



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 6, 1445 ROSS AVENUE, DALLAS, TEXAS 75202-2733
EXPEDITED SPCC SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

DOCKET NO. CWA-06-2018-4313

On: April 18, 2018

At: West Fox SWD, LLC, Gray Fox Commerical SWD Unit,
Off Knob Hill/Owens Road, Rattliff City, Carter County, OK,
73438-2149. Owned or operated by: West Fox SWD, LLC,
595 4th Street, Healdon, OK, 73438-2149 (Respondent).

An authorized representative of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conducted an inspection to determine compliance with the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) regulations promulgated at 40 CFR Part 112 under Section 311(j) of the Clean Water Act (33 USC § 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 SPCC INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY FORM (Form), which is hereby incorporated by reference.

The parties are authorized to enter into this Expedited Settlement under the authority vested in the Administrator of EPA by Section 311(b) (6) (B) (i) of the Act, 33 USC § 1321(b) (6) (B) (i), as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, and by 40 CFR § 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 \$4,525.00. This settlement is subject to the following terms and conditions:

EPA finds the Respondent is subject to the SPCC regulations, which are published at 40 CFR Part 112, and has violated the regulations as further described in the Form. The Respondent admits he/she is subject to 40 CFR Part 112 and that EPA has jurisdiction over the Respondent and the Respondent's conduct as described in the Form. Respondent does not contest the Inspection Findings, and waives any objections it may have to EPA's jurisdiction. The 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 \$4,525.00, payable to the "Environmental Protection Agency," to: "USEPA, Fines & Penalties, P.O. Box 979077, St. Louis, MO 63197-9900," and Respondent has noted on the penalty payment check "Spill Fund-311" and the docket number of this case, "CWA-06-2018-4313."

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

Failure by the Respondent to pay the penalty assessed by the Final Order in full by its due date may subject Respondent to a civil action to collect the assessed penalty, plus interest.

attorney's fees, costs and an additional quarterly nonpayment penalty pursuant to Section 311(b)(6)(H) of the Act, 33 USC §1321(b)(6)(H). In any such collection action, the validity amount and appropriateness of the penalty agreed to hereir shall not be subject to review.

If Respondent does not sign and return this Expedited Settlement as presented within 30 days of the date of its receipt, the proposed Expedited Settlement is withdrawn without prejudice to EPA's ability to file any other enforcement action for the violations identified in the Form.

After this Expedited Settlement becomes effective, EPA will take no further action against the Respondent for the violations of the SPCC regulations described in the Form. However, EPA does not waive any rights to take any enforcement action for any other past, present, or future violations by the Respondent of the SPCC regulations or of any other federal statute or regulations. By its first signature, EPA ratifies the Inspection Findings and Alleged Violations set forth in the Form.

This Expedited Settlement is binding on the parties signing below, and is effective upon EPA's filing of the document with the Regional Hearing Clerk

APPROVED BY EPA:

J. Chris Petersen Date: 5/29/18
Ronald D. Crossland
Branch Chief
Emergency Management Branch
Superfund Division

APPROVED BY RESPONDENT:

Name (print): GERALD CHAPET
Title (print): OWNER - WEST FOX SALT WATER DISPOSAL
Gerald Chapet Date: 03/08/2018
Signature

Estimated cost for correcting the violation(s) is \$16,000.00
FOR BOTH + THIS FINE


IT IS SO ORDERED:

Ronald D. Crossland Date: 8/16/18
Carl E. Edlund, P.E.
Director
Superfund Division

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

(Note: Do not use this form for a farm or if there is no secondary containment)

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

Company Name: West Fox SWD, LLC		Docket Number: CWA-06-2018-4313	
Facility Name: Gray Fox Commerical SWD Unit		Date: 4/18/2018	
Address: 595 4th Street		Inspection Number: SPCC-OK-2018-00057	
City: Healdon		Inspector Name: Tom McKay	
State: OK	Zip Code: 73438-2149	EPA Approving Official: Bryant Smalley	
Contact: Mr. Gerald Chaput, Owner		Enforcement Contact: Misty Ward (214) 665-6418	

**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 \$1,500.00 enter only the maximum allowable of \$1,500.00.)

- No Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan - 112.3\$1,500.00
- Plan not certified by a professional engineer - 112.3(d)..... 450.00
- Certification lacks one or more required elements - 112.3(d)(1)..... 100.00
- Plan not maintained on site (if manned at least four (4) hrs/day) or not available for review - 112.3(e)(1).....300.00
- 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) 75.00
- No evidence of five-year review of plan by owner/operator - 112.5(b)..... 75.00
- Amendment(s) not certified by a professional engineer - 112.5(c).....150.00
- No management approval of plan - 112.7.....450.00
- Plan does not follow sequence of the rule and/or cross-reference not provided - 112.7.....150.00
- Plan does not discuss additional procedures/methods/equipment not yet fully operational - 112.7.....75.00

- Plan does not discuss conformance with SPCC requirement - 112.7(a)(1)75.00
- Plan does not discuss alternative environmental protection to SPCC requirements - 112.7(a)(2).....200.00
- Plan has inadequate or no facility diagram, - 112.7(a)(3)75.00
- Inadequate or no listing of type of oil and storage capacity of containers - 112.7(a)(3)(i).....50.00
- Inadequate or no discharge prevention measures - 112.7(a)(3)(ii).....50.00
- Inadequate or no description of drainage controls - 112.7(a)(3)(iii).....50.00
- Inadequate or no description of countermeasures for discharge discovery, response and cleanup - 112.7(a)(3)(iv).....50.00
- Methods of disposal of recovered materials not in accordance with legal requirements - 112.7(a)(3)(v).....50.00
- No contact list & phone numbers for response & reporting discharges - 112.7(a)(3)(vi).....50.00
- Plan has inadequate or no information and procedures for reporting a discharge - 2.7(a)(4).....100.00
- Plan has inadequate or no description and procedures to use when a discharge may occur - 112.7(a)(5).....150.00
- Inadequate or no prediction of equipment failure which could result in discharges - 112.7(b).....150.00
- Plan does not discuss and facility does not implement appropriate containment/diversionary structures/equipment - 112.7(c).....400.00
- Inadequate containment or drainage for Loading Area - 112.7(c)400.00
- Plan has no or inadequate discussion of any applicable more stringent State rules, regulations, and guidelines -112.7(j)75.00
- 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)150.00

- If claiming impracticability of appropriate containment/diversionary structures:

- Impracticability has not been clearly denoted and demonstrated in plan - 112.7(d).....100.00
- No periodic integrity and leak testing - 112.7(d).....150.00
- No contingency plan - 112.7(d)(1).....150.00
- No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials - 112.7(d)(2).....150.00
- Plan has no or inadequate discussion of general requirements not already specified - 112.7(j).....75.00

QUALIFIED FACILITY REQUIREMENTS: §112.6

-
- Qualified Facility: No Self certification - 112.6(a).....450.00
 - Qualified Facility: Self certification lacks required elements - 112.6(a) or (b)100.00

- Qualified Facility: Technical amendments not certified - 112.6(a) or (b).....150.00
- Qualified Facility: Qualified Facility Plan includes alternative measures not certified by licensed Professional Engineer - 112.6(b).....150.00
- Facility: Environmental Equivalence or Impracticability not certified by licensed Professional Engineer - 112.6(b)(4).....350.00

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)..... 75.00
- Inspections and tests required are not in accordance with written procedures developed for the facility.- 112.7(e)75.00
- No Inspection records were available for review - 112.7(e)..... 200.00
 - Written procedures and/or a record of inspections and/or customary business records:
- Are not signed by appropriate supervisor or inspector- 112.7(e)..... 75.00
- Are not maintained for three years - 112.7(e)..... 75.00

PERSONNEL TRAINING AND DISCHARGE PREVENTION PROCEDURES: §112.7(f)

- No training on the operation and maintenance of equipment to prevent discharges and for facility operations -112.7(f)(1)..... 75.00
- No training on discharge procedure protocols - 112.7(f)(1)..... 75.00
- No training on the applicable pollution control laws, rules, and regulations and/or SPCC plan - 112.7(f)(1).... 75.00
- No designated person accountable for spill prevention - 112.7(f)(2)..... 75.00
- Spill prevention briefings are not scheduled and conducted at least once a year - 112.7(f)(3)..... 75.00
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of personnel training and spill prevention procedures - 112.7(a)(1)..... 75.00

SECURITY (excluding Production Facilities): §112.7(g)

- Plan does not describe how the facility secures and controls access to the oil handling, processing and storage areas - 112.7(g)..... 150.00
- Master flow and drain valves not secured - 112.7(g)..... 300.00
- Starter controls on oil pumps not secured to prevent unauthorized access - 112.7(g)..... 75.00
- Out-of-service and loading/unloading connections of oil pipelines not adequately secured - 112.7(g)..... 75.00
- Plan does not address the appropriateness of security lighting to both prevent acts of vandalism and assist in the discovery of oil discharges - 112.7(g) 150.00

FACILITY TANK CAR AND TANK TRUCK LOADING/UNLOADING RACK: §112.7(h)

- Inadequate secondary containment, and/or rack drainage does not flow to catchment basin, treatment system, or quick drainage system - 112.7(h)(1).....750.00
- 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).....450.00
- There are no interlocked warning lights, or physical barrier system, or warning signs, or vehicle brake interlock system to prevent vehicular departure before complete disconnect from transfer lines - 112.7(h)(2)300.00
- 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)..... 150.00
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility tank car and tank truck loading/unloading rack-112.7(a)(1) 75.00

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).....150.00
- Failure to provide an oil spill contingency plan - 112.7(k)(2)(ii)(A)..... 150.00
- No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials - 112.7(k)(2)(ii)(B)..... 150.00

FACILITY DRAINAGE: §112.8(b) & (c) and/or §112.12(b) & (c)

- Two "lift" pumps are not provided for more than one treatment unit - 112.8(b)(5).....50.00
- 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)&(2) and 112.8(c)(3)(i).....600.00
- Dike water is not inspected prior to discharge and/or valves not open & resealed under responsible supervision - 112.8(c)(3)(ii)&(iii).....450.00
- Adequate records (or NPDES permit records) of drainage from diked areas not maintained - 112.8(c)(3)(iv)..75.00
- Drainage from undiked areas do not flow into catchment basins ponds, or lagoons, or no diversion systems to retain or return a discharge to the facility - 112.8(b)(3)&(4)..... 450.00
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility drainage - 112.7(a)(1) 75.00

BULK STORAGE CONTAINERS: § 112.7(i), §112.8(c) and/or §112.12(c)

- Failure to conduct evaluation of field-constructed aboveground containers for risk of discharge or failure due to brittle fracture or other catastrophe - 112.7(i).....300.00
- Material and construction of containers not compatible with the oil stored and the conditions of storage such as pressure and temperature - 112.8(c)(1).....450.00
- Secondary containment capacity is inadequate - 112.8(c)(2).....750.00
- Secondary containment systems are not sufficiently impervious to contain oil - 112.8(c)(2)..... 375.00
- Completely buried metallic tanks are not protected from corrosion or are not subjected to regular pressure testing - 112.8(c)(4)..... 150.00
- Buried sections of partially buried metallic tanks are not protected from corrosion - 112.8(c)(5)..... 150.00
- Above ground containers are not subject to periodic integrity testing techniques such as visual inspections, hydrostatic testing, or other nondestructive testing methods - 112.8(c)(6).....450.00
- Above ground tanks are not subject to visual inspections - 112.8(c)(6)..... 450.00
- Records of inspections (or customary business records) do not include inspections of container supports/foundation, signs of container deterioration, discharges and/or accumulations of oil inside diked areas - 112.8(c)(6)..... 75.00
- Steam return /exhaust of internal heating coils that discharge into an open water course are not monitored, passed through a settling tank, skimmer, or other separation system - 112.8(c)(7)..... 150.00
- Container installations are not engineered or updated in accordance with good engineering practice because none of the following are present - 112.8(c)(8).....450.00
 - high liquid level alarm with audible or visual signal, or audible air vent - 112.8(c)(8)(i)
 - high liquid level pump cutoff devices set to stop flow at a predetermined level - 112.8(c)(8)(ii)
 - direct audible or code signal communication between container gauger and pumping station - 112.8(c)(8)(iii)
 - fast response system for determining liquid level of each bulk storage container, or direct vision gauges with a person present to monitor gauges and the overall filling of bulk storage containers - 112.8(c)(8)(iv)
- No testing of liquid level sensing devices to ensure proper operation - 112.8(c)(8)(v)..... 75.00
- Effluent treatment facilities not observed frequently to detect possible system upsets that could cause a discharge as described in §112.1(b) - 112.8(c)(9).....150.00
- Causes of leaks resulting in accumulations of oil in diked areas are not promptly corrected - 112.8(c)(10)..450.00
- Mobile or portable storage containers are not positioned or located to prevent discharged oil from reaching navigable water, or have inadequate secondary containment - 112.8(c)(11).....150.00
- Secondary containment inadequate for mobile or portable storage tanks - 112.8(c)(11).....500.00
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of bulk storage tanks - 112.7(a)(1)75.00

FACILITY TRANSFER OPERATIONS, PUMPING, AND FACILITY PROCESS: §112.8(d) and §112.12(d)

- Buried piping is not corrosion protected with protective wrapping, coating, or cathodic protection - *112.8(d)(1)*.....150.00
- Corrective action is not taken on exposed sections of buried piping when deterioration is found - *112.8(d)(1)*.....450.00
- Not-in-service or standby piping is not capped or blank-flanged and marked as to origin - *112.8(d)(2)*.....75.00
- Pipe supports are not properly designed to minimize abrasion and corrosion, and allow for expansion and contraction - *112.8(d)(3)*.....75.00
- Above ground valves, piping and appurtenances are not inspected regularly- *112.8(d)(4)*300.00
- Periodic integrity and leak testing of buried piping is not conducted at time of installation, modification, construction, relocation, or replacement - *112.8(d)(4)*.....150.00
- Vehicle traffic is not warned of aboveground piping or other oil transfer operations -*112.8(d)(5)*.....150.00
- Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility transfer operations, pumping, and facility process - *112.7(a)(1)*75.00

TOTAL \$4,525.00

Docket No. CWA-06-2018-4313

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the original and one copy of the foregoing "Consent Agreement and Final Order," issued pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 22.13(b), was filed on 8-20, 2018, with the Regional Hearing Clerk, U.S. EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, TX 75202-2733; and that on the same date a copy of the same was sent to the following, in the manner specified below:

NAME: Gerald Chaput
ADDRESS: 595 4th Street
Healdon, OK 73438-2149

Frankie Markham

Frankie Markham
OPA Enforcement Administrative Assistant