CIVIL PENALTY AUTHORIZATION SOUTHWEST DISTRICT

Investigator: Lynne Milanian, Permitting Engineer

Date Submitted: August 2, 1990

1. VIOLATORS:

Safety-Kleen Corporation 777 Big Timber Road Elgin, Illinois 60123 FLO980817271

SEP 10 1930

JOUS WASI_

- and ITING

2. LOCATION OF VIOLATION:

24th Avenue and 54th Street Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida 33619

3. NATURE OF VIOLATION:

The violator, Safety-Kleen Corporation, is a hazardous waste storage facility operating under a construction and operation permit (CP&OP), as a result of an agreement worked out with Tallahassee per memorandum dated September 28, 1988. The facility deviated from construction plan approval and submitted inaccurate information to the Department concerning the as-built and/or completed structures in an attempt to support the issuance of their permanent operating permit. An inspection conducted on June 19, 1990 to verify the completion of the constructed facility as certified by Safety-Kleen revealed the following violations:

- A. The facility submitted inaccurate documentation (i.e., calculations, diagrams and narrative) which was utilized to support the operating permit application in violation of Section 403.727(1)(e), F.S.
 - The facility failed to construct the north building container storage area in accordance with diagrams submitted in the construction permit and in the operating permit application.
 - The facility failed to construct the solvent return/fill area loading dock in accordance with diagrams submitted in the construction permit and in the operating permit application.
 - The facility failed to construct the south building container storage area in accordance diagrams submitted in the construction permit and in the operating permit application.

- B. The facility failed to comply with tank system standards pertaining to three dumpsters receiving and storing hazardous wastes, for transfer to a larger 15,000 gallon tank, in violation of 40 CFR Subpart J.
 - The facility failed to provide a written assessment, reviewed and certified by an independent professional engineer detailing the integrity of the three dumpsters, which are ancillary equipment in violation of 40 CFR 264.192(a)(1).
 - The facility failed to provide design considerations for the ancillary equipment in violation of 40 CFR 264.192(a)(5).
 - The facility failed to provide a report detailing proper installation of the ancillary equipment in violation of 40 CFR 264.192(b).
 - The facility failed to provide a report establishing tightness for the ancillary equipment in violation of 40 CFR 264.192(d).
 - The facility failed to maintain written statements certifying the design of the entire tank system on file at the facility in violation of 40 CFR 264.192(g).
 - The facility failed to provide containment capable of containing 100 percent of the capacity of the largest dumpster within the system's boundary in violation of 40 CFR 264.193(e).
- C. The facility has failed to provide adequate secondary containment for the drum storage area in the north building in violation of 40 CFR 264.175(b)(3). Narrative, calculations and diagrams contained in the permit application describe a storage area able to support 6,192 gallons of liquid hazardous waste. Actual liquid hazardous waste storage capacity is approximately 1890 gallons.
- D. The facility failed to design the building to minimize unplanned sudden or non-sudden releases of hazardous waste or hazardous waste constituents to air, soil or waters which could threaten human health or the environment in violation of 40 CFR 264.31.
 - A grated manhole adjacent to the hazardous waste storage area and a floor drain at the base of the stairwell were observed in the north building. These two drainage systems will convey any collected liquids to the on-site septic system.

A. 403.727 (1)(e)

Could change to

neger / moderate +

Her make (17,500)

adjustment for lack

af good faith
(10-2070)

• Two hazardous waste containment systems located in the south building will discharge their contents upon capacity exceedance directly out the south end of the building. Any liquid wastes discharged in this manner will proceed down the asphalt pavement and enter a drainage swale. The swale is supposed to be graded towards an on-site unlined retention pond. However, excess rainfall and/or liquid waste discharge will cause backflow in the receiving drainage swale which will cause liquids to enter a concrete spillway and flow off-site.

Three notice of deficiencies were drafted to Safety-Kleen, and each time repeated requests were made for diagrams for the same areas (i.e., solvent/fill return area, service center storage area particularly for containment, and the accumulation center storage area also for containment). Further, it was clearly stated that all calculations and diagrams must be signed and sealed. Safety-Kleen only sealed the documents in response to the first NOD.

Safety-Kleen has been operating this facility under an agreement with the Department granting interim status. An intent to deny the permit has been drafted. In addition, the RCRA Enforcement Response Policy requires penalties to be assessed.

4. PENALTY RATIONALE

The following is an evaluation of the assessed civil penalty of \$42,000.00 for non-compliance with RCRA requirements prepared in accordance with EPA and Department penalty policies. The monetary figure has been derived as follows:

A. <u>Section 403.727(1)(e), F.S.</u> - Willing submission of false documentation, including calculations, diagrams and narrative, which was utilized to support the operating permit application.

A "Major Potential for Harm" was chosen as the facility deliberately resubmitted the same documents to verify certification of completion of construction of their storage facility to support their request for an operating permit. Further, as the RCRA program is a "self monitoring" system much damage will occur if the professionals documenting projects cannot be relied upon. A "Major Deviation of the Rule" was chosen because this office requested information four times concerning these documents and each time false information was submitted.

The facility has completely failed to supply this office with accurate information as disclosed during the on-site inspection.

Penalty Range - \$20,000 - \$25,000 Penalty Chosen - \$22,500 B. 40 CFR Subpart J - Failed to comply with tank systems standards.

A "Moderate Potential for Harm" was selected as the 3 wet dumpsters within the tank system store only a small part of the total volume of the tank system. A "Moderate Deviation of the Rule" was selected as the facility specifically stated that the wet dumpsters do not store waste although they do.

Penalty Range - \$7,999 - \$5,000 Penalty Chosen - \$6,500

C. 40 CFR 264.175(b)(3) - Failure to provide adequate secondary containment for the container storage area.

A "Moderate Potential for Harm" was chosen as the wastes are not acutely toxic and they will be stored inside the building. A "Moderate Deviation of the Rule" was chosen as some containment was provided, however, this containment was 3 times smaller than what was reported.

Penalty Range - \$7,999 - \$5,000 Penalty Chosen - \$6,500

D. 40 CFR 264.31 - Failure to design building to minimize releases of hazardous wastes to the environment.

A "Moderate Potential for Harm" was selected as the likelihood of an event that will result in contamination is greatly increased as the available storage capacity is inadequate and any excess will immediately enter the environment. A "Moderate Deviation of the Rule" was selected as the facility would release ignitable, toxic wastes to the environment only in the event of an emergency. However, failure to design an adequate containment system and the placing of a grated manhole 8 to 10 feet from the storage area directly in front of an unloading bay are design flaws which were easily preventable if due care had been taken during construction.

Penalty Range - \$7,999 - \$5,000 Penalty Chosen - \$6,500

PENALTY RECOMMENDATIONS: 5.

I recommend that Safety-Kleen Corporation be required through a Consent Order to pay up to \$42,000.00 in civil penalties as calculated on the attached civil penalties worksheets.

Richard D. Garrity, Ph.D. Deputy Assistant Secretary Southwest District

LRM/ncr Attachments

Comments:

Larry Morgan, OGC

	KICK WIIKI	ns, Division	ı Dire	ctor			
	*			· :	,	Approv	eđ
. •			•			Disapp	roved
	•	1	. *				
Dale	Twachtmann	, Secretary			·		٠
	·						,
Date						•	

PENALS YPUTATION WORKSHEET

Vi	olator Name:	y-Kleen Co	spocation		•
Re	gulation Violated: 403	/			•
WO	sessments for each violations and totalled. (In parate sheet.)	on should be determ f more space is nee	nined on separate	•	
·,	Part I - Serious	ness of Violation !	Penalty		• .
1.	Potenzial for Harm:	m	205/		•
2.	Extent of Deviation:	m	i.	-	·
3.	Matrix Cell Range:	20	- 25,000	•	
	Penalty Amount Chosen	· # 22.	500	•	
	Justification for Pena Amount Chosen:	alty dalibus	tily culmittell, dein reques	false inform	uton to imit - a majo
4.	Per-Day Assessment:	device	on front the	r rull.	
	Part II - P	Penalty Adjustments			
		Percentage Change	Dollar Amount		
. 1.	Good faith efforts to comply/lack of good faith:				
2.	Degree of willfulness and/or negligence:			and the second s	
3.	Eistory of noncompliance:	•		·	•
4.	Other unique factors:				.
5.	Justification for Adjustments:				
6.	Adjusted Per-day Penalty (Line 4, Part I + Lines 1-4, Part II):		· 	20 1. 4	
7.	Number of Days of Violation:				
. 8.	Multi-day Penalty (Line 6 x Line 7);	•	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
9.	Economic Benefit of Noncompliance:	•			
	Justification:				
10.	TOTAL (Lines 8 + 9)				•
11.	Ability to Pay Adjustment	: :			
	Justification for Adjustment:	1			
12.	TOTAL PENALTY Amount (must not exceed \$50,00	00			

	C 14.	- 12 Committee	
	acor Name:	- Kleen Corporation CFR Subport J	-
_			•
work	ssments for each violation is heets and totalled. (If wrate sheet.)	should be determined on separate more space is needed, attach	
• .	Part I - Seriousne	ess of Violation Penalty	• .
•	Potential for Harm:	moderate	
1.		Moderate	
2.	Extent of Deviation:	5000 - 7999	
3.	Matrix Cell Range:		
	Fenalty Amount Chosen:	the tails well not :	stay de puntites q
	Justification for Penal Amount Chosen:	west as stated in cul	stre de puntites q guil despons - dey sweeld ands VS de required y.
4.	Per-Day Assessment:	ossessment for only 30	on vigues 4.
	Part II - Pe	malty Adjustments	
		Percentage Change Dollar Amount	
1	Good faith efforts to comply/lack of good faith:	- Carried Committee	
2.	Degree of willfulness and/or negligence:		
3.	Eistory of noncompliance:		ing the second section of the second section is a second section of the second section of the second section is a second section of the s
4.	Other unique factors:		.
5.	Justification for Adjustments:		
6.	Adjusted Per-day Penalty (Line 4, Part I + Lines 1-4, Part II):		•
7.	Number of Days of Violation:		
8.	Mulci-day Penalty (Line 6 x Line 7);	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
9.	Economic Benefit of Noncompliance:		
	Justification:		
10.	TOTAL (Lines 8 + 9)		
11.	Ability to Pay Adjustment		
	Justification for Adjustment:		
12.	TOTAL PENALTY Amount (must not exceed \$50.00	0	

per day of violation):

PENALTY COMPUTATION WORKSHEET

Vio	lator Name: 3 age, -10	our cope	iliane	•		
Reg	ulation Violated: 264-/	75(6)(3	<u> </u>	 ·		
WOT	essments for each violation show ksheets and totalled. (If more arate sheet.)					
			•			
	Part I - Seriousness of					, `
1.	Potential for Harm:		olivete	•		
2.	Extent of Deviation:		Leute		•	
3.	Matrix Cell Range:		00-7999	·		
	Penalty Amount Chosen:	# (6500	2 - 1ta	-a + it a .	0.0 /
	Justification for Penalty Amount Chosen:	spert un	secondary (econdary conti	unment	t was soli
4.	Per-Day Assessment:	3 ames -	smaller Hon	what was cert	Exite o	
	Part II - Penalty	Adjustments	·			•
	Perce	ntage Change	Dollar Amount			•
i.	Good faith efforts to comply/lack of good faith:	. •				•
2.	Degree of willfulness and/or negligence:	·				
3.	History of noncompliance:		· ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
4.	Other unique factors:	<u></u>		•		
5.	Justification for Adjustments:				-	
6.	Adjusted Per-day Penalty (Line 4, Part I + Lines 1-4, Part II):			-		
7.	Number of Days of Violation:			•		
8.	Mulci-day Penalty (Line 6 x Line 7);					d.
9.	Economic Benefit of Noncompliance:					
	Justification:	•		•		
.0.	TOTAL (Lines 8 + 9)					.· .
1.	Ability to Pay Adjustment:	•			•	
	Justification for Adjustment:					· . ·
.2.	TOTAL PENALTY Amount (must not exceed \$50,000 per day of violation):	. •		•		

PENALTY COMPUTATION WORKSHEET

Vio	lator Name:Saker	Kleen Corporation	÷ .
Regi		4.31	
Ass	essments for each violatio	n should be determined on separate more space is needed, attach	
	Part I - Seriousn	ess of Violation Penalty	•
1.	Potential for Harm:	Moderate	
2.	Extent of Deviation:	Moderate	
3.	Matrix Cell Range:	5000 - 7999	
	Penalty Amount Chosen:	\$ 6500	
	Justification for Pena Amount Chosen:	Ity It is possible for one	, excess spill material to - forelity had planned in the event gon energency
4.	Per-Day Assessment:	to release seech metric	I in the event gon emergency
	Part II . P	enalty Adjustments	
	<u> </u>	Percentage Change Dollar Amount	
1.	Good faith efforts to comply/lack of good faith:	rescentage thange bosts August	
2.	Degree of willfulness and/or negligence:		
3.	History of noncompliance:		
4.	Other unique factors:		
5.	Justification for Adjustments:		-
6.	Adjusted Per-day Penalty (Line 4, Part I + Lines 1-4, Part II):		
7.	Number of Days of Violation:		
8.	Multi-day Penalty (Line 6 x Line 7);		
9.	Economic Benefit of Noncompliance:		
	Justification:		
٥.	TOTAL (Lines 8 + 9)		
1.	Ability to Pay Adjustment	:: <u></u>	
•	Justification for Adjustment:		
2.	TOTAL PENALTY Amount (must not exceed \$50,00 per day of violation):	00	