EXPEDITED SPCC SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 7, 901 NORTH 5th STREET, KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66101

DOCKET NO. CWA-07-2012-0053

On: August 25, 2011

At: 136 West Main Street, Bunceton, Missouri

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

This proceeding and the Expedited Settlement are under the authority vested in the Administrator of the EPA by Section 311(b)(6)(B)(i) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1321(b)(6)(B)(i), as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, and by 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13(b). The parties enter into this Expedited Settlement in order to settle the civil violations described in the Form for a penalty of **$2400**.

This settlement is subject to the following terms and conditions:

The EPA finds that Respondent is subject to the SPCC regulations, which are published at 40 C.F.R. Part 112, and has violated the regulations as further described in the Form. Respondent admits that he/she is subject to 40 C.F.R. Part 112 and that the EPA has jurisdiction over Respondent and Respondent's conduct as described in the Form. Respondent does not contest the Inspection Findings, and waives any objections it may have to the EPA's jurisdiction. Respondent consents to the assessment of the penalty stated above. Respondent certifies, subject to civil and criminal penalties for making a false submission to the United States Government, that the violations have been corrected and **Respondent has sent a certified check in the amount of $2400, payable to the "Environmental Protection Agency," via certified mail to:**

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

and Respondent has noted on the penalty payment check Docket No. CWA-07-2012-0053 and "OSLTF – 311." **The original, signed Settlement Agreement and copy of the penalty payment check must be sent via certified mail to:**

Mark Aaron
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 7, AWMD/STOP
11201 Renner Boulevard
Lenexa, Kansas 66219

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

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

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

APPROVED BY EPA:
Margaret E. Stoebl Date 4-1-2013
Chief, Storage Tanks and Oil Pollution Branch (STOP)
Air and Waste Management Division

APPROVED BY RESPONDENT:
Name (print): Missouri Better Bean LLC
Title (print): Manager
Signature: Dennis Cox
Date: 3/20/2013

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

IT IS SO ORDERED:
Karina Borromeo Date 4/8/13
Karina Borromeo
Regional Judicial Officer

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

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

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

Company Name	**Docket Number**
Missouri Better Bean, LLC	CWA-07-2012-0053
Facility Name	**Inspection Date**
Missouri Better Bean, LLC	August 25, 2011
Address	**Inspection Number**
136 West Main Street	N/A
City	**Inspector's Name**
Bunceton	Alan Hancock
State / **Zip Code**	**EPA Approving Official**
Missouri / 65237	Margaret E. Stockdale
Contact	**Enforcement Contacts**
Dennis Oser	Mark Aaron

Summary of Findings

(Bulk Storage Facilities)

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

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

- ☐ No Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan-*112.3* ($1,500)
- ☐ Plan not certified by a professional engineer-*112.3(d)* ($450)
- ☐ Certification lacks one or more required elements -*112.3(d)(1)* ($100)
- ☐ Plan not maintained on site (if manned at least four (4) hrs/day) or not available for review -*112.3(e)(1)* ($300)
- ☐ No evidence of five-year review of plan by owner/operator-*112.5(b)* ($75)
- ☐ No plan amendment(s) if the facility has had a change in: design, construction, operation, or maintenance which affects the facility's discharge potential-*112.5(a)* ($75)
- ☐ Amendment(s) not certified by a professional engineer-*112.5(c)* ($150)
- ☐ No management approval of plan-*112.7* ($450)
- ☐ Plan does not follow sequence of the rule and/or cross-reference not provided-*112.7* ($150)
- ☐ Plan does not discuss additional procedures/methods/equipment not yet fully operational-*112.7* ($75)

☐ Plan does not discuss alternative environmental protection to SPCC requirements-*112.7(a)(2)* ($200)

☑ Plan has inadequate or no facility diagram-*112.7(a)(3)* ($75) $75
Piping and transfer areas were missing from the facility diagram

☐ Inadequate or no listing of type of oil and storage capacity layout of containers-*112.7(a)(3)(i)* ($50)

☐ Inadequate or no discharge prevention measures-*112.7(a)(3)(ii)* ($50)

☐ Inadequate or no description of drainage controls-*112.7(a)(3)(iii)* ($50)

☐ Inadequate or no description of countermeasures for discharge discovery, response and cleanup-*112.7(a)(3)(iv)* ($50)

☐ Recovered materials not disposed of in accordance with legal requirements-*112.7(a)(3)(v)* ($50)

☐ No contact list & phone numbers for response & reporting discharges-*112.7(a)(3)(vi)* ($50)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no information and procedures for reporting a discharge-*112.7(a)(4)* ($100)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no description and procedures to use when a discharge may occur-*112.7(a)(5)*($150)

☐ Inadequate or no prediction of equipment failure which could result in discharges-*112.7(b)* ($150)

☐ Plan does not discuss and facility does not implement appropriate containment/diversionary structures/equipment-*112.7* ($400)

- If claiming impracticability of appropriate containment/diversionary structures:

☐ Impracticability has not been clearly denoted and demonstrated in plan-*112.7(d)* ($100)

☐ No contingency plan-*112.7(d)(1)* ($150)

☐ No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials-*112.7(d)(2)* ($150)

☐ No periodic integrity and leak testing , if impracticability is claimed -*112.7(d)* ($150)

☐ Plan has no or inadequate discussion of general requirements not already specified-*112.7(j)* ($75)

QUALIFIED FACILITY REQUIREMENTS: 112.6

☐ Qualified Facility: No Self certification-*112.6(a)* ($450)

☐ Qualified Facility: Self certification lacks required elements-*112.6(a)* ($100)

☐ Qualified Facility: Technical amendments not certified-*112.6(b)* ($150)

☐ Qualified Facility: Un-allowed deviations from requirements-*112.6(c)($100)*

☐ Qualified Facility: Environmental Equivalence or Impracticability not certified by PE-*112.6(d)* ($350)

WRITTEN PROCEDURES AND INSPECTION RECORDS 112.7(e)

☐ Plan does not include inspections and test procedures in accordance with 40 CFR Part 112 -*112.7(e)* ($75)

☐ Inspections and tests required are not in accordance with written procedures developed for the facility-*112.7(e)* ($75)

☐ No Inspection records were available for review -*112.7(e)* ($200)
- 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)

☐ Are not maintained for three years-*112.7(e)* ($75)

PERSONNEL TRAINING AND DISCHARGE PREVENTION PROCEDURES 112.7(f)

☐ No training on the operation and maintenance of equipment to prevent discharges and or facility operations *112.7(f)(1)* ($75)

☐ No training on discharge procedure protocols-*112.7(f)(1)* ($75)

☐ No training on the applicable pollution control laws, rules, and regulations and/or SPCC plan-*112.7(f)(1)*($75)

☐ Training records not maintained for 3 years-*112.7(f)(1)* ($75)

☐ No designated person accountable for spill prevention-*112.7(f)(2)* ($75)

☐ Spill prevention briefings are not scheduled and conducted at least annually-*112.7(f)(3)* ($75)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no discussion of personnel and spill prevention procedures-*112.7(a)(1)* ($75)

SECURITY (excluding Production Facilities) 112.7(g)

☑ Facility not fully fenced and entrance gates are not locked and/or guarded when plant is unattended or not in production-*112.7(g)(1)*. ($150) $150
Submitted plan states that arrangements are being made to ensure facility is secured, but was not yet secure

☐ Master flow and drain valves that permit direct outward flow to the surface are not secured in closed position when in a non-operating or standby status-*112.7(g)(2)*. ($300)

☑ Starter controls on pumps are not locked in the "off" position or located at a site accessible only to authorized personnel when pumps are not in a non-operating or standby status-*112.7(g)(3)*. ($75) $75
No means to lock starter controls at time plan was submitted

☐ Loading and unloading connection(s) of piping/pipelines are not capped or blank-flanged when not in service or standby status-*112.7(g)(4)*. ($75)

☐ Facility lighting not adequate to facilitate the discovery of spills during hours of darkness and to deter vandalism- *112.7(g)(5)*. ($150)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility security-*112.7(a)(1)* ($75)

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

☐ Inadequate containment for Loading Area (not consistent with 112.7(c)) -*112.7(c)* ($400)

☐ Inadequate secondary containment, and/or rack drainage does not flow to catchment basin, treatment system, or quick drainage system-*112.7(h)(1)* ($750)

☐ Containment system does not hold at least the maximum capacity of the largest single compartment of any tank car or tank truck-*112.7(h)(1)* ($450)

☐ There are no interlocked warning lights, or physical barrier system, or warning signs, or vehicle brake ($300) interlock system to prevent vehicular departure before complete disconnect from transfer lines-*112.7(h)(2)*

☐ There is no inspection of lowermost drains and all outlets prior to filling and departure of any tank car or tank truck- *112.7(h)(3)* ($150)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility tank car and tank truck loading/unloading rack- *112.7(a)(1).* ($75)

QUALIFIED OIL OPERATIONAL EQUIPMENT 112.7(k)

☐ Failure to establish and document procedures for inspections or a monitoring program to detect equipment failure and/or a discharge- *112.7(k)(2)(i)* ($150)

☐ Failure to provide an oil spill contingency plan- *112.7(k)(2)(ii)(A)* ($150)

☐ No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials- *112.7(k)(2)(ii)(B)* ($150)

FACILITY DRAINAGE 112.8(b) & (c)

☐ Secondary Containment circumvented due to containment bypass valves left open and/or pumps and ejectors not manually activated to prevent a discharge- *112.8(b)(1)&(2) and 112.8(c)3)(i)* ($650)

☐ Dike water is not inspected prior to discharge and/or valves not open & resealed under responsible supervision- *112.8(c)(3)(ii)&(iii)* ($450)

☐ Adequate records (or NPDES permit records) of drainage from diked areas not maintained- *112.8(c)(3)(iv)* ($75)

☐ Drainage from undiked areas do not flow into catchment basins ponds, or lagoons, or no diversion systems to retain or return a discharge to the facility- *112.8(b)(3)&(4)* ($450)

☐ Two "lift" pumps are not provided for more that one treatment unit- *112.8(b)(5)* ($50)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility drainage- *112.7(a)(1)* ($75)

BULK STORAGE CONTAINERS 112.8(c)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no risk analysis and/or evaluation of field-constructed aboveground tanks for brittle fracture- *112.7(i)* ($75)

☐ Failure to conduct evaluation of field-constructed aboveground tanks for brittle fracture- *112.7(i)* ($300)

☐ Material and construction of tanks not compatible to the oil stored and the conditions of storage such as pressure and temperature- *112.8(c)(1)* ($450)

☑ Secondary containment appears to be inadequate- *112.8(c)(2)* ($750) $750
Oil/water separator is not adequate secondary containment, given it may not have capacity for full volume of tank

☐ Containment systems, including walls and floors are not sufficiently impervious to contain oil- *112.8(c)(2)* ($375)

☐ Excessive vegetation which affects the integrity ($150)

☐ Walls of containment system slightly eroded or have low areas ($300)

☐ Completely buried tanks are not protected from corrosion or are not subjected to regular pressure testing- *112.8(c)(4)* ($150)

☐ Partially buried tanks do not have buried sections protected from corrosion- *112.8(c)(5)* ($150)

☐ Aboveground tanks are not subject to visual inspections- *112.8(c)(6)* ($450)

☑ Aboveground tanks are not subject to periodic integrity testing, such as hydrostatic, nondestructive methods, etc.- *112.8(c)(6)* ($450) $450

Integrity testing not being conducted at time plan was submitted

☐ Records of inspections (or customary business records) do not include inspections of tank ($75) supports/foundation, deterioration, discharges and/or accumulations of oil inside diked areas- *112.8(c)(6)*

☐ Steam return /exhaust of internal heating coils which discharge into an open water course are ($150) not monitored, passed through a settling tank, skimmer, or other separation system- *112.8(c)(7)*

☑ Tank battery installations are not in accordance with good engineering practice because none of the following are present- *112.8(c)(8)* ($450) $450

Specifically, no high liquid level alarms, high liquid level pump cutoff devices, direct audible or code signal communication, or a fast response system for determining liquid level were present at time plan was submitted.

☐ No testing of liquid level sensing devices to ensure proper operation- *112.8(c)(8)(v)* ($75)

☐ Effluent treatment facilities which discharge directly to navigable waters are not observed frequently to detect oil spills- *112.8(c)(9)* ($150)

☑ Causes of leaks resulting in accumulations of oil in diked areas are not promptly corrected- *112.8(c)(10)* ($450) $450

Submitted plan states facility is cleaning up spills, not eliminating cause of leaks

☐ Mobile or portable storage containers are not positioned to prevent discharged oil from reaching navigable water- *112.8(c)(11)* ($150)

☐ Secondary containment inadequate for mobile or portable storage tanks- *112.8(c)(11)* ($500)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no discussion of bulk storage tanks- *112.7(a)(1)* ($75)

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

☐ Buried piping is not corrosion protected with protective wrapping, coating, or cathodic protection- *112.8(d)(1)*. ($150)

☐ Corrective action is not taken on exposed sections of buried piping when deterioration is found- *112.8(d)(1)* ($450)

☐ Not-in-service or standby piping are not capped or blank-flanged and marked as to origin- *112.8(d)(2)* ($75)

☐ Pipe supports are not properly designed to minimize abrasion and corrosion, and allow for expansion and contraction- *112.8(d)(3)* ($75)

☐ Aboveground valves, piping and appurtenances are not inspected regularly- *112.8(d)(4)* ($300)

☐ Periodic integrity and leak testing of buried piping is not conducted- *112.8(d)(4)* ($150)

☐ Vehicle traffic is not warned of aboveground piping or other oil transfer operations- *112.8(d)(5)* ($150)

☐ Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility transfer operations, pumping, and facility process- *112.7(a)(1)*. ($75)

☐ Plan does not include a signed copy of the Certification of the Applicability of the Substantial Harm Criteria per 40 CFR Part 112.20(e) ($150)

TOTAL	**$2,400**

IN THE MATTER OF Missouri Better Bean, LLC, Respondent
Docket No. CWA-07-2012-0053

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

Copy emailed to Attorney for Complainant:

bunch.howard@epa.gov

Copy by First Class Mail to Respondent:

Dennis Oser, Manager
Missouri Better Bean, LLC
136 Main Street
Bunceton, Missouri 65237

Dated: 4/9/13

Kathy Robinson
Kathy Robinson
Hearing Clerk, Region 7