EPA ENFORCEMENT ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE CONTROL NUMBER FORM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

This form was originated by Wanda I. Santiago for	Jeffrey Kopf Name of Case Attorney	9/13/12 Date
in the ORC (RAA) at 918-1113 Office & Mail Code Phone number		
Case Docket Number	92	
Site-specific Superfund (SF) Acct. Number		
This is an original debt	This is a modification	
Name and address of Person and/or Company/Muni	icipality making the payment:	
Stephen Kircher		
Boyne USA, Inc., Loon Mo	untain Ski Resort	
(00 Loon Mountain Rd		
Lincoln, NH 03251		
Total Dollar Amount of Receivable \$	Due Date: 10/12/12	
	Date Due	
Installment Method (if applicable)		
INSTALLMENTS OF:		
1 ST \$ on		
2 nd \$on	·	
3 rd \$ on		
4 th \$on		
5 th \$on		
For RHC Tracking Purposes:		
Copy of Check Received by RHC	Notice Sent to Finance	***************************************
TO BE FILLED OUT BY LOCAL FINANCIAL	MANAGEMENT OFFICE:	
IFMS Accounts Receivable Control Number		
If you have any questions call: in the Financial Management Office	Phone Number	

	•	



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 1, 5 POST OFFICE SQUARE, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109-3912 **EXPEDITED SPCC SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

DOCKET NO. CWA-01-2012-0092

2012 at Boyne USA. Inc.'s ("Respondent's") Loon Mountain ski resort, located at 60 Loon Mountain Rd., Lincoln, NH, an authorized representative of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") conducted an inspection to determine compliance with the Oil Pollution Prevention regulations promulgated at 40 CFR Part 112 under Section 311(j) of the Clean Water Act (the "Act"), 33 U.S.C. § 1321(j). EPA determined that Respondent, as owner or operator of the facility, violated regulations implementing Section 311(j) of the Act by failing to comply with the Oil Pollution Prevention regulations as noted on the attached Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan ("SPCC") Inspection Findings and Alleged Violations Form ("Violation Form") which is hereby incorporated by reference. By its first signature below, EPA ratifies the Inspection Findings and Alleged Violations set forth in the Violation Form.

The parties enter into this Expedited Settlement in order to settle the civil violations described in the Violation Form for a penalty of \$7,500. The parties are authorized to enter into this Expedited Settlement under the authority of Section 311(b) (6) (B) (i) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1321(b) (6) (B) (i), and by 40 CFR § 22.13(b).

This settlement is subject to the following terms and conditions:

EPA finds the Respondent is subject to the Oil Pollution Prevention regulations, and has violated the regulations as further described in the Violation Form. Respondent admits it is subject to the Oil Pollution Prevention regulations and that EPA has jurisdiction over Respondent and Respondent's conduct as described in the Violation Form. Respondent does not contest the Inspection Findings, and waives any objections it may have to EPA's jurisdiction. Respondent consents to the assessment of the penalty stated above.

Respondent further certifies, subject to civil and criminal penalties for making a false submission to the United States Government, that: (1) the violations identified in the Violation Form will be corrected and the facility brought in full compliance with the Oil Pollution Prevention regulations subject to the deadlines described in Administrative Order on Consent CWA 12- 007; and (2) Respondent has sent a certified check to EPA in the amount of \$7,500, payable to the Environmental Protection Agency. Respondent shall send the check to: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Fines and Penalties, P.O. Box 979077, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000. Respondent shall send a copy of the check to Diane Boisclair, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1, 5 Post Office Square (OES04-3), Boston, Massachusetts LeAnn Jensen 02109-3912. The check should reference the docker Acting Region number of the case and the "Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund – 311".

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

This Expedited Settlement is binding on the parties signing below, and is effective upon filing with the Regional Hearing Clerk pursuant to 40 CFR § 22.31(b).

Once the Expedited Settlement is signed by the Regional Judicial Officer, the original Expedited Settlement will be filed with the Regional Hearing Clerk and a copy will be mailed to: U.S. EPA Cincinnati Finance Office, 26 W. Martin Luther King Drive (MS-002), Cincinnati, OH 45268. A copy of the Expedited Settlement will also be mailed to the Respondent.

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

After this Expedited Settlement becomes effective, EPA will take no further civil penalty action against Respondent for the violations of the Oil Pollution Prevention regulations described in the Violation Form through the order date of this Expedited Agreement. However, EPA does not waive any rights to take any enforcement action for any other past, present, or future violations by Respondent of the Oil Pollution Prevention regulations or of any other federal statute or regulations.

APPROVED BY EPA: Date: 9/10/12 Joanna Jerison, Legal Enforcement Manager Office of Environmental Stewardship

APPROVED BY RESPONDENT:

Stephen Kircher Name(print):

Title(print): President - Boyne Eastern Operation

Signature:

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Date: 9/13/12.

Acting Regional Judicial Officer

Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Inspection Findings and Alleged Violations Form

These Findings, Alleged Violations and Penalties are issued by EPA Region 1 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:
Boyne Resorts	UNITED STATES
Facility Name/Address:	Date of Inspection:
Loon Mountain Recreation Corporation 60 Loon Mountain Road Lincoln, NH 03251	July 12, 2012
Mailing/Corporate Address:	
Boyne Resorts	Joel M. Woods
600 Highlands Drive	V.P. of Engineering & Amusements
City:	Inspector's Name:
Harbor Springs	Joseph Canzano
State: Zip Code:	Enforcement Contact:
MI 49740	Joseph Canzano, Region I SPCC Compliance Coordinator Tel: 617-918-1763
Facility Contact:	
Joseph Aloisio	207-237-6870

Summary of Findings

Boyne Resorts, operates a dozen ski resorts throughout the United States, including Sugarloaf and Sunday River in Maine and Loon Mountain in New Hampshire. The resorts offer accommodations, and other amenities in addition to skiing; during warmer months certain properties also offer golf, and other outdoor activities.

On July 12, 2012, the Region conducted inspections at the facility. The facility's SPCC Plan failed to be certified and signed by a P.E. and management respectively. In addition, the SPCC Plan had not been reviewed by a P.E. within 5-years from its previous review. The SPCC Plan is stamped "draft" and is dated January 2006.

The facility has a total aboveground and below ground oil storage capacity of 82,916-gallons. In the event of an oil spill there is a probability of an oil discharge to Boyle Brook, Loon Pond, Loon Pond Brook, East Branch of the Pemigewasset River and/or several unnamed mountain streams which drain into above mentioned surface waters.

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

No Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan-112.3.
Plan not certified by a professional engineer-112.3(d). Draft January 2006 SPCC Plan fails to include a P.E. stamp.
Certification lacks one or more required elements - 112.3(d)(1)
No management approval of plan-112.7. Draft January 2006 SPCC Plan fails to include a signature by management.
Plan not maintained on site (if manned at least four (4) hrs/day) or not available for review - 112.3(e)(1)
No evidence of five-year review of plan by owner/operator-112.5(b). The facility failed to have a P.E. review the draft SPCC Plan within 5-years of its pervious review. The draft SPCC Plan was prepared in January 2006.
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)
Amendment(s) not certified by a professional engineer- 112.5(c)
Plan does not follow sequence of the rule and/or cross-reference not provided- 112.7
Plan does not discuss additional procedures/methods/equipment not yet fully operational- 112.7
Plan does not discuss alternative environmental protection to SPCC requirements- 112.7(a)(2)
Plan has inadequate or no facility diagram- 112.7(a)(3)
Inadequate or no listing of type of oil and storage capacity layout of containers- 112.7(a)(3)(i) The draft SPCC Plan failed to include certain fixed oil filled containers, the type of oil in each container and its storage capacity During the inspection EPA was informed that certain oil filled containers are not included in the SPCC Plan.
Inadequate or no discharge prevention measures- 112.7(a)(3)(ii)
Inadequate or no description of drainage controls- 112.7(a)(3)(iii)
Inadequate or no description of countermeasures for discharge discovery, response and cleanup- 112.7(a)(3)(iv)
Recovered materials not disposed of in accordance with legal requirements- 112.7(a)(3)(v)
No contact list & phone numbers for response & reporting discharges- 112.7(a)(3)(vi)
Plan has inadequate or no information and procedures for reporting a discharge- 112.7(a)(4)
Plan has inadequate or no description and procedures to use when a discharge may occur- 112.7(a)(5)
Inadequate or no prediction of equipment failure which could result in discharges- 112.7(b)
Plan does not discuss and facility does not implement appropriate containment/diversionary structures/equipment- 112.7(c) - If claiming impracticability of appropriate containment/diversionary structures:

Impracticability has not been clearly denoted and demonstrated in plan- 112.7(d)
No contingency plan- 112.7(d)(1)
No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials- 112.7(d)(2)
No periodic integrity and leak testing, if impracticability is claimed - 112.7(d).
Plan has no or inadequate discussion of general requirements not already specified-112.7(j)
QUALIFIED FACILITY REQUIREMENTS: 112.6
Qualified Facility: No Self certification- 112.6(a)(1)(Tier I) or (b)(1)(Tier II)
Qualified Facility: Self certification lacks required elements- 112.6(a)(1)(Tier 1) or (b)(1)(Tier 11)
Qualified Facility: Technical amendments not certified- 112.6(a)(2)(Tier I) or (b)(2)(Tier II)
Qualified Facility: Un-allowed deviations from requirements- 112.6(a)(Tier I) or (b)(Tier II)
Qualified Facility: Environmental Equivalence or Impracticability not certified by PE- 112.6(b)(3)(Tier II)
 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)
Inspections and tests required are not in accordance with written procedures developed for the facility- 112.7(e)
No Inspection records were available for review - 112.7(e)
- Written procedures and/or a record of inspections and/or customary business records:
Are not signed by appropriate supervisor or inspector- 112.7(e)
Are not maintained for three years- 112.7(e) At the time of the inspection, the facility was not able to provide tank inspection reports, testing and maintenance records for oil filled containers and/or equipment.
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)
No training on discharge procedure protocols- 112.7(f)(1)
No training on the applicable pollution control laws, rules, and regulations and/or SPCC plan- 112.7(f)(1)
Training records not maintained for 3 years-112.7(f)(1). According to facility personnel, employee training is conducted; however training records are not maintained.
No designated person accountable for spill prevention- 112.7(f)(2)
Spill prevention briefings are not scheduled and conducted at least annually- 112.7(f)(3)
Plan has inadequate or no discussion of personnel and spill prevention procedures-112.7(a)(1)

SECURITY (excluding Production Facilities) 112.7(g)

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- $112.7(g)$.
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)
Loading and unloading connection(s) of piping/pipelines are not capped or blank-flanged when not in service or standby status- 112.7(g).
Facility lighting not adequate to facilitate the discovery of spills during hours of darkness and to deter vandalism- $112.7(g)$.
Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility security-112.7(a)(1), (g).
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). The fuel off-loading area associated with underground storage tanks located at the facility's Maintenance Center Building fails to have adequate general secondary containment.
Inadequate secondary containment, and/or rack drainage does not flow to catchment basin, treatment system, or quick drainage system- 112.7(h)(1).
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)
There are no interlocked warning lights, or physical barrier system, or warning signs, or vehicle brake interlock system to prevent vehicular departure before complete disconnect from transfer lines- 112.7(h)(2)
There is no inspection of lowermost drains and all outlets prior to filling and departure of any tank car or tank truck- $112.7(h)(3)$
Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility tank car and tank truck loading/unloading rack-112.7(a)(1)
 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)
Failure to provide an oil spill contingency plan- 112.7(k)(2)(ii)(A)
No written commitment of manpower, equipment, and materials- 112.7(k)(2)(ii)(B)
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)
Dike water is not inspected prior to discharge and/or valves not open & resealed under responsible supervision-112.8(c)(3)(ii)&(iii)
Adequate records (or NPDES permit records) of drainage from diked areas not maintained- 112.8(c)(3)(iv).

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)
Two "lift" pumps are not provided for more that one treatment unit- 112.8(b)(5)
Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility drainage-112.7(a)(1).
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)
Failure to conduct evaluation of field-constructed aboveground tanks for brittle fracture- 112.7(i)
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). During the inspection, EPA observed bulk fuel oil tanks being used as mobile storage tanks on the bed of a vehicle (the Army Truck). The tanks are strapped down to the bed of the truck using nylon straps and/or rigging chain.
Secondary containment appears to be inadequate- 112.8(c)(2).
Containment systems, including walls and floors are not sufficiently impervious to contain oil- 112.8(c)(2
Excessive vegetation which affects the integrity
Walls of containment system slightly eroded or have low areas
Completely buried tanks are not protected from corrosion or are not subjected to regular pressure testing- $112.8(c)(4)$
Partially buried tanks do not have buried sections protected from corrosion- 112.8(c)(5)
Aboveground tanks are not subject to visual inspections- 112.8(c)(6)
Aboveground tanks are not subject to periodic integrity testing, such as hydrostatic, nondestructive methods, etc 112.8(c)(6)
Records of inspections (or customary business records) do not include inspections of tank 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 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 <u>none</u> of the following are present- $112.8(c)(8)$
No testing of liquid level sensing devices to ensure proper operation- 112.8(c)(8)(v)
Effluent treatment facilities which discharge directly to navigable waters are not observed frequently to detect oil spills- $112.8(c)(9)$
Causes of leaks resulting in accumulations of oil in diked areas are not promptly corrected- 112.8(c)(10). At the time of EPA's inspection, EPA observed hydraulic oil spillage/leaking from certain oil filled equipment located at the Maintenance Center Building. Leaking appeared to be from improper procedures when handling oil filled equipment.

Mobile or portable storage containers are not positioned to prevent discharged oil from reaching navigable water- $112.8(c)(11)$
Secondary containment inadequate for mobile or portable storage tanks-112.7(c). During the inspection, EPA observed mobile storage tanks on the bed of a vehicle (the Army Truck). The Truck is parked in a location on the facility that fails to have adequate general secondary containment.
Plan has inadequate or no discussion of bulk storage tanks-112.7(a)(1)
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).
Corrective action is not taken on exposed sections of buried piping when deterioration is found- 112.8(d)(1)
Not-in-service or standby piping are not capped or blank-flanged and marked as to origin- 112.8(d)(2)
Pipe supports are not properly <u>designed</u> to minimize abrasion and corrosion, and allow for expansion and contraction- $112.8(d)(3)$
Aboveground valves, piping and appurtenances are not inspected regularly- 112.8(d)(4).
Periodic integrity and leak testing of buried piping is not conducted 112.8(d)(4)
Vehicle traffic is not warned of aboveground piping or other oil transfer operations- 112.8(d)(5)
Plan has inadequate or no discussion of facility transfer operations, pumping, and facility process-112.7(a)(1)
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).