E between University Avenue and 11th Avenue E was covered by sediment being tracked across the site and had not been swept since approximately 33 days before the inspection, which is not in accordance with the SWPPP commitment to sweep the streets at the end of each day as needed; a rock sock in the roadside ditch downstream of the dewatering discharge pipe was not anchored in the center of the channel; one soil stockpile at the eastern end of the street project was located in the roadside ditch and was not surrounded by any sediment controls to prevent migration of sediment further down the ditch; and the site lacked adequate control measures to minimize the release of sediment at the outfall of the dewatering discharge pipe at the eastern edge of the project, as required by Part II.C.2.g.2 of the permit. Each item listed above is counted as one violation, with the exception of inadequate inlet protection, which is counted as 7	ND CGP II C.3.c	Yes	1		\$250.00		\$5,50
			separate violations.							
	- 1	(count each failure to select, install, maintain each BMP as one violation)								
43		When sediment escapes the site, it is not removed at a frequency necessary to minimize off-site impacts		ND CGP II.C.3.d				\$500.00	=	<u> </u>
44		Litter, construction debns, and construction chemicals exposed to storm water are not prevented from becoming a pollutant source (e.g. screening outfalls, pickup daily, etc.)		ND CGP II.C.2.b			x	\$500.00	=	
45		Stabilization measures are not initiated as soon as practible on portions of the site where construction activities have temporarily or permanently ceased within 14 days after such cessation		ND CGP II.C.3				\$500.00	=	I
-		*Exceptions:								
-		<ul> <li>(a) Snow or frozen ground conditions</li> <li>(b) Activities will be resumed within 14 days</li> </ul>								
46	_	(c) Arid or Semi-arid areas (<20 inches per year)	······································							
40		Common Drainage of 10+ acres does not have a sedimentation basin for the 2 year, 24 hour storm, or 3600 cubic ft. storage per acre drained		ND CGP II.C.3				\$1,000.00	-	
	ļ	Where sedimentation basin not attainable, smaller sediment basins, sediment traps, or erosion controls not implemented for downslope boundaries		ND CGP II.C.3				\$1,000.00	7	
	В	Sediment not removed from sediment basin or traps when design capacity reduced by 50% or more		ND CGP 11.C.3				\$500.00	11	

7 Common Drainage less than 10 acres does not have sediment traps, silt fences, vegetative buffer strips, or equivalent sediment controls for all down stope boundaries (not required if sedimentation sediment basin meeting criteria in 46 above)	ND CGP II.C.3	
A Sediment not removed from sediment trap when design capacity reduced by 50% or more	ND CGP II.C.3 \$500.00 =	
	Subtotal BMP Deficiencies	\$5,5
SMALL BUSINESS EVALUATION		
8 Is the Owner/Operator a Small Business?	No I IIII	<u> </u>
A small business is defined by EPA's Small		<del>.</del>
Business Compliance Policy as: "a person,		
corporation, partnership, or other entity that		÷ .
employs 100 or fewer indiviudals (across all	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.1
facilities and operations owned by the small		
business)." The number of employees should be		
considered as full-time equivalents on an annual		
basis, including contract employees (see 40 CFR		. ·
372.3). A full time employee unit is 2000 hours		
worked per year.	그는 그는 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같이 많은 것 같이 많은 것 같이 많을까?	1 
	Total Expedited Settlement: \$	7,6
* Requires Corrective Action		
	2003, http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/cgp.cfm	

+

## ATTACHMENT A

# Respondent Knife River Corporation's Report of Corrective Actions

. . .

### COW WATER. SEWER, STORM, AND STREET IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT 13-10 CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

DEFICIENCY FORM ITEM 8F: We have edited the map to show the wetland area flowing into the Little Muddy River, as well as the discharge point from the site.

The area designated for concrete washout has been added to the plan. With our concrete plant being so close to the job, we normally take concrete trucks back to the plant for washout.

The location of the erosion control blankets and foam logs between the dewatering hose outlet, and the culvert under the 135<sup>th</sup> Ave spur are now correctly documented. It appears that they were written down as installed on 5/15/14, but the placement on the map was incorrect. We had them marked on the plan a few hundred feet west of where they were actually installed.

DEFICIENCY FORM ITEM 9A: The swppp states in segment (3 d., page 7) that "If any BMP's are not working according to plan, a new BMP is to be implemented and installed according the contractors discretion to ensure the intent and purpose of the proposed BMP is met."

We have amended the map to show where the blanket was installed. We were not aware of the exact date, or who did the installation, therefor we did not document date/personnel, just installation.

DEFICIENCY FORM ITEM 9B: We have created a newly attached page, as a revision to our plan adding more control measures and indicating the applicable phases of the project for each. See attached; 15B.

DEFICIENCY FORM ITEM 15: When construction operations have been completed, we will remove all unnecessary BMP's from the site. After operations grass will be used as vegetative stabilization on the finished slopes. No other permanent practices are currently planned for future use on this project.

DEFICIENCY FORM ITEM 31: We have no remedy for the previously missed site inspection during the period between April 5<sup>th</sup>, and April 20<sup>th</sup>. Going forward, we will continue site inspections, performed by Mick Flugel, Mike Kemp, Dan Comte, or Chris Flippo. After temporary stabilization we may be performing fewer site inspections. If/when runoff appears unlikely due to winter conditions, we may halt inspections entirely.

DEFICIENCY FORM ITEM 34: We have no remedy for the previously missed dewatering inspections. Dewatering appears to be complete for this job, however if and when we use dewatering, we will use the attached 'SWPPP dewatering documentation' form to monitor its potential effect on the receiving water body. We will observe whether or not BMP's for dissipation or filtering are necessary, and react accordingly.

DEFICIENCY FORM ITEM 42A: The 7 storm water inlets along 42<sup>nd</sup> St E that previously lacked inlet protection are now protected. On 7/15 Dan Comte and Brian Cuculto installed foam wattle protection around the inlets.

We have been brooming streets on a more frequent basis, as needed.

### RECEIVED

SEP 1 8 2014

Office of Enforcement, Compliance and Environmental Justice (Water) The foam logs have been removed in the road side ditch, as we are no longer dewatering into this area. We have plugged the culvert on the south part of 42<sup>nd</sup> near the residence with concrete. We have filled the natural ditch with class 5, sloped, and added cat tracks.

The soil stockpile towards the eastern end of 42<sup>nd</sup> St E, south of University is now contained with a silt fence perimeter. Bakken contractors, working on the nearby Pheasant Crossing development installed the fence as part of their SWPPP.

Dewatering is complete for this job, however if and when we use dewatering in the future we will include more control measures, such as rip rap or wattle, to slow dissipation velocity and minimize release of sediment. The discharge hose referred to at the eastern end of the project is no longer being used.

We have corrected all deficiencies identified by the EPA included in the received report.

Mike Kemp and Andy Cramer have previously signed the original agreement, and submitted payment for penalties.

I spoke with Michael Boeglin, the EPA official that inspected our site. He granted us until September 18<sup>th</sup> to submit the corrective actions report.

ESC Measure	_Silt Fence/Fiber Logs	1
Location	Near drainage ditches, and as per plan	
Inspection Frequency	Daily onsite. Weekly with inspection reports, and within 24 hours of any .5" precipitation event, or as soon as field conditions allow access.	
Phases of project used	Grubbing/Subgrade thru completion of project. May be removed after vegetative buffer, or other ground stabilization exists and is effective	
ESC Measure	Swale/Filter Berms	
Location	Near areas where job easement ends.	
Inspection Frequency	Daily onsite. Weekly with inspection reports, and within 24 hours of any .5" precipitation event, or as soon as field conditions allow access.	
Phases of project used	Swale/Filter Berms will be installed concurrently with work progress. It will be mainly used during grubbing and subgrade phases, and kept in place	
	until fical grading and seeding occurs.	
ESC Measure	Inlat Protection Temporary iron covers will be used to cover catch basins after installation, and prior to the casting grate installation. Once the	
	grate is installed, fabric will be used as a temporary BMP, until dandy bags are installed for our final BMP.	
Location	Catch basin curb Intets	
Inspection Frequency	Daily onsite. Weekly with inspection reports, and within 24 hours of any .5" precipitation event, or as soon as field conditions allow access.	
Phases of project used	During storm water pipe and catch basin installation. We will have the BMP's installed (iron plate, filter fabric, and dandy bags in that order) within	
	2 days of installation.	
ESC Measure	Erosien control blankets	
Location	Near slopes running towards water conveyance systems.	
Inspection Frequency	Daily onsite. Weekly with inspection reports, and within 24 hours of any .5" precipitation event, or as soon as field conditions allow access.	
Phases of project used	Erosion control blankets will be installed after finish grade around water conveyance systems, such as the multi plate near the intersection of	
	University and Fairground Road, and near 42nd and 11th Ave E.	
ESC Measure	_ Seeding	
Location	Boulevards in between sidewalk and curb. Sloped berms on 42nd.	
Inspection Frequency	Daily onsite. Weekly with inspection reports, and within 24 hours of any .5" precipitation event, or as soon as field conditions allow access.	
Phases of project used	Seeding will not occur until the project is nearing completion. After a majority of pipe has been installed, and earthwork is complete. Seeding	
	will take place after all areas are to finish grade.	
ESC Measure	_Brooming/Upkeep/Maintenance/Trash Clean up	
Location	Brooming will take place on roads exiting the job site. It will also be used to clean roads after pavement has been replaced. Trash clean up and	
······	general maintenance will be ongoing from start to completion of the project.	
Inspection Frequency	Daily onsite. Weekly with inspection reports, and within 24 hours of any .5" precipitation event, or as soon as field conditions allow access.	
Phases of project used	These measures will be used through completion of the project.	
ESC Measure	Rip Rap	
Location	As per plan, at the outfall near the intersection of 42nd ST E, and 11th Ave E.	
Inspection Frequency	Daily onsite. Weekly with inspection reports, and within 24 hours of any .5" precipitation event, or as soon as field conditions allow access.	
Phases of project used	Rip rap will be installed pear the mouth of the culvert, after the culvert end section is installed at 11th Ave E.	
<u> </u>		

\*\* If temporary stabilization is in place, or runoff becomes unlikely due to winter conditions, inspection frequencies will lessen or halt.

### U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 8 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, CO 80202-1129

# PUBLIC NOTICE OF PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY ASSESSMENT AND OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON CLEAN WATER ACT CONSENT AGREEMENT

### Purpose of Public Notice

The purpose of this notice is to announce the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) intention to enter into a Consent Agreement and Final Order with:

### Knife River Corporation 5654 134<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW Williston, North Dakota 58801

for alleged violations of the Clean Water Act (CWA) on the Little Muddy River and adjacent wetlands in Williston, North Dakota, and to give the public the opportunity to comment on the proposed consent agreement.

### Process Information

Under the CWA, EPA is authorized to issue orders assessing civil penalties for violations of the CWA. 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g). EPA may issue such an order after the commencement of an administrative penalty proceeding. As required by law, EPA is hereby providing public notice of the proposed consent agreement. 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(4)(A) and 40 C.F.R. § 22.45(b).

Administrative enforcement proceedings are conducted under EPA's Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties and the Revocation, Termination or Suspension of Permits (Consolidated Rules), 40 C.F.R. part 22. The procedures through which the public may submit written comment on a proposed consent agreement and participate in a proceeding are set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 22.45. The proposed consent agreement has been entered into by the parties for the purpose of simultaneously commencing and concluding this matter as authorized by 40 C.F.R. § 22.13(b) and executed pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b)(2) and (3). The deadline for submitting public comment on a proposed consent agreement is forty (40) days after the date of public notice.

### Case Summary.

The case against Knife River Corporation (Respondent), Docket No. CWA-08-2014-0001, was filed on October 2, 2014. The complaint that initiated this case was combined with a consent agreement for a penalty of \$7,650 for violations of the storm water discharge permit issued by the State of North Dakota. As the operator under the permit, Respondent was responsible for managing storm water at its construction of water, sewer, storm drain and street improvements at 42<sup>nd</sup> Street East and University Avenue in Williston, North Dakota. The permit violations occurred in July 2014 and were discovered during an EPA inspection on July 15, 2014. The Respondent had failed to install and maintain storm water best management practices, failed to meet permit requirements for a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and failed to conduct site inspections to assess the effectiveness of best management practices. Potential discharges of storm water pollutants from Respondent's construction operations flowed toward the Little Muddy River and adjacent wetlands. The Little Muddy River is, and was at all relevant times, a water of the United States.

### # Further Information and Comments

### Further Information and Comments

Persons wishing to receive a copy of any documents filed in these proceedings, comment upon the proposed consent agreement, or otherwise participate in any of the proceedings should contact the Regional Hearing Clerk, Tina Artemis, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 (8RC), 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129, telephone: 303.312.6765. Written comments on this proposed consent agreement must

be directed to the Regional Hearing Clerk by the deadline set forth above in this public notice.

The case docket for this proceeding is located in the EPA - Region 8 office identified above and the file will be open for public inspection during normal business hours. Written comments submitted by the public are available as part of the case docket, subject to provisions of law restricting public disclosure of confidential information. In order to provide opportunity for public comment, no final order assessing a penalty in these proceedings will be issued prior to 40 calendar days after publication of this notice.

December 5, 2014
Date of Publication