

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 7
11201 RENNER BLVD.
LENEXA, KANSAS 66219

UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY-REGION 7
2016 NOV 15 AM 8:32

BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATOR

IN THE MATTER OF)
)
Agri Star Meat & Poultry, LLC.) Docket No. CWA-07-2016-0079
Postville, Iowa)
Respondent) COMPLAINT AND
) CONSENT AGREEMENT/
) FINAL ORDER
Proceedings under Section 309(g) of the)
Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g))
_____)

COMPLAINT

Jurisdiction

1. This is an administrative action for the assessment of civil penalties instituted pursuant to Section 309(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act (“CWA”), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g), and in accordance with the 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.

2. Complainant, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 (“EPA”) and Respondent, Agri Star Meat & Poultry, LLC, (“Agri Star” or “Respondent”), have agreed to a settlement of this action before the filing of a complaint, and thus this action is simultaneously commenced and concluded pursuant to Rules 22.13(b) and 22.18(b)(2) and (3) of the Consolidated Rules, 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13(b) and 22.18(b)(2) and (3).

3. This Complaint and Consent Agreement/Final Order serves as notice that the EPA has reason to believe that the Respondent, Agri Star, have violated Sections 301 and 402 of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311 and 1342, and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Parties

4. The authority to take action under Section 309(g) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g), is vested in the Administrator of the EPA. The Administrator has delegated this authority to the Regional Administrator, EPA, Region 7, who in turn has delegated the authority under Section 309(g) to the Director of the Water, Wetlands and Pesticides Division of EPA, Region 7 (collectively referred to as the “Complainant”).

5. Agri Star is and was at all relevant times a corporation under the laws of and authorized to conduct business in the State of Iowa.

Statutory and Regulatory Framework

6. Section 301(a) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), prohibits the discharge of pollutants except in compliance with, *inter alia*, Section 402 of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1342. Section 402 of the CWA, provides that pollutants may be discharged in accordance with the terms of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) permit issued pursuant to that Section.

7. The CWA prohibits the “discharge” of “pollutants” from a “point source” into a “navigable water” of the United States, as these terms are defined by Section 502 of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1362.

Stormwater

8. Section 402(p) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p), sets forth requirements for the issuance of NPDES permits for the discharge of stormwater. Section 402(p) of the CWA requires, in part, that a discharge of stormwater associated with an industrial activity must conform with the requirements of a NPDES permit issued pursuant to Sections 301 and 402 of the CWA.

9. Pursuant to Section 402(p) of the CWA, the EPA promulgated regulations setting forth the NPDES permit requirements for stormwater discharges at 40 C.F.R. § 122.26.

10. 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.26(a)(1)(ii) and 122.26(c) require dischargers of stormwater associated with industrial activity to apply for an individual permit or to seek coverage under a promulgated stormwater general permit.

11. 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(14)(ii) defines “stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity,” in part, as discharges from facilities classified as Standard Industrial Classification 2011 (Meat Packing Plants).

12. The Iowa Department of Natural Resources (“IDNR”) is the state agency with the authority to administer the federal NPDES program in Iowa pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA. The EPA maintains concurrent enforcement authority with authorized states for violations of the CWA.

13. The IDNR issued and implemented NPDES General Permit No. 1 for stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity. The most recent 5-year permit has an effective date of October 1, 2012, and an expiration date of October 1, 2017, with previous 5-year permits having been issued in 1997, 2002 and 2007. The relevant provisions of each permit, as reissued, are substantially the same.

14. Any individual seeking coverage under NPDES General Permit No. 1 is required to submit a Notice of Intent (“NOI”) to the IDNR in accordance with the requirements of Part II.C of the Permit. As required by Section III.C.1, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

("SWPPP"), which includes at least the minimum requirements set forth in Section III.C.4 of the Permit, must be completed and maintained on site before the NOI is submitted to the IDNR and fully implemented concurrently with operations at the facility.

EPA's General Allegations

15. Respondent is and was at all times relevant to this action the owner and/or operator of a facility known as Agri Star Meat & Poultry, LLC, located at 220 West Street, Postville, Iowa 52162 ("Facility"), operating under SIC code 2011.

16. Stormwater, snow melt, surface drainage and runoff water leave Respondent's Facility and discharge in several locations, including, but not limited to, the City of Postville's ("City") municipal separate storm sewer system ("MS4"), and into Hecker Creek and Williams Creek which are tributaries of the Yellow River.

17. The runoff and drainage from Respondent's Facility is "stormwater" as defined by 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(13).

18. Stormwater contains "pollutants" as defined by Section 502(6) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(6).

19. The Facility has "stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity" as defined by 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(14)(x), and is a "point source" as defined by Section 502(14) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14).

20. The Yellow River and its tributaries, as identified in Paragraph 16, above, are each a "navigable water" as defined by Section 502(7) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C § 1362(7).

21. Stormwater runoff from Respondent's industrial activity results in the addition of pollutants from a point source to navigable waters, and thus is the "discharge of a pollutant" as defined by CWA Section 502(12), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(12).

22. Respondent's discharge of pollutants associated with an industrial activity, as defined by 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(14)(xi), requires a permit issued pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1342.

23. After receipt of a NOI from Respondent, dated on or about September 8, 2005, the IDNR issued coverage under NPDES General Permit No. 1, Permit Authorization No. IA-10124-9928 (hereafter "Permit"), to Respondent, effective September 9, 2005. Upon Respondent's payment of renewal fees and submission of applications for renewal, the IDNR has extended the Permit to Respondent during several permit cycles, with the current Permit being effective from September 9, 2013, through September 9, 2016. The Permit governs stormwater discharges at the Facility associated with industrial activity, including facilities with the SIC Code of 2011.

24. Respondent has operated under the Permit at all times relevant to this Order. At all relevant times related to these proceedings, the provisions of the Permit applicable to Respondent have remained substantially the same.

25. On or about May 13, 2015, the EPA performed an Industrial Stormwater Compliance Evaluation Inspection (“Inspection”) of Respondent’s facility under the authority of Section 308(a) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1318(a), to evaluate Respondent’s compliance with its Permit and the CWA.

26. During the Inspection, the EPA inspector reviewed Respondent’s records related to the Permit and observed the facility and the receiving stream to which stormwater is discharged.

27. At the time of the Inspection, Respondent was unable to provide a copy of its SWPPP to the EPA inspector.

28. At or near the conclusion of the Inspection, the EPA inspector issued to Respondent a Notice of Potential Violation (“NOPV”) identifying issues that may be violations of Respondent’s Permit, including, but not limited to: SWPPP and associated maps not provided; visual inspection reports not provided; sampling data not provided for each stormwater outfall, improper erosion controls to reduce or minimize soil erosion, and potential unidentified outfalls.

29. On or about May 21, 2015, Respondent provided a response to the NOPV and provided copies of the Facility’s SWPPP and site map, certified by the Facility’s representative on August 1, 2011, copies of visual inspection reports, copies of sampling data for each stormwater outfall, and explained the flow path of a potential unidentified outfall noted in the NOPV.

EPA’s Specific Allegations

Count 1

Failure to Make SWPPP Available

30. The allegations stated in Paragraphs 1 through 29 above are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

31. Part III.C.2.A of Respondent’s Permit requires that the pollution prevention plan shall be retained onsite.

32. Part III.C.2.B of Respondent’s Permit requires that the owner or operator of a facility with a stormwater discharge covered by the permit shall make plans available within three hours of being requested.

33. Respondent was unable to produce the SWPPP for the EPA's review on the day of the Inspection, May 13, 2015; a copy of the SWPPP was not provided by the Respondent to the EPA until May 21, 2015.

34. Respondent's failure to make the SWPPP available during the EPA Inspection is a violation of the terms and conditions of its Permit, and a violation of Sections 301(a) and 402(p) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a) and 1342(p).

Count 2

Failure to Develop an Adequate SWPPP and Failure to Amend SWPPP

35. The allegations stated in Paragraphs 1 through 34 above are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

36. Part III.C. of Respondent's Permit requires that a stormwater pollution prevention plan be developed for each facility covered by the Permit, and that the SWPPP shall: be prepared in accordance with good engineering practices; identify potential sources of pollution which may reasonably be expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity from the facility; and describe and ensure the implementation of practices which will be used to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity at the facility and to assure compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit.

37. Part III.C.3. of Respondent's Permit requires that the SWPPP shall be amended whenever there is a change in design, construction, operation, or maintenance, which has a significant effect on the potential to discharge pollutants, or if the SWPPP proves to be ineffective in achieving the general objectives of controlling pollutants in stormwater discharges associated with industrial activities.

38. Part I of Respondent's SWPPP provides an introduction and the regulatory requirements, Part II of the SWPPP provides a Site Description, Part III provides an inventory and description of areas, materials, and activities at the Facility with the potential to contribute significant amounts of pollutants to stormwater. Part IV of the SWPPP provides suggested and recommended best management practices ("BMPs") for the Facility. Part IV of the SWPPP also states that "Facility staff should continue to evaluate the site on a yearly basis for potential improvements." Part V of the SWPPP provides Monitoring Requirements, Part VI of the SWPPP provides Compliance and Reporting Requirements, Part VIII provides SWPPP Certifications, Appendix A of the SWPPP is the Facility Site Map, and Appendix B of the SWPPP provides a copy of the NPDES Permit.

39. Based on observations and information collected during the EPA Inspection, Respondent's SWPPP failed to meet the following conditions of the NPDES permit:

- a. Respondent's SWPPP failed to identify all outfalls, their drainage areas, and each existing structural control measure serving the Facility, including, but not limited

to the unmarked outfall location north of West Street and immediately south of the eastern cell of the former City of Postville Wastewater lagoon system and the unmarked outfall location serving the southeast corner of the Site that is labeled on the Site Map as, “runoff exits this site by overland flow.”

- b. Respondent’s SWPPP failed to identify and require best management practices for areas with a high potential for soil erosion, including gully formations throughout the facility, an area where recent construction activities occurred near the western perimeter of the Facility buildings, and the discharge of sediment onto neighboring property from the unmarked outfall near the southeast corner of the Facility.
- c. Respondent’s SWPPP failed to properly identify all outdoor storage of materials with the potential to discharge pollutants.
- d. Respondent’s SWPPP failed to properly identify the chemical inventory and/or chemical waste materials and their locations.
- e. Respondent failed to amend the SWPPP after there was a change in design, construction, operation or maintenance at the facility that had an impact on the potential to discharge pollutants or when controls were determined to be ineffective including: the addition of the trailer parking area, and the addition of the paint booth and maintenance building located near the northwest corner of the Facility.
- f. Respondent’s SWPPP failed to identify and implement best management practices for non-stormwater discharges including: discharge from the Facility truck wash building, uncovered trash dumpsters, steam condensate, and unknown discharges from roof drains.
- g. Respondent’s SWPPP failed to develop a plan to provide training for personnel at all levels of responsibility of the components and goals of the stormwater pollution prevention plan.

40. Respondent’s failure from at least August 1, 2011 through May 2015 to develop an adequate SWPPP, failure to properly amend the SWPPP to accurately reflect changes to the Facility, and failure to require adequate best management practices for controlling pollutants in stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity are violations of the terms and conditions of its Permit, and as such, are violations of Section 301(a), 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), and the permit issued pursuant to Section 402(p) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p).

Count 3

Failure to Conduct Employee Training

41. The allegations stated in Paragraphs 1 through 40 above are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

42. Part III.C.4.B.(8) of Respondent's Permit requires that employee training programs shall inform all personnel at all levels of responsibility of the components and goals of the SWPPP. The Permit requires that the SWPPP identify periodic dates for such training.

43. Part IV of Respondent's SWPPP states that "All appropriate employees whose job could impact stormwater pollution prevention will be trained on all aspects of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan on an annual or as needed basis."

44. Respondent failed to produce documentation of employee training for calendar year 2014 in violation of the Permit.

45. Respondent's failure to conduct employee SWPPP training for Facility employees is a violation of the terms and conditions of its Permit, and is a violation of Sections 301(a) and 402(p) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a) and 1342(p).

Count 4

Non-Stormwater Pollutants

46. The allegations stated in Paragraphs 1 through 45 above are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

47. Part III.A. of Respondent's Permit states that, "[a]ll discharges covered by this permit shall be composed entirely of storm water."

48. Part III.C.4.H. of Respondent's Permit states that, "the plan shall identify and ensure the implementation of appropriate pollution prevention measures for the non-stormwater component(s) of the discharge."

49. The EPA Inspection documented potential sources of uncontrolled non-stormwater pollutants throughout the Facility, including, but not limited to:

- a. discharge of process wastewater from the Truck wash located south of the railroad tracks and west of Outfall #2;
- b. discharge of leachate or fluids from uncovered dumpsters;

- c. discharge of unknown substances from one or more roof drains located on the production building;
- d. spilled paint in multiple locations near stormwater inlets;
- e. concrete washout near the unmarked outfall near the northeast corner of the site; and
- f. exposed drums and containers with unknown substances comingled with stormwater near Outfall 001 outside of any secondary containment structure.

50. The failure to account for and implement best management practices to control the sources of non-stormwater pollutants, as observed and documented by the EPA's Inspection, are violations of the terms and conditions its Permit, and are violations of Section 301(a) and 402(p) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a) and 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p).

Count 5

Failure to Follow Proper Sampling Procedures

51. The allegations stated in Paragraphs 1 through 50 above are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

52. Part V of Respondent's permit provides Monitoring and Reporting Requirements and requires that such samples are collected and analyzed in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Part 136. Part V B.8.A of the NPDES permit lists the sampling parameters for Animal Handling/Meat Packing facilities.

53. Part VI of Respondent's SWPPP lists Compliance and Reporting Requirements for Annual Storm Water Sampling at the three previously identified outfall locations, including sampling parameters and frequency.

54. The EPA inspection determined that Respondent failed to analyze the samples for hydrogen ion activity (pH) and fecal coliform for calendar years 2012, 2013 and 2014, and for biochemical oxygen for calendar year 2012 within the allowable holding time required by applicable provisions of 40 C.F.R. Part 136.

55. Respondent's failure to follow proper sampling and analysis procedures in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Part 136 is a violation of the terms and conditions of its Permit, and is a violation of Sections 301(a) and 402(p) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a) and 1342(p), and implementing regulations.

56. As alleged in the preceding Counts 1 through 5, and pursuant to Section 309(g)(2)(B) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(2)(B), as adjusted pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, Respondent are liable for civil penalties of up to \$16,000 per day for each day during which the violation

continues, up to a maximum of \$187,500.

CONSENT AGREEMENT

57. Respondent and the EPA agree to the terms of this Consent Agreement/Final Order.

58. Respondent admits the jurisdictional allegations of this Complaint and Consent Agreement/Final Order and agrees not to contest the EPA's jurisdiction in this proceeding or any subsequent proceeding to enforce the terms of this Consent Agreement/Final Order.

59. Respondent neither admits nor denies the factual allegations and legal conclusions asserted by the EPA in this Complaint and Consent Agreement/Final Order.

60. Respondent waives its right to contest any issue of fact or law set forth above, and its right to appeal this Consent Agreement/Final Order.

61. Respondent and Complainant agree to conciliate the matters set forth in this Consent Agreement/Final Order without the necessity of a formal hearing and agree to bear their own costs and attorney's fees incurred as a result of this action.

62. The undersigned representative(s) of Respondent certifies that he or she is fully authorized to enter the terms and conditions of this Consent Agreement/Final Order and to execute and legally bind Respondent to it.

63. Respondent understands and agrees that this Consent Agreement/Final Order shall apply to and be binding upon Respondent and Respondent's agents, successors and/or assigns. Respondent shall ensure that all contractors, employees, consultants, firms or other persons or entities acting for Respondent with respect to matters included herein comply with the terms of this Consent Agreement/Final Order.

64. Respondent certifies by the signing of this Consent Agreement/Final Order that to the best of its knowledge, Respondent's Facility is in current compliance with Administrative Order on Consent, EPA Docket no. CWA-07-2016-0037, to achieve compliance with NPDES General Permit No. 1, Permit Authorization No. IA-10124-9928, and Sections 301 and 402 of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311 and 1342, and applicable regulations.

Penalty Payment

65. Respondent agrees that, in settlement of the claims alleged in this Consent Agreement/Final Order, Respondent shall pay a civil penalty of **Forty-Three Thousand Dollars (\$43,000)** pursuant to the authority of Section 309(g) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g), to be paid in full no later than 30 days after the effective date of this Consent Agreement/Final Order as set forth below.

66. The payment of penalties must reference docket number “CWA-07-2016-0079” and be remitted using one of the payment methods specified in Appendix A to this Order.

67. Copies of the checks or verification of another payment method for the penalty payments remitted as directed by above, shall be mailed to:

Kathy Robinson
Regional Hearing Clerk
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 7
11201 Renner Boulevard
Lenexa, Kansas 66219

and

Patricia Gillispie Miller
Senior Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 7
11201 Renner Boulevard
Lenexa, Kansas 66219

68. Respondent agrees that no portion of the civil penalty or interest paid by Respondent pursuant to the requirements of this Consent Agreement/Final Order shall be claimed by Respondent as a deduction for federal, state, or local income tax purposes.

69. Respondent understands that, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 13.18, interest on any late payment will be assessed at the annual interest rate established by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3717. The interest will be assessed on any overdue amount from the due date through the date of payment. Failure to pay the civil penalty when due may result in the commencement of a civil action in Federal District Court to collect said penalty, together with costs or interest.

Effect of Settlement and Reservation of Rights

70. Respondent’s payment of the entire civil penalty pursuant to this Consent Agreement/Final Order resolves all civil and administrative claims pursuant to Section 309(g) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g), for alleged violations identified in this Complaint and Consent Agreement/Final Order. Complainant reserves the right to take any enforcement action with respect to any other violations of the CWA or any other applicable law.

71. The effect of settlement described above is conditional upon the accuracy of the Respondent’s representations to the EPA, as memorialized in Paragraph 64 of this Consent Agreement/Final Order.

72. Nothing contained in this Consent Agreement/Final Order shall alter or otherwise affect Respondent's obligation to comply with all applicable federal, state and local environmental statutes and regulations and applicable permits.

73. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Consent Agreement/Final Order, the EPA reserves the right to enforce the terms of this Consent Agreement/Final Order by initiating a judicial or administrative action pursuant to Section 309 of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319, and to seek penalties against Respondent or to seek any other remedy allowed by law.

74. With respect to matters not addressed in this Consent Agreement/Final Order, the EPA reserves the right to take any enforcement action pursuant to the CWA and its implementing regulations, or any other available legal authority, including without limitation, the right to seek injunctive relief, penalties and damages.

General Provisions

75. The Parties acknowledge that this Consent Agreement/Final Order is subject to the public notice and comment required pursuant to Section 309(g)(4) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(4), and 40 C.F.R. § 22.45.

76. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.31(b), this Consent Agreement/Final Order shall be effective after entry by the authorized Regional official and upon filing with the Regional Hearing Clerk U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219. All time periods herein shall be calculated therefrom in calendar days unless otherwise provided in this Consent Agreement/Final Order.


77. The State of Iowa has been provided an opportunity to consult with Complainant regarding this matter in accordance with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 22.38(b) and Section 309(g)(1) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(1).


78. The headings in this Consent Agreement/Final Order are for convenience of reference only and shall not affect interpretation of this Consent Agreement/Final Order.

79. Respondent and Complainant agree that this Consent Agreement/Final Order may be signed in part and counterpart.

For the Complainant, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7:

11-9-16
Date


Karen A. Flournoy
Director
Water, Wetlands and Pesticides Division


Patricia Gillispie Miller
Senior Counsel
Office of Regional Counsel

For the Respondent, Agri Star Meat & Poultry, LLC:

David L. Van Kampen

Signature

9/14/16

Date

David L. Van Kampen

Name

COO

Title

Consent Agreement/Final Order

In the Matter of Agri Star Meat & Poultry, LLC

EPA Docket No. CWA-07-2016-0079

FINAL ORDER

Pursuant to Section 309(g) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g), and the Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties and the Revocation, Termination or Suspension of Permits, 40 C.F.R. Part 22, the foregoing Consent Agreement resolving this matter is hereby ratified and incorporated by reference into this Final Order.

The Respondent is ORDERED to comply with all of the terms of the Consent Agreement. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 22.31(b), the effective date of the foregoing Consent Agreement and this Final Order is the date on which this Final Order is filed with the Regional Hearing Clerk.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark Hague", is written over a horizontal line.

Mark Hague

Regional Administrator

11/14/2016

Date

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the date below the original and one true copy of this Complaint and Consent Agreement/Final Order was delivered to and filed with the Regional Hearing Clerk, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219. I further certify that on the date below a true and correct copy of the original Complaint and Consent Agreement/Final Order was sent by first class mail to:

Brent Beebe
Director of Operations
Agri Star Meat & Poultry, LLC
220 N. West Street
Postville, Iowa 52162

and

Ted Petersen, Supervisor
IDNR Field Office #5
502 East 9th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

11/15/16

Date



Signature

APPENDIX A
PENALTY PAYMENT INFORMATION

CHECK PAYMENTS:

US Environmental Protection Agency
Fines and Penalties - CFC
PO Box 979077
St. Louis, MO 63197-9000

WIRE TRANSFERS:

Wire transfers should be directed to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York

Federal Reserve Bank of New York
ABA = 021030004
Account = 68010727
SWIFT address = FRNYUS33
33 Liberty Street
New York NY 10045
Field Tag 4200 of the Fedwire message should read "D 68010727 Environmental Protection Agency"

OVERNIGHT MAIL:

U.S. Bank
1005 Convention Plaza
Mail Station SL-MO-C2GL
ATTN Box 979077
St. Louis, MO 63101
Contact: Natalie Pearson 314-418-4087

ACH (also known as REX or remittance express):

Automated Clearinghouse (ACH) for receiving US currency

PNC Bank
808 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20074
Contact: Jesse White 301-887-6548
ABA = 051036706
Transaction Code 22 - checking
Environmental Protection Agency
Account 310006
CTX Format

ON LINE PAYMENT:

There is now an On Line Payment Option, available through the Dept. of Treasury.
This payment option can be accessed from the information below:

WWW.PAY.GOV
Enter "SFO 1.1" in the search field

Open form and complete required fields.