

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 8: 48

901 NORTH FIFTH STREET
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66101
SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT (ESA)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY-REGION VII
REGIONAL HEARING CLERK

DOCKET NO: CAA-07-2006-0243

This ESA is issued to: Midland Resources, Inc. At: 10 Bremen Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63147 for violating Section 112(r)(7) of the Clean Air Act.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 (EPA) and Midland Resources, Inc., 10 Bremen Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63147 (Respondent), have agreed to a settlement of this action before filing of a complaint, and thus this action is simultaneously commenced and concluded pursuant to Rules 22.13(b) and 22.18(B)(2) of the Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties, Issuance of Compliance or Corrective Action Orders, and the Revocation, Termination or Suspension of Permits (Consolidated Rules), 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13(b), 22.18(b)(2).

The Complainant, by delegation of the Administrator of EPA, is the Director of the Air, RCRA and Toxics Division. The Respondent is Midland Resources, Inc., 10 Bremen Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri.

This is an administrative action for the assessment of civil penalties instituted pursuant to Section 113(d) of the Clean Air Act. Pursuant to Section 113(d) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d), the Administrator and the Attorney General jointly determined that this matter, where the total penalty exceeds \$270,000 or where the first alleged date of violation occurred more than 12 months prior to the initiation of the administrative action, was appropriate for administrative penalty action.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

On March 28, 2006, an authorized representative of the EPA conducted a compliance inspection of the Respondent's facility located at 10 Bremen Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri, to determine compliance with the Risk Management Plan (RMP) regulations promulgated at 40 C.F.R. Part 68 under Section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act. The EPA found that the Respondent had violated regulations implementing Section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act by failing to comply with the regulations as noted on the enclosed Risk Management Program Inspection Findings, Alleged Violations and Proposed Penalty Shect (RMP Findings), which is hereby incorporated by reference.

Midland Resources, Inc. Docket No. CAA-07-2006-0243 Page 2 of 3

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 the ESA in order to settle the violations, described in the enclosed RMP Findings, for the total penalty amount of \$2910.00.

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 in herein and in the RMP Findings, 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 Clean Air 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 enclosed RMP Findings and has sent a cashier's check or certified check (payable to the "Treasurer, United States of America") in the amount of \$2910.00 in payment of the full penalty amount to the following address:

United States Environmental Protection Agency P.O. Box 371099M Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15251.

The Docket Number of this ESA is CAA-07-2006-0243, and <u>must be included on the check.</u>

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

Deanna Smith
Office of Regional Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7
901 North 5th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

A copy of the check must also be sent to:

Kathy M. Robinson Regional Hearing Clerk U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 901 North 5th Street Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

Midland Resources, Inc. Docket No. CAA-07-2006-0243 Page 3 of 3

Upon Respondent's submission of the signed original ESA, EPA will take no further civil action against Respondent for the alleged violations of the Clean Air Act referenced in the RMP Findings. The EPA does not waive any other enforcement action for any other violations 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 7 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 RMP Findings.

This ESA is binding on the parties signing below.

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

| | FOR RESPONDENT: Pult M Shulp Name (print): Robert Shuler | Date: 9/28/06 |
|-----|--|---|
| | Title (print): VP Manufacturing Midland Resources, Inc. | |
| Lor | FOR COMPLAINANT: Carol Kather Acting Director | Date: 10/6/06 |
| | Air, RCRA and Toxics Division EPA Region 7 Saruh Thibos Assistant Regional Counsel | Date: 10/5/06 |
| | I hereby ratify the ESA and incorporate it herein by reference to the second of the se | ence. It is so ORDERED. Date: 10 11 06 |
| | Karina Borromeo | |

RMP INSPECTION FINDINGS

Midland Resources, Inc. 10 Bremen Avenue St. Louis, MO 63147

CAA 112(r) Violations

VIOLATIONS

PENALTY AMOUNT

Prevention Program- Process Hazard Analysis [68.67]

\$750.00

1. The owner or operator has failed to establish or complete the following items:

a) a system to promptly address the team's findings and recommendations;
b) assure that the recommendations are resolved in a timely manner and c)
document what actions are to be taken;
d) complete actions as soon as possible;
c) develop a written schedule of when these actions are to be completed;
and f) communicate 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)]

Prevention Program- Process Hazard Analysis [68.67] \$300.00

2. The owner or operator failed to retain PHAs and updates or revalidations for each process covered, as well as the resolution of recommendations for the life of the process. [68.67(g)]

How was this addressed: Please see a Hacked

Prevention Program- Operating procedures [68.69]

\$750.00

- 3. The owner or operator has failed to develop or implement written operating procedures that provide instructions or steps for conducting activities associated with each covered process consistent with the safety information for the following areas. [68.69(a)]
 - a. Temporary operations. [68.69((a)(1)(iii)]

Rx Date/Time SEP-29-2006(FRI) 15:26 09/29/2006 16:31 8637971045

8637971045 KEMIRON

(FAX)3142419021

P. 001 PAGE 01/01 P. 008/009

SEP-22-2006(FRI) 15:06 MIDLAND - KEMIRON

| Section F - | Contractors [68.87] | No Fine Assessed |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| d | The owner or operator failed to provide proof that the identity of each employee(s), date perify that the training was understood as required. | of training, and means to |
| How was th | is addressed: Please See attache | ل |
| | | |
| Risk Mana | gement Plan [68.160 - 68.195] | \$2000.00 |
| | The owner or operator has not reviewed and update resubmitted it to EPA [68.190(a)], as a five-year up | |
| How was th | is addressed: Please see attache | d |
| - | | |
| Calculation | of Adjusted Penalty | |
| during RMF * > 10 times | erence the Multipliers for calculating proposed peor inspection matrix. Finding the column for number the threshold quantity listed in CFR 68.130 for the s a multiplier factor of 0.6. Therefore, the multipl | er of employees 21 - 50 and c particular chemical use in |
| | isted Penalty = \$4850.00 (Unadjusted Penalty) X 0 Adjusted Penalty = \$2910.00 | 1.6 (Size-Threshold |
| for Violatio | Adjusted Penalty of \$2910.00 would be assessed to us found during the RMP Compliance Inspection. dited Settlement Agreement (ESA). | |
| TOTAL | | \$2910.00 |
| The approxi | | 200.00 |
| Compliance | staffname: KURT BARGER | <u>. </u> |
| Signed: | - Klay | Date: 9- 29-06 |

| 5. | Emergency | operations. | [68.69 | (a)(1 | l)(v) |] |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|---|
|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|---|

c. Startup following a turnaround, or after emergency shutdown.
[68.69(a)(1)(vii)]

| How was this addressed: Please see a Hached | |
|--|-------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | NA.III |
| Prevention Program - Operating procedures [68.69] | \$600.00 |
| The owner or operator has failed to certify annually that the oprocedures are current and accurate and that procedures have as often as necessary. [68.69(c)] | T. T. |
| How was this addressed: Please see a Hacked | |
| 1107 Will this data costa. | |
| | |
| Prevention Program - Compliance audits [68.79] | \$300.00 |
| The owner or operator failed to certify that the stationary sour compliance with the provisions of the prevention program at years to verify that the developed procedures and practices ar being followed. [68.79(a)] | least every three |
| How was this addressed: Please see attached | |
| | |
| | |
| Prevention Program - Compliance audits [68.79] | \$150.00 |
| The owner or operator has failed to promptly determine or do appropriate response to each of the findings of the audit and deficiencies have been corrected. [68.79(d)] | |
| How was this addressed: Please see a Hached | |
| | |
| | |
| | 140140 |

Attachment to RMP INSPECTION FINDINGS

Below is the answer to the "How was this addressed:" for each violation. The number refers to the number on the RMP INSPECTION FINDINGS sheet.

- A new Process Hazard Analysis was done and the actions taken were put on a list stating when it was to be done and by who. It also had a column to sign off when the action was completed. All of the recommendations have been done per the schedule.
- 2. The PHA's were actually kept. What was missing was the recommendations as in #1. This has now been addressed by #1.
- 3. The operating procedures were updated to include temporary operations, emergency operations, and startup following a turnaround or after an emergency shutdown.
- 4. A certification sheet was included with the operating procedures.
- A new audit was done on Scpt 1., 2006 and all deficiencies were assigned to someone with the date at which they are to be completed. A signoff was then included to show deficiency was corrected.
- 6. This is the same as in number 5.
- 7. All contractors are now required to provide the relevant training for each employee. This includes employee identification, date of training, and means used to verify that the training was understood.
- The RMP update was submitted and accepted by EPA. It was done on March, 30, 2006.

IN THE MATTER OF Midland Resources, Inc., Respondent Docket No. CAA-07-2006-0243

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Expedited Settlement Agreement (ESA) was sent this day in the following manner to the addressees:

Copy hand delivered to:

Sarah Thibos
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 7
901 N. 5th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

Copy by Certified Mail Return Receipt to:

Robert Shuler Vice President, Manufacturing Midland Resources, Inc. 10 Bremen Avenue St. Louis, Missouri 63147

Dated

Kathy Robinson

Hearing Clerk, Region 7