

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

AUG 2 1 2009

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF

SC-6J

<u>CERTIFIED MAIL</u> <u>RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED</u>

Shawn Lambert
Safety & Risk Manager
Co-Alliance (Buchanan Agronomy)
1 Lincoln Ave.
Danville, Indiana 46122

RE: Complaint and Expedited Settlement Agreement ESA Docket No. RMP-09-ESA-008 Docket No. CAA-05-2009-0029

Dear Mr. Lambert:

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 <u>Chrzaszcz.monika@epa.gov</u>, 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 yours,

Mark J. Horwitz, Chief

Chemical Emergency

Preparedness & Prevention Section

Enclosure



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY EDENVED NEGIONAL HEARING CLERK

77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

U.S. EPA REGION 5

2009 AUG 21 AM IO: L.I

EXPEDITED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (ESA)

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

DOCKET NO: RMP-09-ESA-008

CAA-05-2009-0029

This ESA is issued to: Co-Alliance (Buchanan Agronomy) At: 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchanan, Michigan 49107

2750903A031

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

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 October 28, 2009, an authorized representative of the EPA conducted a compliance inspection of 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 RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY SHEET (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 \$1,500.00

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 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 \$1,500.00 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.)

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: Shawn Cambert Date: 7/31/2009
Name (print): Shawn Lambert
Title (print): <u>Safety & Risk Manager</u>
Co-Alliance (Buchanan Agronomy)
FOR COMPLAINANT:
Richard C. Karl, Director Superfund Division Date: 8-13-09
I hereby ratify the ESA and incorporate it herein by reference. It is so ORDERED.
Bharat Mathur, Acting Regional Administrator Date: \$\frac{\psi_{19/09}}{2}

National City.

National City Bank

Pay to the order of TREASURER, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ******************************

ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS AND DO CENTS

Drawer: National City Bank

National City Bank

Drawer: National City Bank

National City Bank

Drawer: National City Bank

National City Bank

National City Bank

Drawer: National City Bank

Nation

100095237#

110311002091

38790749#

BO#2750903A031

RECEIVED
REGIONAL HEARING CLERK
U.S. EPA REGION 5
2009 AUG 21 AM 10: 4-1

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTINGS.

	ate RMP submitted: 04/08/2008 Date process(es) came to of Inspection: 10/28/2008 EPA Facility Identifier:	e online: 1	960's	5
<u> </u>	ection A-Management [68.15]	100000108	3023	
Ma Co	anagement system developed and implemented as provided in 40 CFR 68.15? mments:	⊠S □	M [J U 🗆 N
Ha	s the owner or operator:			
1.	Developed a management system to oversee the implementation of the risk management program elements? [68.15(a)]	X)	/ 💷	N 🗆 V
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)]	⊠ Y	/ 🖂	N 🗆 N
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)]	⊠ Y	′ □ ľ	N D N
Se	ction B: Hazard Assessment [68.20-68.42]			
Ha: Co	zard assessment conducted and documented as provided in 40 CFR 68.20-68.42?	OS XM	ال	I □ N/A
Ha	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)] □ a. For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)] □ b. For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)] □ c. For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)] or □ d. 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)]			I 🗆 N
2.	Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for an alternative release scenario: [68.22(a)] ☑ a. For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)] ☑ b. For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)] ☑ c. For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m2 for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)] ☑ d. 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)]	XY	□N	□ N/.
3.	Used appropriate wind speeds and stability classes for the release analysis? [68.22(b)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□ N/A
4.	Used appropriate ambient temperature and humidity values for the release analysis? [68.22(c)]	XY	ΠN	□ N/A
5.	Used appropriate values for the height of the release for the release analysis? [68.22(d)]	⊠Y	□N	□ Ñ/A
6.	Used appropriate surface roughness values for the release analysis? [68.22(e)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□ 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)]	⊠Y	□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)]	ΟY	□N	⊠ N/A

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENAL SHEET

Program Level 2 Process Checklist

Facility Name: Buchanan Agronomy (Co-Alliance), 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107

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)]	ΟY	Z ⊠N	
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)]	ΠY	ΠN	X N
11. Analyzed and reported in the RMP additional worst-case release scenarios for a hazard class if the a 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)]	ΩY	ΠN	X N
 12. Has the owner or operator determined the worst-case release quantity to be the greater of the following: [68.25(b)] □ 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)] □ b. 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)] 	OY	⊠N	□ N 図 N
13a. Has the owner or operator for toxic substances that are normally gases at ambient temperature and handled as a gas or liquid under pressure :			127
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
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)]	⊠Y	□N	□ N
13.b. Has the owner or operator for toxic gases handled as refrigerated liquids at ambient pressure:		II.	
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	ΠN	⊠ N/
13.b.(2) [Optional for owner / operator] Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool, if the released substance would be contained by passive mitigation systems in a pool with a depth greater than 1 cm? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠ N/
13.b.(3) Calculated the volatilization rate at the boiling point of the substance and at the conditions specified in 68.25(d)? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/
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)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠ N//
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, the surface area of the contained liquid shall be used to calculate the volatilization rate? [68.25(d)(1)(i)]	_p \square Y	□N	⊠ N//
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	□N	⊠ N/A

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENAL-SHEET

acility Name: Buchanan Agronomy (Co-Alliance), 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107	<u> </u>		
13.c.(5) Determined the rate of release to air from the volatilization rate of the liquid poc [68.25(d)(3)]	ים אופ	Y 🗆 N	
13.c.(6) Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offs. Consequence Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current prace proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model feat differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [6]	or the ctices, or wher or	/ <u> </u> N	 I 🗵 I
13.d. Has the owner or operator for <u>flammables</u> :			
13.d.(1) Assumed the quantity in a vessel(s) of flammable gas held as a gas or liquid un pressure or refrigerated gas released to an undiked area vaporizes resulting in a vapor c explosion? [68.25(e)]	ider 🔲 Y	′ □N	X N
13.d.(2) For refrigerated gas released to a contained area or liquids released below their atmospheric boiling point, assumed the quantity volatilized in 10 minutes results in a vapo [68.25(f)]	r	′ □N	⊠N
13.d.(3) Assumed a yield factor of 10% of the available energy is released in the explosion determining the distance to the explosion endpoint, if the model used is based on TNT-edmethods? [68.25(e)]	on for QY	□N	⊠ N
14. Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the endpoints? [68.25(g)]	I XY	′ □N	N/
15. Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Conse Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary reaccount for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.25(g)] a. What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]	conditions models that the	′ □N	□ N/
16. Ensured that the passive mitigation system, if considered, is capable of withstanding the revent triggering the scenario and will still function as intended? [68.25(h)]	release	□N	⊠ N/
 17. Considered also the following factors in selecting the worst-case release scenarios: [68.25(i)] () a. Smaller quantities handled at higher process temperature or pressure? [68.25(i)(1)] () b. Proximity to the boundary of the stationary source? [68.25(i)(2)] 	ΟY	□N	⊠ N/2
Hazard Assessment: Alternative release scenario analysis [68.28]	TG/V		
18. Identified and analyzed at least one alternative release scenario for each regulated toxic substance is covered process(es) and at least one alternative release scenario to represent all flammable substance overed processes? [68.28(a)]	held in a 区Y nces held in	□N	□ N//
 19. Selected a scenario: [68.28(b)] ☑ a. That is more likely to occur than the worst-case release scenario under 68.25? [68.28(b)(1)(i)] ☑ b. That will reach an endpoint off-site, unless no such scenario exists? [68.28(b)(1)(ii))]	□N	□ N/A
 20. Considered release scenarios which included, but are not limited to, the following: [68.28(l) (2)(i)] □ a. Transfer hose releases due to splits or sudden hose uncoupling? [68.28(b)(2)(i)] □ b. Process piping releases from failures at flanges, joints, welds, valves and valve so drains or bleeds? [68.28(b)(2)(ii)] □ c. Process vessel or pump releases due to cracks, seal failure, or drain, bleed, or plu [68.28(b)(2)(iii)] 	eals, and ug failure?	□N	□ N/A
d. Vessel overfilling and spill, or overpressurization and venting through relief valves	or rupture		

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENAL-SHEET

•	active Name: Bucharian Agronomy (Co-Allianice), 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107			
	disks? [68.28(b)(2)(iv)] □ e. 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)]	⊠Y		
	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 and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.28(c)]	XY		
	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)]	⊠Y	□N	
	24. Considered the following factors in selecting the alternative release scenarios: [68.28(e)] □ a. The five-year accident history provided in 68.42? [68.28(e)(1)] □ b. Failure scenarios identified under 68.50? [68.28(e)(2)]	ΟY	□N	⊠N
	Hazard 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)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□ N
	26. Identified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings in the RMP? [68.30(b)]	⊠Y	□N	□ N
	27. Used most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)]	⊠Y	□N	□ N
	28. Estimated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)]	⊠Y	ΠN	O N
	Hazard 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)]	⊠Y	□N	□ N/
	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)]	⊠Y	□N	□ N/
	Hazard Assessment: Review and update [68.36]			- ·-
	31. Reviewed and updated the off-site consequence analyses at least once every five years? [68.36(a)]	⊠Y	ΩN	□ N/.
	32. Completed a revised analysis and submit a revised RMP within six months of a change in processes, quantities stored or handled, or any other aspect that might reasonably be expected on increase or decrease the distance to the endpoint by a factor of two or more? [68.36(b)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠ N//
	Hazard Assessment: Documentation [68.39] Has the owner/operator maintained the following records:			
	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)]	⊠Y	□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)]	⊠Y	ΩN	□ N/A

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALSHEET

S 1	acility Name: Buchanan Agronomy (Co-Alliance), 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107			
	35. Documentation of estimated quantity released, release rate, and duration of release? [68.39(c)]	⊠Y	/ UN	
	36. Methodology used to determine distance to endpoints? [68.39(d)]	⊠Y	′ □N	
ļ	37. Data used to estimate population and environmental receptors potentially affected? [68.39(e)]	⊠Y	_ UN	
	Hazard Assessment: Five-year accident history [68.42]	32		
	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)]	ΠY	□N	X N
	39. Has the owner or operator reported the following information for each accidental release: [68.42(b)] a. Date, time, and approximate duration of the release? [68.42(b)(1)] b. Chemical(s) released? [68.42(b)(2)] c. Estimated quantity released in pounds and percentage weight in a mixture (toxics)? [68.42(b)(3)] d. NAICS code for the process? [68.42(b)(4)] e. The type of release event and its source? [68.42(b)(5)] f. Weather conditions (if known)? [68.42(b)(6)] g. On-site impacts? [68.42(b)(7)] h Known offsite impacts? [68.42(b)(8)] i. Initiating event and contributing factors (if known)? [68.42(b)(9)] j. Whether offsite responders were notified (if known)? [68.42(b)(10)]	υY	ΩN	⊠ N
ŀ	k. Operational or process changes that resulted from investigation of the release? [68.42(b)(11)]			
-	Section C: Prevention Program			
L	Implemented the Program 2 prevention requirements as provided in 40 CFR 68.48 - 68.60? Comments:	S ⊠M	u U	□ N//
L	Prevention Program- Safety information [68.48]			
	 Compiled and maintained the following up-to-date safety information, related to the regulated substances, processes, and equipment: [68.48(a)] a. Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) that meet the requirements of the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard [29 CFR 1910.1200(g)]? [68.48(a)(1)] b. Maximum intended inventory of equipment in which the regulated substances are stored or processed? [68.48(a)(2)] c. Safe upper and lower temperatures, pressures, flows, and compositions? [68.48(a)(3)] d. Equipment specifications? [68.48(a)(4)] e. Codes and standards used to design, build, and operate the process? [68.48(a)(5)] 	ΠY	⊠N	□ N/,
1	2. Ensured the process is designed in compliance with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices? [68.48(b)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□ N/A
3	3. Updated information if a major change has occurred that made the information inaccurate? [68.48(c)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/A
F	Prevention Program- Hazard review [68.50]			
4	Has the owner or operator conducted a review of the hazards associated with the regulated substances, processes, and procedures? [68.50(a)]	⊠Y	ПN	□ N/A
5	 Did the review identify: a. The hazards associated with the process and regulated substances? [68.50(a)(1)] b. Opportunities for equipment malfunctions or human errors that could cause an accidental release? [68.50(a)(2)] c. The safeguards used or needed to control the hazards or prevent equipment malfunctions 	□Y I	⊠N	□ N/A

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALT SHEET

acii	rty Name: _Buchanan Agronomy (Co-Alliance), 16/24 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107			_
	or human error? [68.50(a)(3)] d. Any steps used or needed to detect or monitor releases? [68.50(a)(4)]			
6	Determined by inspecting all equipment that the processes are designed, fabricated, and operated in accordance with applicable standards or rules, if designed to meet industry standards or Federal or state design rules? [68.50(b)]	⊠Y	′ 🗆 N	I
7	Documented the results of the review? [68.50(c)]	⊠Y	ON.	□ N
8	Ensured that problems identified were resolved in a timely manner? [68.50(c)]	ΟY	⊠N	u N
9	Updated the review at least once every five years or whenever a major change in the processes occurred? [68.50(d)]	ΩY	⊠N	ΠN
1	D. Resolved all issues identified in the review before startup of the changed process? [68.50(d)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N
Р	revention Program- Operating procedures [68.52]	-		
1	1. Has the owner or operator prepared written operating procedures that provide clear instructions or steps for safely conducting activities associated with each covered process consistent with the safety information for that process? (Operating procedures or instructions provided by equipment manufacturers or developed by persons or organizations knowledgeable about the process and equipment may be used as a basis for a stationary source's operating procedures.) [68.52(a)]	⊠Y	□N	□ N
12	 2. Do the procedures address the following: [68.52(b)] a. Initial startup? [68.52(b)(1)] b. Normal operations? [68.52(b)(2)] c. Temporary operations? [68.52(b)(3)] d. Emergency shutdown and operations? [68.52(b)(4)] e. Normal shutdown? [68.52(b)(5)] f. Startup following a normal or emergency shutdown or a major change that requires a hazard review? [68.52(b)(6)] g. Consequences of deviations and steps required to correct or avoid deviations? [68.52(b)(7)] h. Equipment inspections? [68.52(b)(8)] 	⊠Y	□N	□ N/
13	. Has the owner or operator ensured that the operating procedures have been updated, if necessary, whenever a major change occurred and prior to startup of the changed process? [68.52(c)	ΣΥ	□N	□ N//
Pr	evention Program - Training [68.54]	12		
14	Certified that each employee presently operating a process, and each employee newly assigned to a covered process have been trained or tested competent in the operating procedures provided in § 68.52 that pertain to their duties? (For those employees already operating a process on June 21, 1999, the owner or operator may certify in writing that the employee has the required knowledge, skills, and abilities to safely carry out the duties and responsibilities as provided in the operating procedures.) [68.54(a)]	ΩY	⊠N	□ N//
15	Provided refresher training at least every three years, or more often if necessary, to each employee operating a process, to ensure that the employee understands and adheres to the current operating procedures of the process? [68.54(b)]	XY	□N	□ N/A
16	Determined, in consultation with the employees operating the process, the appropriate frequency of refresher training? [68.54(b)]	ΠY	⊠N	□ N/A
17	Certified that each employee was trained in any updated or new procedures prior to startup of a process after a major change? [68.54(d)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/A
Pro	evention Program - Maintenance [68.56]			
18.	Prepared and implemented procedures to maintain the on-going mechanical integrity of the process			

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENAL-SHEET

Facility Name: Buchanan Agronomy (Co-Alliance), 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107			
equipment? [68.56(a)]	ΠY		1 🗆 1
19. Trained or caused to be trained each employee, involved in maintaining the on-going mechanical integrity of the process, in the hazards of the process, in how to avoid or correct unsafe conditions, and in the procedures applicable to the employee's job tasks? [68.56(b)]	⊠\	Y DN	1 □ 1
20. Has every maintenance contractor ensured that each contract maintenance employee is trained to perform the maintenance procedures developed? [68.56(c)]	X		1 🗆 1
21. Has the owner or operator performed or caused to be performed inspections and tests on process equipment that follow recognized and generally accepted engineering practices? [68.56(d)]	⊠Y	′ 🗆 N	1 🗆 N
Prevention Program -Compliance audits [68.58]	<u></u>		
22. Has the owner or operator certified that compliance audits are conducted at least every three years to verify that the procedures and practices are adequate and are being followed? [68.58(a)]	ΠY	⊠N	
23. Has compliance audit been conducted by at least one person knowledgeable in the process? [68.58(b)]	⊠Y	□N	ΠN
24. Has the owner operator developed a report of the audits findings? [68.58(c)]	⊠Y	ΠN	ΠN
25. 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? [68.58(d)]	ΟY	ПN	X N
26. Has the owner or operator retained the two most recent compliance audit reports, unless more than five years old? [68.58(e)]	ΠY	⊠N	□ N
Prevention Program - Incident investigation [68.60]			
27. Has the owner or operator investigated each incident which resulted in, or could reasonably have resulted in a catastrophic release? [68.60(a)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/
28. Were all incident investigations initiated not later than 48 hours following the incident? [68.60(b)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/
 29. Was a summary prepared at the conclusion of every investigation, which included: [68.60(c)] a. Date of incident? [68.60(c)(1)] b. Date investigation began? [68.60(c)(2)] c. A description of incident? [68.60(c)(3)] d. The factors that contributed to the incident? [68.60(c)(4)] e. Any recommendations resulting from the investigation? [68.60(c)(5)] 	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/
30. Has the owner or operator promptly addressed and resolved the investigation findings and recommendations, and are the resolutions and corrective actions documented? [68.60(d)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N//
31. Has the owner or operator reviewed the finding with all affected personnel whose job tasks are affected by the findings? [68.60(e)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/A
32. Has the owner or operator retained investigation summaries for five years? [68.60(f)]	ΠY	□N	× N/A
Section D - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.95]			
Developed and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.95?	□М	<u></u> U [□ N/A

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENAL1 SHEET

acility Name: Buchanan Agronomy (Co-Alliance), 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107	T =		
1. Is the facility designated as a "first responder" in case of an accidental release of regulated substances"	□Y	⊠N	<u> </u>
1.a. If the facility is not a first responder:			
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)]	⊠Y	′ □N	□ N
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)]	ΟY	□N	⊠N
1.a.(3) Are appropriate mechanisms in place to notify emergency responders when there is need for a response? [68.90(b)(3)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□ N.
An emergency response plan which is maintained at the stationary source and contains the following? [68.95(a)(1)] a. Procedures for informing the public and local emergency response agencies about accidental	ΟY	ПN	⊠ N,
releases? [68.95(a)(1)(i)] b. Documentation of proper first-aid and emergency medical treatment necessary to treat accidental human exposures? [68.95(a)(1)(ii)]			
c. Procedures and measures for emergency response after an accidental release of a regulated substance? [68.95(a)(1)(iii)]			
3. Procedures for the use of emergency response equipment and for its inspection, testing, and maintenance? [68.95(a)(2)]	ΟY	□N	⊠ N/
4. Training for all employees in relevant procedures? [68.95(a)(3)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/.
5. 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/,
6. 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)]	ΠY	□N	⊠ N/,
7. Has the emergency response plan been coordinated with the community emergency response plan developed under EPCRA? [68.95(c)]	ΠY	□N∈	⊠ N/,
Section G - Risk Management Plan [68.190 - 68.195]			
 Has the owner or operator reviewed and updated the RMP and submitted it to EPA [68.190(a)]? Reason for update. Five-year update. [68.190(b)(1)] 	⊠Y	ΩN	□ N//
Within three years of a newly regulated substance listing. [68.190(b)(2)]			
At the time a new regulated substance is first present in an already regulated process above threshold quantities. [68.190(b)(3)]			
At the time a regulated substance is first present in a 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 OCA 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)]			

RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENAL1 SHEET

Faci	lity Name: Buchanan Agronomy (Co-Alliance), 16724 Bakerstown Road, Buchana, Michigan 49107			
2.	If the owner or operator experienced an accidental release that met the five-year accident history reporting criteria (as described at 68.42) subsequent to April 9, 2004, did the owner or operator submit the information required at 68.168, 68.170(j) and 68.175(l) within six months of the release or by the time the RMP was updated as required at 68.190, whichever was earlier. [68.195(a)]	ΠY	□N	X
3.	If the emergency contact information required at 68.160(b)(6) has changed since June 21, 2004, did the owner or operator submit corrected information within thirty days of the change? [68.195(b)]	ΠY	□N	X I