

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

OCT 0 1 2010

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

SM-5J

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

Greg Alimenti Water Plant Superintendent City of St. Joseph 700 Broad Street St. Joseph, Michigan 49085

RE: Complaint and Expedited Settlement Agreement ESA Docket No. RMP-10-ESA-055 Docket No. CAA-05-2011-0001

BD# 2751103A001

Dear Mr. Alimenti:

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, Mark

Mark J. Horwitz, Chief Chemical Emergency Preparedness & Prevention Section

Enclosure





RECEIVED UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY: ARING CLERK

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

ILS EPA REGION 5

2010 DCT -1 PM 12: 08

EXPEDITED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (ESA)

DOCKET NO: RMP-10-ESA-055 This ESA is issued to: City of St. Joseph Water Filtration Plant At: 1701 Lions Park Drive, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085 for violating Section 112(r)(7) of the Clean Air Act.

CAA-05-2011-0001

2751103A001

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 (Act), 42 U.S.C. § 7413(a)(3) and (d), and by 40 C.F.R. § 22.13(b). On May 25, 2010, 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 February 19, 2010, EPA sent a Request for Information Pursuant to Section 114(a) of the Clean Air Act to 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 RMP Program Process Checklist (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 \$1,000.00

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 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 \$1,000.00 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.)

RECEIVED REGIONAL HEARING CLERK U.S. EPA REGION 5

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:	D
Name (print): GREG ALIMENTI	

Date: 8/25/2010

Title (print): WATER PLANT SUPERINTENDENT

City of St. Joseph, St. Joseph, Michigan

FOR COMPLAINANT: Richard C. Karl, Director Superfund Division

Date: 7/78/10

I hereby ratify the ESA and incorporate it herein by reference. It is so ORDERED.

Susan Hedman Regional Administrator

Date:	9/28/10	RECEIVE
		AUG 2 4 REC'

'n

CAA-05-2011-0001

Qlash and	ACCTS PAYABLE
JATE 8125/10 PROJECT #_	
ACCT # 591-530-956	\$ 1,000.00
ACCT #	
DESCRIPTION RMP-ESA	
DEPT HEAD APPR'D OK	

	Invoice	Description/Detail	REFEIVED	Amount
08/31/2010	8/25/2010 591-530.000-956.000	RMP-ESA 0 Miscellaneous Ex	LEGIONAL HEARING	<u>CL£R</u> K 1,000.00 1,000.00
			2010 OCT - 1 PM I	2: 08
08/31/10	Check #: 000	00146630		1,000.00
		CITY OF ST. JOSEPH · ST. JOS	SEPH, MI 49085-1276	
	warning: do F ST. JOSEPH		RS IN BACKGROUND OF CHECK H THIRD BANK DSEPH, MICHIGAN	14663
700 B	BROAD STREET		74-005 / 724	00000146630
	EPH, MI 49085-1276	에 다른 그 여러 다른 것이 있는 정말을 받았다.	08/31/10	
	E: (269) 983-4731	and the second se	08/31/10 VOID AF 90 DA	AMOUNT
PHON		10 Dollars*************	Void Af 90 da	
PHON	E: (269) 983-4731)0 Dollars***********		AMOUNT YS \$1,000.00
PHON PAY ***On TO THE US DRDER CI	E:(269)983-4731 ne Thousand and NO/10 5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTE INCINNATI FINANCE CEN	ECTION AGENCY		AMOUNT YS \$1,000.00
PHON PAY ***On TO THE US DRDER CI OF P.	E:(269)983-4731 ne Thousand and NO/10 5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTE	ection agency		AMOUNT YS \$1,000.00 ********************************

#146630# #072400052# 8092474113#

CAA-05-2011-0001

BD# 275/1034001

		Program ess Checklist	CAA-05-2011-0001	Facility Name: <u>City of St. Joseph Wa</u> EPA Facility ID: <u>100000095</u>		tratio	<u>n Plant</u>
Se	ctio	n A – Manageme	ent [68.15]	U.S. EPA REGIC	s slei Ny 5	H.	
Management system developed and implemented as provided in 40 CFR 68.15? 2010 OCT IS PIC Comments: 2010 OCT IS PIC					- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Ου	XIN/A
Ha	s the	owner or operator:					
1.	De	veloped a management	system to oversee the implementation of	f the risk management program elements? [68.15(a)]	ΠY		XN/A
2.			on or position that has the overall respons nagement program elements? [68.15(b)]	sibility for the development, implementation, and	ΠY	۵N	XIN/A
3.	Do def	cumented other persons ined the lines of author	s responsible for implementing individua ity through an organization chart or simil	I requirements of the risk management program and lar document? [68.15(c)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
Se	ctio	n B: Hazard Asse	essment [68.20-68.42]				
	zard : mme		and documented as provided in 40 CFR 6	58.20-68.42? 🖾 S 🛛]M	ΠU	XIN/A
Ha	zard	Assessment: Offsite	e consequence analysis parameters [6	8.22]			
1.	Use	ed the following endpoi	ints for offsite consequence analysis for a	a worst-case scenario: [68.22(a)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
		For toxics: the endpoi	ints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR P	Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]			
		For flammables: an ex	xplosion resulting in an overpressure of 1	l psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]; or			
		For flammables: a fire	e resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5	5 kw/m ² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)]			
			ncentration resulting in a lower flammabi sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]	ility limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other			
2.	Use	ed the following endpoi	ints for offsite consequence analysis for a	an alternative release scenario: [68.22(a)]	ΠY	ΠN	🖾 N/A
		For toxics: the endpoi	ints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR P	Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]			
		For flammables: an ex	xplosion resulting in an overpressure of 1	i psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]			
		For flammables: a fire	e resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5	5 kw/m ² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)]			
		For flammables: a cor generally recognized s	ncentration resulting in a lower flammabi sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]	ility limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other			
3.	Use	d appropriate wind spe	eds and stability classes for the release and	nalysis? [68.22(b)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
4.	Use	ed appropriate ambient	temperature and humidity values for the	release analysis? [68.22(c)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
5.	Use	d appropriate values fo	or the height of the release for the release	analysis? [68.22(d)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
6.	Use	ed appropriate surface re	oughness values for the release analysis?	[68.22(e)]	ΠY	ΠN	XIN/A
7.		tables and models, used yant gases? [68.22(f)]	d for dispersion analysis of toxic substand	ces, appropriately account for dense or neutrally	ΞY	۵N	XN/A
8.	tem	re liquids, other than ga perature, based on data chever is higher? [68.2	for the previous three years appropriate	idered to be released at the highest daily maximum for a stationary source, or at process temperature,	Ωy	۵N	XIN/A

Hazard Assessment: Worst-case release scenario analysis [68.25]						
 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)] 	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A			
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)]	ΩY	ΠN	XN/A			
 Analyzed and reported in the RMP additional worst-case release scenarios for a hazard class if the 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	XN/A			
12. Has the owner or operator determined the worst-case release quantity to be the greater of the following: [68.25(b)]	DY	۵N	XN/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)]						
□ 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)]						
13.a. Has the owner or operator for toxic substances that are normally gases at ambient temperature and handled as a gas	or liquic	lunder	pressure:			
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)]	ΩY	ΠN	🖾 N/A			
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)]	ΩY	DN	XN/A			
13.b. Has the owner or operator for toxic gases handled as refrigerated liquids at ambient pressure:						
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)]	ΩY	ΠN	XN/A			
13.b.(2) If released substance would be contained by passive mitigation systems in a pool with a depth > 1 cm;	ΠY	۵N	🖾 N/A			
☐ Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe (as determined per 68.25(b)) would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]						
□ Calculated the volatility rate at the boiling point of the substance and at the conditions specified in 68.25(d)? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]						
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/A			
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, was the surface area of the contained liquid used to calculate the volatilization rate? [68.25(d)(1)(i)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A			
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	ΠN	XN/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	ΠN	XN/A			
13.c.(5) Determined the rate of release to air from the volatilization rate of the liquid pool? [68.25(d)(3)]	ΠY	DN	⊠N/A			

RMP Program Facility Name: <u>City of St. Joseph Water Filtration Plan</u>				
Process Checklist	EPA Facility ID: <u>100000095</u>	<u>489</u>		
13.c.(6) Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietant may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implem model features and differences from publicly available models [68.25(d)(3)]	t for the modeling conditions and are recognized by ry models that account for the modeling conditions nenting agency access to the model and describes	DY	DN	XN/A
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.2	25(g)]			
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 released to an undiked area vaporizes resulting in a vapor clou	a gas or liquid under pressure or refrigerated gas d explosion? [68.25(e)]	DY	۵N	XN/A
13.d.(2) For refrigerated gas released to a contained area or liquids released the quantity volatilized in 10 minutes results in a vaparity of the second		ΠY	۵N	XN/A
13.d.(3) Assumed a yield factor of 10% of the available energy is release the explosion endpoint, if the model used is based on TNT-equ	sed in the explosion for determining the distance to nivalent methods? [68.25(e)]	Ωy	۵N	XN/A
14. Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the e	ndpoints? [68.25(g)]	ΠY		XN/A
15. Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the any other publicly available techniques that account for the modelin applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that accounting agency account of the owner or operator allows the implementing agency plan differences from publicly available models to local emergency plan	ng conditions and are recognized by industry as count for the modeling conditions may be used cess to the model and describes model features and	ΟY	ΠN	XIN/A
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]				
16. Ensured that the passive mitigation system, if considered, is capable scenario and will still function as intended? [68.25(h)]	e of withstanding the release event triggering the	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
17. Considered also the following factors in selecting the worst-case rel	lease scenarios: [68.25(i)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
□ Smaller quantities handled at higher process temperature or pre	essure? [68.25(i)(1)]			i
Proximity to the boundary of the stationary source? [68.25(i)(2)	2)]			
Hazard Assessment: Alternative release scenario analysis [68.28]				
 Identified and analyzed at least one alternative release scenario for process(es) and at least one alternative release scenario to represent processes? [68.28(a)] 	each regulated toxic substance held in a covered all flammable substances held in covered	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
19. Selected a scenario: [68.28(b)]		ΠY	۵N	XN/A
□ That is more likely to occur than the worst-case release scenari	o under 68.25? [68.28(b)(1)(i)]	I		
□ That will reach an endpoint off-site, unless no such scenario ex	tists? [68.28(b)(1)(ii)]			

20.	Cor	nsidered release scenarios which included, but are not limited to, the following: [68.28(b)(2)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
		Transfer hose releases due to splits or sudden hose uncoupling? [68.28(b)(2)(i)]			
		Process piping releases from failures at flanges, joints, welds, valves and valve seals, and drains or bleeds? [68.28(b)(2)(ii)]			63
		Process vessel or pump releases due to cracks, seal failure, or drain, bleed, or plug failure? [68.28(b)(2)(iii)]			
		Vessel overfilling and spill, or overpressurization and venting through relief valves or rupture disks? [68.28(b)(2)(iv)]			
		Shipping container mishandling and breakage or puncturing leading to a spill? [68.28(b)(2)(v)]			
21.	Use	ed the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the endpoints? [68.28(c)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
22.	any app prov diff	termined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as licable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used vided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and erences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.28(c)]	ΩY	۵N	XN/A
	Wn	at modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]			
23.		sured that the passive and active mitigation systems, if considered, are capable of withstanding the release event gering the scenario and will be functional? [68.28(d)]	ΩY		XN/A
24.	Cor	nsidered the following factors in selecting the alternative release scenarios: [68.28(e)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
		The five-year accident history provided in 68.42? [68.28(e)(1)]			
		Failure scenarios identified under 68.50? [68.28(e)(2)]			
Hazard Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Population [68.30]					
Haz	ard	Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Population [68.30]	·		
	Esti	Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Population [68.30] imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)]	Ωy	۵N	XN/A
25.	Esti poir Ider	mated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the	DY DY		XN/A
25. 26.	Esti poir Iden in th	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] ntified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings			
25. 26. 27.	Esti poir Iden in th Use	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] ntified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings he RMP? [68.30(b)]	Ωy	۵N	ØN/A
 25. 26. 27. 28. 	Esti poir Iden in th Use Esti	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] ntified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings he RMP? [68.30(b)] ad most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)]	DY DY		⊠N/A ⊠N/A
 25. 26. 27. 28. Haz 	Esti poir Iden in th Use Esti zard	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] ntified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings he RMP? [68.30(b)] ad most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)] imated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)]	DY DY		⊠N/A ⊠N/A
 25. 26. 27. 28. Haz 29. 	Esti poir Ider in th Use Esti zard Iden poin Reli	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] intified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings the RMP? [68.30(b)] ad most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)] imated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)] Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Environment [68.33] ntified environmental receptors that would be included in the distance to the endpoint based on a circle with the			IN/A IN/A IN/A
 25. 26. 27. 28. Haz 29. 30. 	Esti poir Ider in th Use Esti Zard Iden poir Reli envi	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] ntified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings he RMP? [68.30(b)] ad most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)] imated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)] Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Environment [68.33] ntified environmental receptors that would be included in the distance to the endpoint based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.33(a)] ied on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify	DY DY DY DY		⊠N/A ⊠N/A ⊠N/A
 25. 26. 27. 28. Haz 29. 30. Haz 	Esti poir Ider in th Use Esti zard Iden poir Reli envi zard	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] ntified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings he RMP? [68.30(b)] ad most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)] imated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)] Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Environment [68.33] ntified environmental receptors that would be included in the distance to the endpoint based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.33(a)] ied on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify ironmental receptors? [Source may have used LandView to obtain information] [68.33(b)]	DY DY DY DY		⊠N/A ⊠N/A ⊠N/A
 25. 26. 27. 28. Haz 29. 30. Haz 31. 	Esti poir Ider in th Use Esti zard Iden poir Reli envi zard Rev Con or h	imated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.30(a)] ntified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings he RMP? [68.30(b)] ad most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)] imated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)] Assessment: Defining off-site impacts—Environment [68.33] ntified environmental receptors that would be included in the distance to the endpoint based on a circle with the nt of release at the center? [68.33(a)] ied on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify ironmental receptors? [Source may have used LandView to obtain information] [68.33(b)] Assessment: Review and update [68.36]	ПҮ ПҮ ПҮ ПҮ		IN/A IN/A IN/A IN/A

Hazard Assessment: Documentation [68.39]			·
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)]	ΩY	۵N	×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)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
35. Documentation of estimated quantity released, release rate, and duration of release? [68.39(c)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
36. Methodology used to determine distance to endpoints? [68.39(d)]	ΠY		XN/A
37. Data used to estimate population and environmental receptors potentially affected? [68.39(e)]	ΩY		XN/A
Hazard Assessment: Five-year accident history [68.42]	<u></u>		· · · · ·
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	۵N	XN/A
39. Has the owner or operator reported the following information for each accidental release: [68.42(b)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
Date, time, and approximate duration of the release? [68.42(b)(1)]			
□ Chemical(s) released? [68.42(b)(2)]			
Estimated quantity released in pounds and percentage weight in a mixture (toxics)? [68.42(b)(3)]			
\square NAICS code for the process? [68.42(b)(4)]			w.
□ The type of release event and its source? [68.42(b)(5)]	[
□ Weather conditions (if known)? [68.42(b)(6)]			
$\Box \text{On-site impacts? [68.42(b)(7)]}$			
□ Known offsite impacts? [68.42(b)(8)]			
□ Initiating event and contributing factors (if known)? [68.42(b)(9)]			
□ Whether offsite responders were notified (if known)? [68.42(b)(10)]			
□ Operational or process changes that resulted from investigation of the release? [68.42(b)(11)]			
Section C: Prevention Program			
Implemented the Program 3 prevention requirements as provided in 40 CFR 68.65 - 68.87?	M	ΠU	XN/A
Page 5 of 13			

Pre	Prevention Program- Safety information [68.65]						
1.	Has haz pro- requ	ΠY	□n	XN/A			
	Do	es the process safety information contain the following for hazards of the substances: [68.65(b)]					
		Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) that meet the requirements of the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard [29 CFR 1910.1200(g)]? [68.48(a)(1)]					
		Toxicity information? [68.65(b)(1)]					
		Permissible exposure limits? [68.65(b)(2)]					
		Physical data? [68.65(b)(3)]	1				
		Reactivity data? [68.65(b)(4)]	1				
		Corrosivity data? [68.65(b)(5)]	1				
		Thermal and chemical stability data? [68.65(b)(6)]					
		Hazardous effects of inadvertent mixing of materials that could foreseeably occur? [68.65(b)(7)]	1				
2.	Has	s the owner documented information pertaining to technology of the process?	ΩY	۵N	XN/A		
		A block flow diagram or simplified process flow diagram? [68.65(c)(1)(i)]	1				
		Process chemistry? [68.65(c)(1)(ii)]	1				
		Maximum intended inventory? [68.65(c)(1)(iii)]					
		Safe upper and lower limits for such items as temperatures, pressures, flows, or compositions? [68.65(c)(1)(iv)]	ł				
		An evaluation of the consequences of deviation? [68.65(c)(1)(iv)]	1				
3.	Dor	es the process safety information contain the following for the equipment in the process: [68.65(d)(1)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A		
		Materials of construction? 68.65(d)(1)(i)]	1				
		Piping and instrumentation diagrams [68.65(d)(1)(ii)]	1				
		Electrical classification? [68.65(d)(1)(iii)]	İ		ļ		
		Relief system design and design basis? [68.65(d)(1)(iv)]					
		Ventilation system design? [68.65(d)(1)(v)]					
		Design codes and standards employed? [68.65(d)(1)(vi)]	l				
		Material and energy balances for processes built after June 21, 1999? [68.65(d)(1)(vii)]					
		Safety systems? [68.65(d)(1)(viii)]					
4.		the owner or operator documented that equipment complies with recognized and generally accepted good ineering practices? [68.65(d)(2)]	Πλ		XN/A		
5.	acco	the owner or operator determined and documented that existing equipment, designed and constructed in ordance with codes, standards, or practices that are no longer in general use, is designed, maintained, inspected, ed, and operating in a safe manner? [68.65(d)(3)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A		
Pre	vent	ion Program- Process Hazard Analysis [68.67]					
6.		the owner or operator performed an initial process hazard analysis (PHA), and has this analysis identified, luated, and controlled the hazards involved in the process? [68.67(a)]	ΩY	۵N	XN/A		
				<u>,</u>			

		2.		
7.	Has the owner or operator determined and documented the priority order for conducting PHAs, and was it based on a appropriate rationale? [68.67(a)]	an □Y	DN	XN/A
8.	Has the owner used one or more of the following technologies to conduct process PHA: [68.67(b)]	ΠY	N	XN/A
	□ What-if? [68.67(b)(1)]			
	Checklist? [68.67(b)(2)]			
	□ What-if/Checklist? [68.67(b)(3)]			
	Hazard and Operability Study (HAZOP) [68.67(b)(4)]			
	□ Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) [68.67(b)(5)]			
	□ Fault Tree Analysis? [68.67(b)(6)]			
	An appropriate equivalent methodology? [68.67(b)(7)]			
9.	Did the PHA address:			XN/A
	\Box The hazards of the process? [68.67(c)(1)]			
	□ Identification of any incident that had a likely potential for catastrophic consequences? [68.67(c)(2)]			
	□ Engineering and administrative controls applicable to hazards and interrelationships?[68.67(c)(3)]			
	□ Consequences of failure of engineering and administrative controls? [68.67(c)(4)]			
	□ Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)]			
	□ Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)]			
	\Box An evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
10.	Was the PHA performed by a team with expertise in engineering and process operations and did the team include	ΠY		XN/A
<u> </u>	appropriate personnel? [68.67(d)]			
11.	Has the owner or operator established a system to promptly address the team's findings and recommendations; assure that the recommendations are resolved in a timely manner and documented; documented what actions are to be taken completed actions as soon as possible; developed a written schedule of when these actions are to be completed; and communicated the actions to operating, maintenance, and other employees whose work assignments are in the process and who may be affected by the recommendations? [68.67(e)]	;	ΠN	XN/A
12.	Has the PHA been updated and revalidated by a team every five years after the completion of the initial PHA to assurt that the PHA is consistent with the current process? [68.67(f)]	re □Y	۵N	XN/A
13.	Has the owner or operator retained PHAs and updates or revalidations for each process covered, as well as the resolution of recommendations for the life of the process? [68.67(g)]	DY	۵N	XN/A
Pre	vention Program- Operating procedures [68.69]			
14.	Has the owner or operator developed and implemented written operating procedures that provide instructions or steps for conducting activities associated with each covered process consistent with the safety information? [68.69(a)]	s 🗆 Y	۵N	XN/A

			r	_	
15	Do the	procedures address the following: [68.69(a)]	DY	ΠN	XN/A
	Steps for	r each operating phase: [68.69(a)(1)]	[
		Initial Startup? [68.69(a)(1)(i)]			
		Normal operations? [68.69(a)(1)(ii)]			
		Temporary operations? [68.69((a)(1)(iii)]			
	Emergency shutdown including the conditions under which emergency shutdown is required, and the assignment of shutdown responsibility to qualified operators to ensure that emergency shutdown is executed in a safe and timely manner? [68.69(a)(1)(iv)]				
		Emergency operations? [68.69(a)(1)(v)]			
		Normal shutdown? [68.68(a)(1)(vi)]			
		Startup following a turnaround, or after emergency shutdown? [68.69(a)(1)(vii)]			
	<u>Operati</u>	ng limits: [68.69(a)(2)]			
		Consequences of deviations [68.69(a)(2)(i)]			
		Steps required to correct or avoid deviation? [68.69(a)(2)(ii)]			
	Safety 2	nd health considerations: [68.69(a)(3)]			
		Properties of, and physical hazards presented by, the chemicals used in the process [68.69(a)(3)(i)]			
		Precautions necessary to prevent exposure, including engineering controls, administrative controls, and personal protective equipment? [68.69(a)(3)(ii)]			
		Control measures to be taken if physical contact or airborne exposure occurs? [68.69(a)(3)(iii)]			
		Quality control for raw materials and control of hazardous chemical inventory levels? [68.69(a)(3)(iv)]			
		Any special or unique hazards? [68.69(a)(3)(v)]			
	□ <u>Saf</u>	ety systems and their functions? [68.69(a)(4)]			
16					
		rating procedures readily accessible to employees who are involved in a process? [68.69(b)]	ΠY		DN/A
17.		owner or operator certified annually that the operating procedures are current and accurate and that procedures en reviewed as often as necessary? [68.69(c)]	ΠY	DN	⊠N/A
18.		owner or operator developed and implemented safe work practices to provide for the control of hazards during operations, such as lockout/tagout? [68.69(d)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
Pre	vention]	Program - Training [68.71]			
19	Has each assigned	n employee involved in operating a process, and each employee before being involved in operating a newly process, been initially trained in an overview of the process and in the operating procedures? [68.71(a)(1)]	Ωy	ΠN	XN/A
20.	Did initi work pr	al training include emphasis on safety and health hazards, emergency operations including shutdown, and safe actices applicable to the employee's job tasks? [68.71(a)(1)]	Ωy	ΠN	XN/A
21.	 In lieu of initial training for those employees already involved in operating a process on June 21, 1999, an 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 specified in the operating procedures [68.71(a)(2)] 			۵N	XN/A
22.	in operat	esher training been provided at least every three years, or more often if necessary, to each employee involved ting a process to assure that the employee understands and adheres to the current operating procedures of the [68.71(b)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A

23,	Has owner or operator ascertained and documented in record that each employee involved in operating a process has received and understood the training required? [68.71(c)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
24.	Does the prepared record contain the identity of the employee, the date of the training, and the means used to verify that the employee understood the training? [68.71(c)]	ΩY	۵N	XN/A
Pro	evention Program - Mechanical Integrity [68.73]			·····
25.	Has the owner or operator established and implemented written procedures to maintain the on-going integrity of the process equipment listed in 68.73(a)? [68.73(b)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
26.	Has the owner or operator trained each employee involved in maintaining the on-going integrity of process equipment? [68.73(c)]	ΟY	۵N	XN/A
27.	Performed inspections and tests on process equipment? [68.73(d)(1)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
28.	Followed recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices for inspections and testing procedures? [68.73(d)(2)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
29.	Ensured the frequency of inspections and tests of process equipment is consistent with applicable manufacturers' recommendations, good engineering practices, and prior operating experience? [68.73(d)(3)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
30.	Documented each inspection and test that had been performed on process equipment, which identifies the date of the inspection or test, the name of the person who performed the inspection or test, the serial number or other identifier of the equipment on which the inspection or test was performed, a description of the inspection or test performed, and the results of the inspection or test? $[68.73(d)(4)]$	ΠY		XN/A
31.	Corrected deficiencies in equipment that were outside acceptable limits defined by the process safety information before further use or in a safe and timely manner when necessary means were taken to assure safe operation? [68.73(e)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
32.	Assured that equipment as it was fabricated is suitable for the process application for which it will be used in the construction of new plants and equipment? $[68.73(f)(1)]$	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
33.	Performed appropriate checks and inspections to assure that equipment was installed properly and consistent with design specifications and the manufacturer's instructions? $[68.73(f)(2)]$	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
34.	Assured that maintenance materials, spare parts and equipment were suitable for the process application for which they would be used? $[68.73(f)(3)]$	ΟY	۵N	XN/A
Pre	vention Program - Management Of Change [68.75]			
35.	Has the owner or operator established and implemented written procedures to manage changes to process chemicals, technology, equipment, and procedures, and changes to stationary sources that affect a covered process? [68.75(a)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
36.	Do procedures assure that the following considerations are addressed prior to any change: [68.75(b)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
0	The technical basis for the proposed change? [68.75(b)(1)]	<i>111.</i>		
	□ Impact of change on safety and health? [68.75(b)(2)]			
	□ Modifications to operating procedures? [68.75(b)(3)]			
	□ Necessary time period for the change? [68.75(b)(4)]			
	Authorization requirements for the proposed change? [68.75(b)(5)]			
37.	Were employees, involved in operating a process and maintenance, and contract employees, whose job tasks would be affected by a change in the process, informed of, and trained in, the change prior to start-up of the process or affected parts of the process? [68.75(c)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A`
			• <u> </u>	

38.	If a change resulted in a change in the process safety information, was such information updated accordingly? [68.75(d)]	DY	۵N	XN/A		
39.	If a change resulted in a change in the operating procedures or practices, had such procedures or practices been updated accordingly? [68.75(e)]	DY	ΠN	XN/A		
Pre	vention Program - Pre-startup Safety Review [68.77]	<u> </u>				
40.	If the facility installed a new stationary source, or significantly modified an existing source, (as discussed at 68.77(a)) did it perform a pre-startup safety review prior to the introduction of a regulated substance to a process to confirm: [68.77(b)]	DY		XN/A		
	Construction and equipment was in accordance with design specifications? [68.77(b)(1)]					
	□ Safety, operating, maintenance, and emergency procedures were in place and were adequate? [68.77(b)(2)]					
	□ For new stationary sources, a process hazard analysis had been performed and recommendations had been resolved or implemented before startup? [68.77(b)(3)]					
	□ Modified stationary sources meet the requirements contained in management of change? [68.77(b)(3)]					
	Training of each employee involved in operating a process had been completed? [68.77(b)(4)]					
Pre	vention Program - Compliance audits [68.79]					
41.	Has the owner or operator certified that the stationary source has evaluated compliance with the provisions of the prevention program at least every three years to verify that the developed procedures and practices are adequate and being followed? [68.79(a)]	ΟY	ΠN	XN/A		
42.	Has the audit been conducted by at least one person knowledgeable in the process? [68.79(b)]	ΟY	ΠN	XN/A		
43.	Are the audit findings documented in a report? [68.79(c)]	ΠY		XN/A		
44.	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? [68.79(d)]	ΟY	۵N	XN/A		
45.	Has the owner or operator retained the two most recent compliance reports? [68.79(e)]	ΠY		XN/A		
Pre	Prevention Program - Incident investigation [68.81]					
46.	Has the owner or operator investigated each incident that resulted in, or could reasonably have resulted in a catastrophic release of a regulated substance? [68.81(a)]	ΟY	ΠN	XN/A		
47.	Were all incident investigations initiated not later than 48 hours following the incident? [68.81(b)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A		
48.	Was an accident investigation team established and did it consist of at least one person knowledgeable in the process involved, including a contract employee if the incident involved work of a contractor, and other persons with appropriate knowledge and experience to thoroughly investigate and analyze the incident? [68.81(c)]	ΟY	DN	XN/A		
49.	Was a report prepared at the conclusion of every investigation? [68.81(d)]	ΩY	۵N	XN/A		
50.	Does every report include: [68.81(d)]	DΥ	۵N	XN/A		
	□ Date of incident? [68.81(d)(1)]					
	Date investigation began? [68.81(d)(2)]					
	□ A description of the incident? [68.81(d)(3)]					
	□ The factors that contributed to the incident? [68.81(d)(4)]	1				
	Any recommendations resulting from the investigation? [68.81(d)(5)]					
				2		

	RMP Program Facility Name: <u>City of St. Joseph Water Filtration Plan</u>			
Pr	ocess Checklist EPA Facility ID: 100000095			
51.	Has the owner or operator established a system to address and resolve the report findings and recommendations, and are the resolutions and corrective actions documented? [68.81(e)]	ΟY	N	XN/A
52.	Was the report reviewed with all affected personnel whose job tasks are relevant to the incident findings including contract employees where applicable? [68.81(f)]	ΩY		XN/A
53.	Has the owner or operator retained incident investigation reports for at least five years? [68.81(g)]	ΠY		XN/A
Se	ction D - Employee Participation [68.83]	<u></u>		
1.	Has the owner or operator developed a written plan of action regarding the implementation of the employee participation required by this section? [68.83(a)]	ΠY		XN/A
2.	Has the owner or operator consulted with employees and their representatives on the conduct and development of process hazards analyses and on the development of the other elements of process safety management in chemical accident prevention provisions? [68.83(b)]	ΩY	۵N	XN/A
3.	Has the owner or operator provided to employees and their representatives access to process hazards analyses and to all other information required to be developed under the chemical accident prevention rule? [68.83(c)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
Sec	ction E - Hot Work Permit [68.85]	<u></u>		
1.	Has the owner or operator issued a hot work permit for each hot work operation conducted on or near a covered process? [68.85(a)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
2.	Does the permit document that the fire prevention and protection requirements in 29CFR 1910.252(a) have been implemented prior to beginning the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
3.	Does the permit indicate the date(s) authorized for hot work and the object(s) upon which hot work is to be performed? [68.85(b]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
4.	Are the permits being kept on file until completion of the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	ΠY		XN/A
Sec	tion F - Contractors [68.87]			
1.	Has the owner or operator obtained and evaluated information regarding the contract owner or operator's safety performance and programs when selecting a contractor? [68.87(b)(1)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
2.	Informed contract owner or operator of the known potential fire, explosion, or toxic release hazards related to the contractor's work and the process? [68.87(b)(2)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
3.	Explained to the contract owner or operator the applicable provisions of the emergency response or the emergency action program? [68.87(b)(3)]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
4.	Developed and implemented safe work practices consistent with §68.69(d), to control the entrance, presence, and exit of the contract owner or operator and contract employees in the covered process areas? [68.87(b)(4)]	ΠY	□ N	XN/A
5.	Periodically evaluated the performance of the contract owner or operator in fulfilling their obligations (as described at $68.87(c)(1) - (c)(5)$)? [$68.87(b)(5)$]	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
Sec	tion G - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.95]			
	eloped and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.95?	М	Ου	XN/A
1.	Is the facility designated as a "first responder" in case of an accidental release of regulated substances"	ΠY	۵N	XN/A
1.a.	If the facility is not a first responder:			
	Page 11 of 13			
				10/1/2010

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)]	ΟY	۵N	XN/A
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? $[68.90(b)(2)]$	DY	ΠN	⊠N/A
1.a.(3)		Are appropriate mechanisms in place to notify emergency responders when there is need for a response? [68.90(b)(3)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
2.	An	emergency response plan is maintained at the stationary source and contains the following? [68.95(a)(1)]	ΠY	⊡n	XN/A
		Procedures for informing the public and local emergency response agencies about accidental releases? [68.95(a)(1)(i)]			
		Documentation of proper first-aid and emergency medical treatment necessary to treat accidental human exposures? $[68.95(a)(1)(ii)]$			
		Procedures and measures for emergency response after an accidental release of a regulated substance? [68.95(a)(1)(iii)]			i
3.	The emergency response plan contains procedures for the use of emergency response equipment and for its inspection, testing, and maintenance? [68.95(a)(2)]			۵N	XN/A
4.	The emergency response plan requires, and there is documentation of, training for all employees in relevant procedures? [68.95(a)(3)]		ΠY	DN	XN/A
5.	The owner or operator has developed and implemented 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	۵N	XN/A
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)]		ΟY	ΠN	XN/A
7.		the emergency response plan been coordinated with the community emergency response plan developed under CRA? [68.95(c)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A
Se	ctio	n H – Risk Management Plan [40 CFR 68.190 – 68.195]			
1.	sub: mix	s the single registration form include, for each covered process, the name and CAS number of each regulated stance held above the threshold quantity in the process, the maximum quantity of each regulated substance or ture in the process (in pounds) to two significant digits, the five- or six-digit NAICS code that most closely esponds to the process and the Program level of the process? [68.160(b)(7)]	ΟY	ΠN	XN/A
2.	Did	the facility assign the correct program level(s) to its covered process(es)? [68.160(b)(7)]	ΠY	ΠN	XN/A

3.	Has the owner or operator reviewed and updated the RMP and submitted it to EPA [68.190(a)]? Reason for update:	ΩY	ΣN	DN/A
	□ Five-year update. [68.190(b)(1)]			
	□ 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 an new process above threshold quantities. [68.190(b)(4)]	1		I
	□ Within six months of a change requiring revised PHA or hazard review. [68.190(b)(5)]			I
	□ Within six months of a change requiring a revised OCA as provided in 68.36. [68.190(b)(6)]	1		
	□ Within six months of a change that alters the Program level that applies to any covered process. [68.190(b)(7)]	1		
4.	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		XN/A
5.	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)]	ΩY	ΠN	XN/A