



**EXPEDITED SPCC SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**  
**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 7**  
**REGION 7, 11201 RENNER BOULEVARD, LENEXA, KANSAS 66219**

2013 SEP 25 AM 9:48

**DOCKET NO. CWA-07-2013-0042**

On: November 15, 2012  
 At: 1701 E. South Avenue, Emporia, Kansas

Owned or operated by, Norfolk Iron & Metal Company (Respondent), an authorized representative of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conducted an inspection to determine compliance with the Oil Pollution Prevention (SPCC) regulations promulgated at 40 C.F.R. Part 112 under Section 311(j) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1321(j)) (the Act), and found that Respondent had violated regulations implementing Section 311(j) of the Act by failing to comply with the regulations as noted on the attached SPILL PREVENTION CONTROL AND COUNTERMEASURES INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS, AND PROPOSED PENALTY FORM (Form), which is hereby incorporated by reference.

This proceeding and the Expedited Settlement are under the authority vested in the Administrator of the EPA by Section 311(b)(6)(B)(i) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1321(b)(6)(B)(i), as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, and by 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13(b). The parties enter into this Expedited Settlement in order to settle the civil violations described in the Form for a penalty of \$975.

This settlement is subject to the following terms and conditions:

The EPA finds that Respondent is subject to the SPCC regulations, which are published at 40 C.F.R. Part 112, and has violated the regulations as further described in the Form. Respondent admits that he/she is subject to 40 C.F.R. Part 112 and that the EPA has jurisdiction over Respondent and Respondent's conduct as described in the Form. Respondent does not contest the Inspection Findings, and waives any objections it may have to the EPA's jurisdiction. Respondent consents to the assessment of the penalty stated above. Respondent certifies, subject to civil and criminal penalties for making a false submission to the United States Government, that the violations have been corrected and Respondent has sent a certified check in the amount of \$975, payable to the "Environmental Protection Agency," via certified mail to:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
 P.O. Box 979077  
 St. Louis, Missouri 63197-9000

and Respondent has noted on the penalty payment check Docket No. CWA-07-2013-0042 and "OSLTF - 311." **The original, signed Settlement Agreement and copy of the penalty payment check must be sent via certified mail to:**


/ Robert Webber, Environmental Engineer  
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
 Region 7, AWMD/APCO  
 11201 Renner Boulevard  
 Lenexa, Kansas 66219

This Expedited Settlement resolves Respondent's liability for Federal civil penalties for the violations of the SPCC regulations described in the Form. However, the EPA does not waive any rights to take any enforcement action for any other past, present, or future violations by Respondent of the SPCC regulations or of any other federal statute or regulations. By its first signature, the EPA ratifies the Inspection Findings and Alleged Violations set forth in the Form.


Upon signing and returning this Expedited Settlement to the EPA, Respondent waives the opportunity for a hearing or appeal pursuant to Section 311 of the Act, and consents to the EPA's approval of the Expedited Settlement without further notice.

This Expedited Settlement is binding on the parties signing below, and is effective upon the Regional Judicial Officer's signature.

APPROVED BY EPA:  
  
 Date 8-30-13  
 Chief, Storage Tanks and Oil Pollution Branch (STOP)  
 Air and Waste Management Division (AWMD)

APPROVED BY RESPONDENT:  
 Name (print): Eric Crook  
 Title (print): Operations Manager  
 Signature:   
 Date: 7-15-2013

The estimated cost for correcting the violation(s) is:  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

IT IS SO ORDERED:  
  
 Date 9-25-13  
 Karina Borromeo  
 Regional Judicial Officer

UNITED STATES  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY REGION 1

2013 SEP 22 AM 9:48

*[Faint handwritten text]*

*[Faint handwritten text]*

*[Faint handwritten text]*

**Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Inspection  
Findings, Alleged Violations, and Proposed Penalty Form**

(Note: Do not use this form if there is no secondary containment)

These Findings, Alleged Violations and Penalties are issued by EPA Region 7 under the authority vested in the Administrator of the EPA by Section 311(b)(6)(B)(I) of the Clean Water Act, as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.



<b>Company Name</b> Norfolk Iron & Metal Company		<b>Docket Number</b> CWA-07-2013-0042
<b>Facility Name</b> Norfolk Iron & Metal Company		<b>Date</b> November 15, 2012
<b>Address</b> 1701 E. South Avenue		<b>Inspection Number</b> N/A
<b>City</b> Emporia		<b>Inspector's Name</b> Bjorn Brinkman, Bruce Canova, Trainee
<b>State</b> KS	<b>Zip Code</b> 66801	<b>EPA Approving Official</b> Margaret E. Stockdale
<b>Contact</b> Eric Crook, Operations Manager		<b>Enforcement Contact</b> Robert Webber

**Summary of Findings  
(Bulk Storage Facilities)**

GENERAL TOPICS: 112.3(a), (d), (e); 112.5(a), (b), (c); 112.7 (a), (b), (c), (d)

(When the SPCC Plan review penalty exceeds \$1,500 enter only the maximum allowable of \$1,500)

- No Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan 112.3 (\$1,500)
- Plan not certified by a professional engineer 112.3(d) (\$450)
- Certification lacks one or more required elements 112.3(d)(1) (\$100) \$100
- Plan not maintained on site (if manned at least four hrs/day) or not available for review 112.3(e)(1) (\$300)
- No evidence of five-year review of plan by owner/operator 112.5(b) (\$75) \$75
- No plan amendment(s) if the facility has had a change in: design, construction, operation, or maintenance which affects the facility's discharge potential 112.5(a) (\$75)
- Amendment(s) not certified by a professional engineer 112.5(c) (\$150)
- No management approval of plan 112.7 (\$450)
- Plan does not follow sequence of the rule and/or cross-reference not provided 112.7 (\$150)
- Plan does not discuss additional procedures/methods/equipment not yet fully operational 112.7 (\$75)

┌

- Plan does not discuss alternative environmental protection to SPCC requirements 112.7(a)(2) (\$200)
  - Plan has inadequate or no facility diagram 112.7(a)(3) (\$75)
  - Inadequate or no listing of type of oil and storage capacity layout of containers 112.7(a)(3)(i) (\$50)
  - Inadequate or no discharge prevention measures 112.7(a)(3)(ii) (\$50)
  - Inadequate or no description of drainage controls 112.7(a)(3)(iii) (\$50)
  - Inadequate or no description of countermeasures for discharge discovery, response and cleanup 112.7(a)(3)(iv) (\$50)
  - Recovered materials not disposed of in accordance with legal requirements 112.7(a)(3)(v) (\$50)
  - No contact list & phone numbers for response & reporting discharges 112.7(a)(3)(vi) (\$50)
  - Plan has inadequate or no information and procedures for reporting a discharge 112.7(a)(4) (\$100)
  - Plan has inadequate or no description and procedures to use when a discharge may occur 112.7(a)(5) (\$150)
  - Inadequate or no prediction of equipment failure which could result in discharges 112.7(b) (\$150)
  - Plan does not discuss and facility does not implement appropriate containment/diversionary structures/equipment 112.7 (\$400)
- If claiming impracticability of containment and appropriate diversionary structures:**
- Impracticability has not been clearly denoted and demonstrated in plan 112.7(d) (\$100)
  - No contingency plan 112.7(d)(1) (\$150)
  - No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials 112.7(d)(2) (\$150)
  - No periodic integrity and leak testing, if impracticability is claimed 112.7(d) (\$150)
  - Plan has no or inadequate discussion of general requirements not already specified 112.7(j) (\$75)

**QUALIFIED FACILITY REQUIREMENTS: 112.6**

---

- Qualified Facility: No Self certification 112.6(a) (\$450)
- Qualified Facility: Self certification lacks required elements 112.6(a) (\$100)
- Qualified Facility: Technical amendments not certified 112.6(b) (\$150)
- Qualified Facility: Un-allowed deviations from requirements 112.6(c) (\$100)
- Qualified Facility: Environmental Equivalence or Impracticability not certified by PE 112.6(d) (\$350)

**WRITTEN PROCEDURES AND INSPECTION RECORDS 112.7(e)**

---

- Plan does not include inspections and test procedures in accordance with 40 CFR Part 112 112.7(e) (\$75)
- Inspections and tests required are not in accordance with written procedures developed for the facility 112.7(e) (\$75)

- No Inspection records were available for review 112.7(e) (\$200) \$200  
(Written procedures and/or a record of inspections and/or customary business records)
- Inspection records are not signed by appropriate supervisor or inspector 112.7(e) (\$75)
- Inspection records are not maintained for three years 112.7(e) (\$75)

**PERSONNEL TRAINING AND DISCHARGE PREVENTION PROCEDURES 112.7(f)**

---

- No training on the operation and maintenance of equipment to prevent discharges and/or facility operations 112.7(f)(1) (\$75)
- No training on discharge procedure protocols 112.7(f)(1) (\$75)
- No training on the applicable pollution control laws, rules and regulations, and/or SPCC plan 112.7(f)(1) (\$75)
- Training records not maintained for three years 112.7(f)(1) (\$75) \$75
- No designated person accountable for spill prevention 112.7(f)(2) (\$75)
- Spill prevention briefings are not scheduled and conducted at least annually 112.7(f)(3) (\$75) \$75
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of personnel and spill prevention procedures 112.7(a)(1) (\$75)

**SECURITY (excluding Production Facilities) 112.7(g)**

---

- Facility not fully fenced and entrance gates are not locked and/or guarded when plant is unattended or not in production 112.7(g)(1) (\$150)
- Master flow and drain valves that permit direct outward flow to the surface are not secured in a closed when in a non-operating or standby status 112.7(g)(2) (\$300)
- Starter controls on pumps are not locked in the "off" position or located at a site accessible only to authorized personnel when pumps are not in a non-operating or standby status 112.7(g)(3) (\$75)
- Loading and unloading connection(s) of piping/pipelines are not capped or blank-flanged when not in service or standby status 112.7(g)(4) (\$75)
- Facility lighting not adequate to facilitate the discovery of spills during hours of darkness and to deter vandalism 112.7(g)(5) (\$150)
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility security 112.7(a)(1) (\$75)

**FACILITY TANK CAR AND TANK TRUCK LOADING/UNLOADING 112.7(c) and/or (h-j)**

---

- Inadequate containment for Loading Area [not consistent with 112.7(c)] 112.7(c) (\$400)
- Inadequate secondary containment, and/or rack drainage does not flow to catchment basin treatment system, or quick drainage system 112.7(h)(1) (\$750)
- Containment system does not hold at least the maximum capacity of the largest single compartment of any tank car or tank truck 112.7(h)(1) (\$450)

- There are no interlocked warning lights, or physical barrier system, or warning signs, or vehicle brake (\$300) interlock system to prevent vehicular departure before complete disconnect from transfer lines- 112.7(h)(2)
- There is no inspection of lowermost drains and all outlets prior to filling and departure of any tank car or tank truck- 112.7(h)(3) (\$150)
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility tank car and tank truck loading/unloading rack 112.7(a)(1) (\$75)

---

**QUALIFIED OIL OPERATIONAL EQUIPMENT 112.7(k)**

---

- Failure to establish and document procedures for inspections or a monitoring program to detect equipment failure and/or a discharge 112.7(k)(2)(i) (\$150)
- Failure to provide an oil spill contingency plan 112.7(k)(2)(ii)(A) (\$150)
- No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials 112.7(k)(2)(ii)(B) (\$150)

---

**FACILITY DRAINAGE 112.8(b) & (c)**

---

- Secondary Containment circumvented due to containment bypass valves left open and/or pumps and ejectors not manually activated to prevent a discharge 112.8(b)(1)and(2), and 112.8(c)(3)(i) (\$650)
- Dike water is not inspected prior to discharge and/or valves not open & resealed under responsible supervision 112.8(c)(3)(ii)and(iii) (\$450)
- Adequate records (or NPDES permit records) of drainage from diked areas not maintained 112.8(c)(3)(iv) (\$75)
- Drainage from undiked areas do not flow into catchment basins ponds or lagoons, or no diversion system to retain or return a discharge to the facility 112.8(b)(3)and(4) (\$450)
- Two "lift" pumps are not provided for more that one treatment unit 112.8(b)(5) (\$50)
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility drainage 112.7(a)(1) (\$75)

---

**BULK STORAGE CONTAINERS 112.8(c)**

---

- Plan has inadequate or no risk analysis and/or evaluation of field-constructed aboveground tanks for brittle fracture 112.7(i) (\$75)
- Failure to conduct evaluation of field-constructed aboveground tanks for brittle fracture 112.7(i) (\$300)
- Material and construction of tanks not compatible to the oil stored and the conditions of storage such as pressure and temperature 112.8(c)(1) (\$450)
- Secondary containment appears to be inadequate 112.8(c)(2) (\$750)
- Containment systems, including walls and floors, are not sufficiently impervious to contain oil 112.8(c)(2) (\$375)
- Excessive vegetation which affects the integrity (\$150)
- Walls of containment system slightly eroded or have low areas (\$300)
- Completely buried tanks are not protected from corrosion or are not subjected to regular pressure testing 112.8(c)(4) (\$150)

- Partially buried tanks do not have buried sections protected from corrosion *112.8(c)(5)* (\$150)
- Aboveground tanks are not subject to visual inspections *112.8(c)(6)* (\$450)
- Aboveground tanks are not subject to periodic integrity testing, such as hydrostatic, nondestructive methods, etc. *112.8(c)(6)* (\$450) \$450
- Records of inspections (or customary business records) do not include inspections of tank supports, foundation, deterioration, discharges and/or accumulations of oil inside diked areas *112.8(c)(6)* (\$75)
- Steam return/exhaust of internal heating coils which discharge into an open water course are not monitored, passed through a settling tank, skimmer or other separation system *112.8(c)(7)* (\$150)
- Tank battery installations are not in accordance with good engineering practice because none of the following are present *112.8(c)(8)* (\$450)
- No testing of liquid level sensing devices to ensure proper operation *112.8(c)(8)(v)* (\$75)
- Effluent treatment facilities which discharge directly to navigable waters are not observed frequently to detect oil spills *112.8(c)(9)* (\$150)
- Causes of leaks resulting in accumulations of oil in diked areas are not promptly corrected *112.8(c)(10)* (\$450)
- Mobile or portable storage containers are not positioned to prevent discharged oil from reaching navigable water *112.8(c)(11)* (\$150)
- Secondary containment inadequate for mobile or portable storage tanks *112.8(c)(11)* (\$500)
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of bulk storage tanks *112.7(a)(1)* (\$75)

**FACILITY TRANSFER OPERATIONS, PUMPING, AND FACILITY PROCESS 112.8(d)**

- 
- Buried piping is not corrosion protected with protective wrapping, coating or cathodic protection protection *112.8(d)(1)* (\$150)
  - Corrective action is not taken on exposed sections of buried piping when deterioration is found *112.8(d)(1)* (\$450)
  - Not-in-service or standby piping is not capped or blank-flanged and marked as to origin *112.8(d)(2)* (\$75)
  - Pipe supports are not properly designed to minimize abrasion and corrosion, and allow for expansion and contraction *112.8(d)(3)* (\$75)
  - Aboveground valves, piping and appurtenances are not inspected regularly *112.8(d)(4)* (\$300)
  - Periodic integrity and leak testing of buried piping is not conducted *112.8(d)(4)* (\$150)
  - Vehicle traffic is not warned of aboveground piping or other oil transfer operations *112.8(d)(5)* (\$150)
  - Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility transfer operations, pumping, and facility process *112.7(a)(1)* (\$75)
  - Plan does not include a signed copy of the Certification of the Applicability of the Substantial Harm Criteria per 40 CFR Part 112.20(e) (\$150)  
(Do not use this if FRP subject; go to traditional enforcement)

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$975</b>
--------------	--------------





IN THE MATTER OF Norfolk Iron & Metal Company, Respondent  
Docket No. CWA-07-2013-0042

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Order was sent this day in the following manner to the addressees:

Copy by email to Attorney for Complainant:

nazar.kristen@epa.gov

Copy by First Class Mail to Respondent:

Eric Crook  
Operations Manager  
Norfolk Iron & Metal Company  
1701 E South Avenue  
Emporia, Kansas 66801

Dated: 9/25/13



Kathy Robinson  
Kathy Robinson  
Hearing Clerk, Region 7

