

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FISCAL YEAR 1998

U.S. EPA REGION 5 - Office of Regional Counsel

INTRODUCTION

This is a comprehensive, descriptive report on all enforcement cases concluded in Fiscal Year 1998 in Region 5 in which an injunctive order—involving pollution reduction, remediation, restoration and/or other measures—was secured against a Respondent or Defendant who violated one or more federal environmental laws. This report seeks to highlight some of the most important achievements of Region 5 of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), measured specifically by enforcement and the environmental benefits to be gained through such enforcement.

A few important notes concerning the content and format of this report must be made. First, while most of the cases included in this report involve orders requiring pollution reduction, remediation, and/or restoration, a few of them order compliance only with access, reporting, and/or permit application requirements. However, since this report aims to identify all orders secured by Region 5's Office of Regional Counsel which may result in some sort of environmental benefit, these cases are included here.

Second, this report does not identify those Respondents and Defendants who have not yet complied with their respective injunctive orders, nor does it identify those who have. This report simply describes the order which was secured against each Respondent or Defendant. The term “Respondent” refers to the party to whom an administrative order was issued or an administrative complaint was served. The term “Defendant” refers to the party in a civil judicial lawsuit against whom relief is sought.

Third, when the cost of the injunctive relief is indicated, it is usually estimated (unless, of course, the Respondent or Defendant has already complied with the injunctive order). In cases in which the cost is extremely rough, the word “estimated” follows the cost in parentheses. If the case also involved a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) and/or penalty, the costs of these, if available, are listed immediately following the cost of the injunctive relief.

Fourth, the statute section listed in each case is the section of the statute that was violated by the Respondent or Defendant, not the section which authorized Region 5 to issue a complaint.

Fifth, and finally, the following page contains keys to common acronyms used in this report. These acronyms include environmental statutes, by which the cases are divided, and geographic initiatives. They also include a set of miscellaneous acronyms which refer to various chemicals, reports, abbreviations, etc. For those acronyms used only once in this report, both the full name and the acronym are embedded within the report and are not included on the following page.

KEY TO ACRONYMS

Key to Environmental Statutes

		<u>Pages</u>
CAA	Clean Air Act	3 -28
CERCLA	Comprehensive Envmtl. Response, Compensation, and Liability Act	29 - 58
CWA	Clean Water Act	59 - 87
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act	N/A
FIFRA	Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act	88 - 91
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	92 - 103
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act	104 - 107
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act	108 - 111
304/103	EPCRA Section 304 and CERCLA Section 103	N/A
Multi-Media	Cases involving more than one statute	112 - 115

Key to Region 5 Geographic Initiatives

[CLE]	Cleveland Initiative
[GAT]	Mississippi Gateway Initiative
[GC]	Greater Chicago Initiative
[GLB]*	Great Lakes Basin
[NWI]	Northwest Indiana Initiative
[SEMI]	Southeast Michigan Initiative
[TRI]	Tristate Initiative
[UM]	Upper Mississippi Initiative

* Note: Cases which are identified as GLB cases are not part of any official Region 5 geographic initiative. Rather, these cases are tracked in the same manner as official initiative cases because, similar to the official initiative cases, GLB cases represent Region 5's effort to secure environmental cleanup and protection within a specific geographic region.

Key to Common Acronyms and Abbreviations

CMI	Corrective Measures Implementation	RFI	RCRA Facility Investigation
CMS	Corrective Measures Study	SO₂	Sulfur Dioxide
CO	Carbon Monoxide	STP	Sewage Treatment Plant
CO₂	Carbon Dioxide	USDW	Underground Source of Drinking Water
MEK	Methyl Ethyl Ketone	UST	Underground Storage Tank
NPDES	Nat'l Pollution Discharge Elim. System	VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides (NO and NO ₂)	WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl	dba	"doing business as"
PM	Particulate Matter		

Clean Air Act

Statute Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief:	51
Total cost value of injunctive relief:	\$11,089,678
Average cost value of injunctive relief:	\$426,526
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties:	18
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs:	5

Case Name: In re: ACD HOLDINGS, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Jane Woolums / Shaun Burke
Location: South Holland, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: September 8, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Information Letter Response, Permit Application, Training
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$4,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$41,000 / \$35,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit an application for a Title V permit, to improve its procedures for covering tanks, to conduct extensive training of plant personnel on abatement of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and to enter into a Compliance Commitment Agreement with Illinois EPA to maintain equipment in accordance with State Implementation Plan (SIP) regulations.
Quantitative Reduction(s): VOCs, 15 tons per year.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: ALLIED METAL CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Mary McAuliffe / Bonnie Bush
Location: Chicago, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order (assessing penalty)
Administrative Compliance Order (injunctive relief)

Date of Order: September 18, 1998
[Both orders, while separate and distinct, were issued jointly as part of a pre-negotiation process]

Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Training, Emissions/Discharge Change

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$8,500

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$23,100 / \$23,100

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install video monitors and cameras on the facility roof monitor for the purpose of identifying incidents of increased emissions, which indicate a problem with the seal on the door between the charging well and the melting chamber. The order also requires the installation of a data logger for recording parameters on any occasion when emissions bypass the baghouse, and regular visible emissions testing of the roof monitor.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Particulate matter (PM), amount and % reduction unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: ALLISON ENGINE CO.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Nhien Pham

Location: Indianapolis, Indiana (Marion County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: December 12, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Industrial Process Change

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$40,000

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install pollution prevention equipment to eliminate all hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions.

Quantitative Reduction(s): HAPs, 100% reduction.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.
Potential ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: ALLISON ENGINE CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Andre Daugavietis / Cynthia Curtis
Location: Indianapolis, Indiana (Marion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: February 9, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct initial testing at lower than normal operating rates to assure interim compliance during the repair/improvement of the facility's air pollution control system, and to retest at the normal operating rate at the end of March 1998. The order also requires the reporting of control equipment parameters to assure continued compliance with the relevant NESHAP.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: AUSTEEL LEMONT CO., INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Mary McAuliffe / Denny Dart
Location: Lemont, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Sections 111 and 112
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order (assessing penalty)
Administrative Compliance Order (injunctive relief)
Date of Order: September 28, 1998
[Both orders, while separate and distinct, were issued jointly.]
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Emissions/Discharge
Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$4,659,500
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$275,000 / \$225,000
SEP: \$50,000 (Pollution Prevention)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to resolve opacity violations at its electric arc furnace.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Particulate matter (PM), amount and % reduction
unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: AVON RUBBER & PLASTICS, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Spiros Bourgikos
Location: Cadillac, Michigan (Wexford County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to comply with the alternative emission limit (150 kg/sq. meter/month, 3-month rolling average). Compliance was achieved prior to the issuance of the order.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None (since any reductions were achieved prior to the issuance of the order, and therefore did not occur as a result of the order).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: BAGCRAFT CORP. OF AMERICA
Attorney/Program Contacts: Kris Vezner / Linda Hamsing
Location: Chicago, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: April 17, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Emissions/Discharge Change, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$80,500
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$250,000 / \$170,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to reformulate its inks by switching from inks containing highly volatile organic material (VOM) content to ink with low VOM content. The order also requires the Respondent to revise its recordkeeping practices and to conduct required future testing on inks to determine their VOM content.
Quantitative Reduction(s): VOM, 50 tons/year (40% reduction).

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: BRUSH WELLMAN, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Diana Embil / Lynn Kuo
Location: Elmore, Ohio (Ottawa County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: May 7, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Monitoring/Sampling,
Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$250,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install certain non-
absorbent slings and a continuous precision liquid level
transmitter on its perchloroethylene (PCE) degreaser, install
a CO₂ degreaser as partial replacement of the PCE
degreaser, calculate emissions for the PCE degreaser, and
thereafter meet and maintain all compliance requirements for
both degreasers.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Perchloroethylene (PCE) and solvent, amounts and %
reductions unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: BUCKO CONSTRUCTION CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Berman / Loren Denton
Location: Gary, Indiana (Lake County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, NWI
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 114
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: October 27, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA
information concerning its compliance with Section 114 of
the CAA, and to perform a stack test.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: C.S.C. LIMITED
Attorney/Program Contacts: Constandina Dalianis / Rae-Lynn Trine
Location: Warren, Ohio (Trumbull County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 114
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 11, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA information concerning both its stack testing during the last five years and its permits to install facility equipment.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: U.S. v. CARDINAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Attorney/Program Contacts: Richard Wagner / Charles Hall
Location: Tallmadge, Ohio (Summit County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: March 24, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Reporting
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Original/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$5,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to submit quarterly reports on asbestos removal projects, as required by the asbestos NESHAPs.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: CARTER CHROME
Attorney/Program Contacts: Andre Daugavietis / Cynthia Curtis
Location: Muncie, Indiana (Delaware County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 24, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Testing, Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$35,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install a new air blower to come into compliance with the air NESHAP.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Chromium, 0.06 mg/dscm (400% reduction).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: CHROME INDUSTRIES, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Andre Daugavietis / Julie Brandt
Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 17, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to take and report daily pressure drop readings across its composite mesh pad control system, and to conduct routine inspections of the entire control and plating system. The order also requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA and the State quarterly reports concerning these readings and inspections.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Chromium, amount and % unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: CINCINNATI MILACRON (D-M-E)
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Nhien Pham
Location: Cincinnati, Ohio (Hamilton County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: December 2, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Industrial Process Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$40,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement two pollution prevention projects, which will eliminate all hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions.
Quantitative Reduction(s): HAPs, 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.
Potential ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: CINERGY CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Dave Schulz
Location: New Richmond, Ohio (Clermont County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Sections 109 and 110
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order (assessing penalty)
Administrative Compliance Order (injunctive relief)
Date of Order: Penalty Order: May 4, 1998
Compliance Order: February 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing and Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100,000
Original/Final Penalty: \$77,000 / \$63,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct stack tests on particulate matter (PM) for three years. If any of the tests is failed, the Respondent must test quarterly for the first year until it comes into compliance and bi-annually for years two and three until it comes into compliance.
Quantitative Reduction(s): PM, 250 tons/year.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: COHEN INDUSTRIAL SCRAP PROCESSORS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Debra Carlson / Kenneth Tenny

Location: Cincinnati, Ohio (Hamilton County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 608
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: April 24, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order is a cease and desist order, requiring the Respondent to stop scrap processing and submit a plan to U.S. EPA for future processing which complies with regulations.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: COHEN INDUSTRIAL SCRAP PROCESSORS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Debra Carlson / Kenneth Tenny
Location: Cincinnati, Ohio (Hamilton County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 608
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: June 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: This order follows the April 24, 1998 order which required the Respondent to stop scrap processing and submit a plan to U.S. EPA for future processing which complies with regulations. This order requires that the Respondent either buy equipment to recover refrigerant or not accept appliances which contain refrigerant in order to come into compliance with CAA regulations.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: CRUCIBLE MATERIALS CORP.
(Trent Tube Engineering)
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Spiros Bourgikos
Location: East Troy, Wisconsin (Walworth County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The Respondent had purchased a freeboard refrigeration device, but had delayed installation of one part (the control panel) of the device. This order requires the Respondent to install the control panel.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: DETROIT, CITY OF, DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS
(DETROIT BRUSH BURNER FACILITY)
Attorney/Program Contacts: Bobb Beauchamp / Jeff Gahris
Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: May 15, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Original/Final Penalty: \$58,000 / \$5,000
SEP: \$25,000 in Pollution Prevention
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to close its Brush Burner Facility.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: DOLLOFF INDUSTRIES, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Robert Thompson / Julie Brandt
Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$50,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to use interim controls, to order, install, and test long-term controls, and to report milestone activities to U.S. EPA.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Chromium, 1.16 tons/year (18.3% reduction).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: DYNACHEM, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Susan Muller / Loren Denton
Location: Georgetown, Illinois (Vermilion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: January 13, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to collect samples from each of its waste streams subject to the rule at 40 C.F.R. Section 61.355, calculate its 1997 Total Annual Benzene, and submit the results to U.S. EPA.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: FORD ELECTRONICS AND REFRIGERATION CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Nhien Pham
Location: Connersville, Indiana (Fayette County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: December 2, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Industrial Process Change

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$40,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement two pollution prevention projects, which will eliminate all hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions.
Quantitative Reduction(s): HAPs, 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.
Potential ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: U.S. v. FORD MOTOR CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Christine Liszewski / Brent Marable
Location: Chicago, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: February 10, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$135,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to comply with a program for the reduction of emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from materials used in cleanup solvents.
Quantitative Reduction(s): VOCs, amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: FOUNTAIN FOUNDRY, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Robert Guenther / Bonnie Bush
Location: Veedersburg, Indiana (Fountain County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: June 16, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$76,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$87,408 / \$18,000
SEP: \$118,598 (Pollution Prevention/Pollution Reduction)

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to replace bags in its baghouse and install a new opacity monitor.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Particulate matter (PM), amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: GENERAL MOTORS CORP., SAGINAW] METAL CASTING OPERATION
Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Farrio Assadi
Location: Saginaw, Michigan (Saginaw County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: October 21, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1.3 million
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install a high energy scrubber on its moldline casting shakeout process.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Particulate matter (PM), 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: H. KRAMER & CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Nhien Pham
Location: Chicago, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Sections 109 and 110
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: November 14, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$5,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) implement managerial controls to reduce the potential loss of fugitive emissions; (2) install institutional controls to facilitate the coordination of charging/pouring activities at the furnaces and Baghouse 5; (3) debottleneck Baghouse 6 to reduce humidity problems; (4) increase the size of the R2 hood and

position it closer to the pouring area if possible; (5) reduce duct work disturbances and repair leaks in the ductwork; and (6) implement a predictive maintenance program.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: HAMILTON, CITY OF (MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC PLANT)

Attorney/Program Contacts: None / David Schulz
Location: Hamilton, Ohio (Butler County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: October 17, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Testing, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to upgrade and repair existing control equipment, and install new control equipment. The order also requires the Respondent to regularly report on its continuous opacity monitoring for nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂).

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: INDIANAPOLIS POWER AND LIGHT CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Leslie Kirby / David Schulz
Location: Indianapolis, Indiana (Marion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Testing, Recordkeeping, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100,000
Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to operate one of its boilers at a derated load until that boiler is converted to coke oven gas/natural gas firing, and to conduct stack tests and implement additional reporting procedures to ensure compliance with applicable requirements.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Sulfur dioxide (SO₂), 10% reduction.
Particulate matter (PM), 25% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: JASPER FURNITURE CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Janice Loughlin / Brent Marable
Location: Jasper, Indiana (Dubois County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 26, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Training
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$500
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to reformulate one noncompliant coating.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), 500 lbs/year.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: K.B. RECYCLING, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sabrina Argentieri / Joseph Cardile
Location: West Branch, Michigan (Ogemaw County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 114
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: February 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA information needed to determine if the Respondent is in compliance with 40 CFR, Part 82, Subpart F.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: LWG FINISHING COMPANY (HARD SURFACE TECHNOLOGY)

Attorney/Program Contacts: Andre Daugavietis / Julie Brandt

Location: Fairfield, Ohio (Butler County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order (assessing penalty)
Administrative Compliance Order (injunctive relief)

Date of Order: Penalty order: September 4, 1998

Compliance order: June 18, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Other

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1,823

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$92,400 / \$2,500

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to upgrade the operations equipment for the controls, and to regularly report on its emissions to U.S. EPA and the State.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Chromium, 0.0203 tons/year (99% reduction).

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: LINCOLN ELECTRIC CO.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Jose de Leon / David Schultz

Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 113

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: September 30, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1 million

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$177,000 / \$50,000

SEP: \$406,400 (Pollution Prevention and Reduction)

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to switch from gas to coal for use in its industrial processes.

Quantitative Reduction(s): [Amounts and % reductions unavailable.]
Particulate matter (PM).
Carbon dioxide (CO₂).
Sulfur dioxide (SO₂).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: U.S. v. M&O ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Nicole Cantello / Linda Hamsing
Location: Hazel Crest, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Sections 112 and 114
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: January 27, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Training
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Original/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$100,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to institute a compliance program designed to ensure that there is enough supervision at asbestos removal sites to comply with applicable regulations.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual worker protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: U.S. v. M.K. MOORE & SONS, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Janice Loughlin / Charles Hall
Location: Dayton, Ohio (Montgomery County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: September 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping, Training
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Original/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$70,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to provide training to all supervisors and asbestos abatement workers, install transparent port windows at the entrances of all containment

areas, and provide to U.S. EPA quarterly reports of all asbestos removal projects.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: CITY OF MONROE FIRE & RESCUE ASSOC.
(Note: This was one ACO issued as part of one case against Abner Environmental; two other ACOs were issued, one to Morning, John, and the other to R & K Construction).

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Christina Prasinos
Location: Monroe, Wisconsin (Green County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: October 31, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide notice to U.S. EPA before beginning a demolition or renovation project and must adequately wet all Regulated Asbestos Containing Material (RACM) during projects and dispose of the RACM as soon as is practicable at a waste disposal site.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Reductions beyond compliance requirements.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.
Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: MORNING, JOHN
(Note: This was one ACO issued as part of one case against Abner Environmental; two other ACOs were issued, one to City of Monroe Fire & Rescue Association, and the other to R & K Construction).

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Christina Prasinos
Location: Evansville, Wisconsin (Rock County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: November 13, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal

Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide notice to U.S. EPA before beginning a demolition or renovation project and must adequately wet all Regulated Asbestos Containing Material (RACM) during projects and dispose of the RACM as soon as is practicable at a waste disposal site.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Reductions beyond compliance requirements.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.
Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name: U.S. v. NATIONAL STEEL CORP., GRANITE CITY DIVISION
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Martin / Emmett Keegan
Location: Granite City, Illinois (Madison County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GAT
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 113
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: August 26, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1,722,000
Original/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$546,700
SEP: Pollution Reduction (\$1,682,871)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to add a fourth electrostatic precipitator (ESP) to its three existing ESPs. The ESPs control the particulate matter (PM) collected by the primary and secondary collection systems in the basic oxygen furnace (BOF) shop. The enforcement action was the result of high opacity levels from the BOF ESP stack.
Quantitative Reduction(s): PM, 37 tons/year (12% reduction).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: ONEKAMA SCHOOLS
Attorney/Program Contacts: James Cha / Sherry Finley and Gurcharn Jhaj
Location: Onekama, Michigan (Manistee County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 25, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to comply with asbestos NESHAP and CAA Section 112 requirements in any future demolition or renovation projects.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: OUTLET MALL, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Terry Branigan / Jeff Gahrns
Location: Manitowoc, Wisconsin (Manitowoc County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: June 18, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to properly remove asbestos remaining on five interior columns.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Asbestos, 125 sq. feet.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: PRAIRIE CENTRAL COOPERATIVE
Attorney/Program Contacts: Karl Karg / Linda Hamsing
Location: Weston, Illinois (McLean County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Industrial Process Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$10,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install a control device or reduce the amount of grain processed.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Particulate matter (PM), 5 tons/year (25% reduction).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: R & K CONSTRUCTION
(Note: This was one ACO issued as part of one case against Abner Environmental; two other ACOs were issued, one to City of Monroe Fire & Rescue Association, and the other to Morning, John).

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Christina Prasinis
Location: Evansville, Wisconsin (Rock County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: November 3, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide notice to U.S. EPA before beginning a demolition or renovation project and must adequately wet all Regulated Asbestos Containing Material (RACM) during projects and dispose of the RACM as soon as is practicable at a waste disposal site.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Reductions beyond compliance requirements.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.
Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: R & M Appliance Service, Inc.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Alan Walts / Loren Denton
Location: Bridgeview, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 114
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: August 7, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to supply information concerning the Respondent's compliance with 40 C.F.R. Part 82 Subpart F (Recycling and Emissions Reduction), which sets forth conditions for the service, maintenance, repair and disposal of appliances containing substances which deplete the ozone layer.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: R.S.V., INC.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Sabrina Argentieri / Nancy Mugavero

Location: Steubenville, Ohio (Jefferson County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: October 27, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Other

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to stop the demolition of a building.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Asbestos, 1,210 cubic yards (100% reduction).

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.
Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: R.S.V., INC.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Sabrina Argentieri / Nancy Mugavero

Location: Steubenville, Ohio (Jefferson County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: January 6, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Other

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to resume work (demolition of a building; see 10-27-97 order) in accordance with regulations, and to perform additional testing and monitoring.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Asbestos, 1,210 cubic yards (90% reduction).

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.
Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: RICHARDS INDUSTRIES, INC.

Attorney/Program Contacts: James Cha / Julie Brandt

Location: Cincinnati, Ohio (Hamilton County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: September 22, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$16,855

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$50,050 / \$27,500

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct a performance test in compliance with the requirements of the Chrome Plating NESHAP, and to submit to U.S. EPA a complete report of the test.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: SHELCO STEEL WORKS, INC.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Kevin Chow / Bonnie Bush

Location: South Holland, Illinois (Cook County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC

Statute Violated: CAA, Sections 113 and 114

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: January 16, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Use Reduction

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to use compliant coatings, i.e., coatings with 3.5 pounds or less of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) per gallon of coating (excluding water and exempt solvents).
Quantitative Reduction(s): VOCs, amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: TIODIZE MICHIGAN, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Lillian Pinzon / Farrio Assadi
Location: Wixom, Michigan (Oakland County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 111
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: May 7, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Use Reduction
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$20,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$40,388 / \$40,388
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to reformulate its surface coating solvents to reduce their content of volatile organic compounds (VOCs).
Quantitative Reduction(s): VOCs, 27 tons/year (100% reduction).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: UNITED MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS USA, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Lynn Kuo
Location: Eastlake, Ohio (Lake County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Industrial Process Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$650,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement projects to eliminate all hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions.
Quantitative Reduction(s): HAPs, 100% reductions.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.
Potential ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: U.S. v. UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
Attorney/Program Contacts: Jeffrey Cox / Howard Caine
Location: Notre Dame, Indiana (St. Joseph County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 110
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: March 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Use Reduction,
Emissions/Discharge Change, Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$120,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$250,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to: perform repairs on its multiclones for Boilers 2 and 3; improve its coal blending procedures to reduce sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions from Boiler 4; switch to natural gas to reduce particulate matter (PM) emissions from Boiler 4 in order to achieve compliance with the SIP limit; and install, operate, and certify continuous opacity monitors on Boilers 2 and 3.
Quantitative Reduction(s): PM, 197 tons/year.
SO₂, 210 tons/year.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: WINNEBAGO MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTE
Attorney/Program Contacts: Louise Gross / Christina Prasinis
Location: Winnebago, Wisconsin (Winnebago County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CAA, Section 112
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: November 13, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change, Testing
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$10,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install new control equipment and to conduct stack testing.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Particulate matter (PM), 15 tons/year (99% reduction).
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: U.S. v. WORLD COLOR PRESS, INC. (Alden Division)

Attorney/Program Contacts: Janice Loughlin / Emmett Keegan

Location: Elk Grove Village, Illinois (Cook County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC

Statute Violated: CAA, Section 113

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: December 15, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$750,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$615,000 / \$250,000

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to replace five condensing units with a single afterburner, thereby resulting in more efficient control of volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

Quantitative Reduction(s): VOCs, 63 tons/year (83% reduction).

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Statute Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief:	53
Total cost value of injunctive relief:	\$180,696,724
Average cost value of injunctive relief:	\$5,646,773
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties:	0
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs:	0

Superfund Site Name: ALLIED PAPER/PORTAGE CREEK/ KALAMAZOO RIVER SUPERFUND SITE
[Note: This case involved a cash-out settlement pursuant to a prospective purchaser agreement. No order was issued in this case.]

PRPs: Millenium Holdings, Inc. (settling party).

Attorney/Program Contacts: Eileen Furey / Brad Stimple

Location: Allegan and Kalamazoo Counties, Michigan

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 107

Type of Settlement: Cash-Out, pursuant to CERCLA, Section 122(h)

Date of Settlement: June 2, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$7.5 million

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: Pursuant to the terms of this 122(h) cash-out settlement, the settling party will fund U.S. EPA's time-critical removal action at the Bryant Mill Pond Area of this Superfund Site. In exchange for payment of \$7.5 million, Millenium Holdings, Inc. will receive a covenant not to sue under sections 106 and 107 of CERCLA and section 7003 of RCRA for the Bryant Mill Pond Area and the removal action.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: AVANTI SUPERFUND SITE (INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY PORTION)
PRPs: Johnson Controls/Globe Union; St. Joes Minerals; Alter Co.; Ace Battery; Brodey & Brodey, Inc.; J. Solotken & Co.; Exide Corp.; Corning, Inc.; Kohler Corp.; SW Industries; Oxide & Chemical.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Kevin Chow / Sonia Vega
Location: Indianapolis, Indiana (Marion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: June 3, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$2.2 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to implement a removal action workplan (previously drafted) for the Industrial Property portion of the Site.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Lead-contaminated soil, 47,000 cubic yards.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: BOSTWICK DRUM SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Robert Brown.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael McClary / Carol Graszer-Ropski
Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Order: Administrative Order on Consent
Date of Order: October 21, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: N/A - Respondent has refused to comply.
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: N/A - Respondent has refused to comply.
Quantitative Reduction(s): N/A - Respondent has refused to comply.
Environmental Benefit(s): N/A - Respondent has refused to comply.

Superfund Site Name: BUCKEYE RECLAMATION LANDFILL
SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Allegheny Ludlum Corp.; Aristech Chemical Corp.; Ashland, Inc.;
Beazer East, Inc.; Consolidation Coal Co.; National Steel Corp.; The
Pullman Co.; SKF USA, Inc.; Triangle Wire & Cable, Inc.; USX
Corp.; Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp.; Belmont County, Ohio;
Cravat Coal; Ohio Resources Corp.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Monesh Chabria / Mary Tierney

Location: St. Clairsville, Ohio (Belmont County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: March 17, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$26-33 million

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to implement a
remediation plan to remove various hazardous substances at
the affected site, which was listed on the National Priorities
List on September 9, 1983.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: CANNELTON INDUSTRIES, INC. SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Cannelton Industries, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Rosita Clarke

Location: Sault St. Marie, Michigan (Chippewa County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: March 11, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Release Assessment/Remedial Design

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement the
remedial design of the selected remedy for the Site, which
consists of the excavation of chromium-contaminated soil
for disposal in an offsite landfill.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Chromium-contaminated soil, 40,000 cubic yards.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Actual ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: CELOTEX SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: T.L.C. Trust (Ronald Cruse, President).
Attorney/Program Contacts: Eva Hahn / Steve Faryan
Location: Wilmington, Illinois
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: August 19, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$71,966 (minimum)
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to remove asbestos from soil and groundwater at the Site.

Quantitative Reduction(s): [Amounts and % reductions unavailable.]
Asbestos (soil and groundwater).
Flammable liquids (soil and groundwater).
Caustic liquids (soil and groundwater).

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: CITY BUMPER SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: General Dynamics Corp.; Enron Corp.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Anastasio / Steve Renninger
Location: Cincinnati, Ohio (Hamilton County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: March 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1,000,000
[Total cost is \$1,500,000, to be shared with third PRP, Praxair, Inc., which was issued a separate order.]
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to clean up the mercury-contaminated process towers at the Site, which is located in Lower Price Hill, one of U.S. EPA's environmental justice areas.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Mercury, amount and % reduction unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: CITY BUMPER SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Praxair, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Anastasio / Steve Renninger

Location: Cincinnati, Ohio (Hamilton County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: March 30, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$500,000
[Total cost is \$1,500,000, to be shared with the other two PRPs, General Dynamics Corp. and Enron Corp., which were served a separate order.]

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to clean up the mercury-contaminated process towers at the Site, which is located in Lower Price Hill, one of U.S. EPA's environmental justice areas.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Mercury, amount and % reduction unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: CONRAIL SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Consolidated Rail Corp.; Penn Central Corp., aka American Underwriters, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Cynthia King / Brad Bradley

Location: Elkhart, Indiana (Elkhart County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107

Type of Order: Consent Decree

Date of Order: November 11, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$7 million

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to provide, with U.S. EPA oversight, 1150 homes in the area of the Site with an alternate water supply.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available, except that trichloroethylene and carbon tetrachloride will fall below required concentrations.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health protection.
Potential worker and ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Superfund Site Name: DIXIE AUTO SALVAGE SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: General Electric Co.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Richard Clarizio / Kevin Adler
Location: Danville, Illinois (Vermillion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106, 107, and 122
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Superfund Administrative Order for Cost Recovery
[Both orders were issued jointly in this case.]

Date of Order: September 2, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Restoration, Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$3 to 4 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to excavate and consolidate under a cap on-site soils contaminated with polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and lead (Pb) that are located at the site and in an adjacent stream. Additionally, the Respondent will take measure to enhance the habitat in the area for certain State endangered and threatened species.
Quantitative Reduction(s): PCBs (soil and surface water), amount and % reduction unavailable.
Lead (Pb) (soil), amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: EAGLE PICHER SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Bunting Bearings Corp.; Eagle Picher Industries.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Craig Melodia / Matthew Ohl
Location: Delta, Ohio (Fulton County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Sections 104 and 106
Type of Order: Administrative Order on Consent
Date of Order: March 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to conduct an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) to select a response action to address Site contamination. U.S. EPA will then select one of the proposed alternatives, which will be implemented by the PRPs.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
 Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: FIELDS BROOK SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Cabot Corp.; Centerior Energy Corp.; Consolidated Rail Corp.; Detrex Corp.; GenCor; Millenium Inorganic Chemicals, Inc.; Occidental Chemical Co.; Ohio Power Co.; RMI Titanium Co.; Sherwin Williams Co.; Union Carbide Corp.; Viacom International, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Terese van Donsel
Location: Ashtabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 17, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design/Remedial Action
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to excavate or cover contaminated soil, and dispose of any excavated soil in a landfill constructed for OU 1 and 4 waste.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.
 Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: FIELDS BROOK SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Consolidated Rail Corp.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Terese van Donsel
Location: Ashtabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 24, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to excavate or cover contaminated soil, and dispose of any excavated soil in a landfill constructed for OU 1 and 4 waste.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: FIELDS BROOK SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Detrex, Corp.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Terese van Donsel
Location: Astabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 24, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to construct a slurry wall and install extraction wells to capture and treat contaminated groundwater.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: FIELDS BROOK SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Detrex, Corp.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Terese van Donsel
Location: Astabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 24, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to clean the Site's sewers and dispose of contaminated material in a landfill. If the sewer cannot be cleaned, the Respondents are to close it off and replace it.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: FIELDS BROOK SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Millenium Inorganic Chemicals, Inc.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Terese van Donsel
Location: Ashtabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 24, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to excavate or cover contaminated soil, and dispose of any excavated soil in a landfill constructed for OU 1 and 4 waste.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: FIELDS BROOK SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: RMI Titanium Co.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Terese van Donsel
Location: Ashtabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 24, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$101,530
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to excavate or cover contaminated soil, and dispose of any excavated soil in a landfill constructed for OU 1 and 4 waste.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: FIELDS BROOK SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Acme Scrap Iron & Metal Co.; Centerior Energy Corp.; Ohio Power.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Peter Felitti / Terese van Donsel
Location: Ashtabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 29, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to excavate or cover contaminated soil, and dispose of any excavated soil in a landfill constructed for OU 1 and 4 waste.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: GRAFTON, TOWNSHIP OF RESIDENTIAL WELL CONTAMINATION SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Town of Grafton; Village of Grafton; James Denow; Rexnord Corp.; Tecumseh Products; Brunswick Corp.; RHI Holding (successor to Rexnord Plastics Division).

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Nash / Kaushalya Khanna, Ken Theisen, Joe Malek

Location: Grafton, Wisconsin (Ozaukee County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: May 21, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$47,000

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide an alternate water supply to the residents of the Township of Grafton who were affected by a plume of vinyl chloride contamination emanating from an old landfill. This action will be accomplished by extending municipal water lines from the Village of Grafton to the Town's residents in the affected area.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health protection.

Superfund Site Name: H. BROWN CO. SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: H. Brown Co., Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Cynthia King / Timothy Prendiville

Location: Walker, Michigan (Kent County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107

Type of Order: Consent Decree

Date of Order: April 28, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to establish a remedial design for future remediation activities.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Superfund Site Name: HOLMDEN AVENUE SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Master Metals, Inc.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Kris Vezner / Ababi Harris
Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: October 23, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$2.275 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to remove 3,000 cubic yards of lead (Pb)-impacted soil from the Holmden Avenue Superfund Site (such that lead (Pb) concentrations are reduced to 400 ppm or less). The order also requires the Respondent to demolish and remove several lead (Pb)-contaminated structures, including fifty 55-gallon drums, and to remove lead (Pb)-impacted soil from the main Master Metals facility.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Lead (Pb), 50 drums and 3,000+ yards of impacted soil.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: J&L LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: LTV Steel Company.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Nash / Laura Evans
Location: Rochester Hills, Michigan (Oakland County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: None (applicable statute is CERCLA, Section 106)
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: June 5, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$700,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement the Record of Decision (ROD) for Operable Unit 2 at the Site. The ROD requires additional groundwater monitoring and institutional controls, and provides for the provision of an alternative water supply as a contingent remedy if the monitoring program detects certain exceedances in down-gradient groundwater attributable to the landfill by trend analysis.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Superfund Site Name: KYSOR INDUSTRIAL SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Kysor Industrial Corp.; Robert W. Meyer, Jr.; Raymond Weigel (part of Kysor for settlement purposes).

Attorney/Program Contacts: Cynthia King / Leah Evison

Location: Cadillac, Michigan (Wexford County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107

Type of Order: Consent Decree

Date of Order: December 16, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design/Remedial Action

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$4.7 million

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendants to remove contaminated sediments, water, and soil from the Site.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Trichloroethylene (TCE) (groundwater), 99% reduction.
1,1,1-Trichloroethane (TCA) (groundwater), 99% reduction.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.
Potential human health protection.

Superfund Site Name: LAKE PETRO STATION TRUCK STOP SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Bostik; Hahn Systems; Matrix Coating, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Turner / Arlene Lilly, Sonia Vega

Location: Gary, Indiana (Lake County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, NWI

Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: December 19, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to remove completely from the Site a number of low flash-point substances (volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-VOCs, and methyl ethyl ketone (MEK)).
Quantitative Reduction(s): VOCs, amount and % reduction unavailable.
Semi-VOCs, amount and % reduction unavailable.
MEK, amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: LEMON LAKE LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Brian Griffin.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Jeff Cahn / Thomas Alcamo
Location: Bloomington, Indiana (Monroe County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 104
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: April 16, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Site Access
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide access to his property (which is adjacent to the Lemon Lake Landfill Superfund Site).
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: MADISON METRO SEWERAGE DISTRICT
SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: City of Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Krueger / Leah Evison
Location: Madison, Wisconsin (Dane County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107

Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: May 27, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design/Remedial Action
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1.8 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to implement the remedy selected by U.S. EPA for the Site. This remedy involves the construction of dikes, the installation of geotextile layer and vegetative cover, and ongoing monitoring and maintenance.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.
Actual ecosystem protection.
Exceedance of compliance requirements.

Superfund Site Name: MAIN STREET WELL FIELD SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Excel Corp.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Nidhi O'Meara / Deb Orr and Lolita Hill
Location: Elkhart, Indiana (Elkhart County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: June 9, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal, RFI/CMS
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$407,600
Original/Final Penalty: None/None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to remove contaminated soil from the site.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Organic and halogenated compounds, amounts and % reductions unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health protection.

Superfund Site Name: MARINA CLIFF BARREL DUMP SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Badger Paint and Hardware; BASF Corp.; Benjamin Moore & Co.; Chrysler Corp.; General Motors Corp.; Glidden Co.; Harnischgeder Corp.; Hercules, Inc.; S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.; Kearney & Trecker Corp.; Kimberly-Clark Corp.; Mautz Paint Co.; Menasha Printing Ink Co.; 3M Co.; Outboard Marina Corp. (Evinrude Motors); Pfsiter & Vogel Leather Co.; PPG Industries, Inc.; Reichhold Chemicals, Inc.;

Scott Paper Co.; Sherwin-William Co.; Speed Queen Corp.; Tousey Varnish Co.; Towne Realty; Valspar Corp.; Wisconsin Solvents and Chemicals; ZPC Industrial Coatings.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Krueger / Valerie Mullins
Location: Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Milwaukee County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 104 and 106
Type of Settlement: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: July 22, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Site Access, Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Restoration, Removal, Labeling/Manifesting, Information Letter Response

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$2 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to conduct the removal of drums containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) which are stacked and partly submerged in soil at the Site (for an estimated 50 to 60 years), as well as of affected soil. There includes evidence of illegal dumping of various debris, which must also be removed. PPG, Inc. is the principal PRP while Towne Realty is the owner of the property.

Quantitative Reduction(s): PCBs (soil and potential groundwater), 10 parts per million (ppm).

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: MASTER METALS, INC. SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Shannon, Dale R.; Allied Signal, Inc.; Chrysler Corporation; Ford Motor Company; General Motors Corporation; NL Industries, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Kris Vezner / Rosanne Ellison
Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: June 26, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Site Access, Restoration, Removal, Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Labeling/Manifesting, Information Letter Response

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1.25 million (rough estimate)

Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to develop an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), under which the removal and disposal of hazardous substances will occur. The order also requires the Respondents to submit to U.S. EPA for approval a Removal Work Plan, weekly progress reports, and a final report, and to provide access to the Site. The Respondents have agreed to pay all past costs.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: NATIONAL PRESTO INDUSTRIES SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: National Defense Corp.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Brad Beeson / Mike Bellot
Location: Eau Claire, Wisconsin (Eau Claire County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Settlement: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Settlement: September 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration, Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$725,628
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) install a soil vapor extraction (SVE) system to remove volatile organic compound (VOC) vapors from the soil beneath Lagoon #1; (2) backfill Lagoon #1 once the SVE has removed the VOCs; (3) place contaminated, stockpiled soils beneath the Melby Road Disposal Site cap; and (4) conduct long-term operation and maintenance of the Melby Road Disposal Site.

Quantitative Reduction(s): VOCs (gas contained in soil), 800 gallons.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: NORTH SANITARY LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE,
aka VALLEYCREST SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: NCR Corp; General Motors Corp.; North Sanitary Landfill Co.; Industrial Waste Disposal; Blaylock Trucking c/o Waste Management North America; Danis Industries, Inc.; Dayton Industrial Drum; Gayston Corp.; Bendix (Allied Signal); DAP/Roberts Consolidated.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Sean Mulrone / Carol Grazer-Ropski

Location: Dayton, Ohio (Montgomery County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Settlement: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: September 10, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$10 million

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to conduct the removal of soil contaminated with heavy metals, unknown solvents, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).

Quantitative Reduction(s): [Amounts and % reductions unavailable.]
Heavy metals (soil),.
Unknown solvents (soil).
PCBs (soil).

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: POWELL ROAD LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE
(Final Design Administrative Order)

PRPs: Chrysler Corp.; DAP, Inc.; Delco (General Motors Corp.); Laidlaw Waste Systems; Waste Management of Ohio.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Jeffrey Cahn / Michael Bellot

Location: Huber Heights, Ohio (Montgomery County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: May 6, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design/Remedial Action

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$23 million (shared with Groundwater UAO)

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to construct and implement the 100% final approved remedial design for the site, and to design, construct, and implement an on-site leachate treatment system when so directed in the future by U.S. EPA.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: POWELL ROAD LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE
(Groundwater Administrative Order)

PRPs: Chrysler Corp.; DAP, Inc.; Delco (General Motors Corp.); Laidlaw Waste Systems; Waste Management of Ohio.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Jeffrey Cahn / Michael Bellot

Location: Huber Heights, Ohio (Montgomery County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: May 6, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$23 million (shared with Final Design UAO)

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to design, construct, and implement a groundwater pump and treatment system.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: PREMIER CHEMICAL SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Jana R. Bryant.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Turner / Bill Simes and Arlene Finley

Location: Gary, Indiana (Lake County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, NWI

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: July 17, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct a removal at the Premier Chemical Superfund Site to remove soil contaminated with trichloroethylene, hydrochloric acid, and other solvents.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Trichloroethylene (TCE) (soil), amount and % unavailable.
Hydrochloric acid (HCl) (soil), amount and % unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: RAMONA PARK BATTERY CASING AREA
SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Auburn Supply Co.; Chrysler Corp.; Detroit Edison Co.; Ford Motor Co.; General Motors Corp.; Glick Iron & Metal Co.; H. Hirschfield Sons Co.; L. Surath & Sons, Inc.; Michigan Bell Telephone Co.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; SLC Recycling Industries, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Monesh Chabria / Laura Evans

Location: Utica, Michigan (Macomb County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI

Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: May 14, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Other

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$75,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct an Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) to determine future actions, and to pay oversight costs.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: REILLY TAR & CHEMICAL CORP. SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Karen Peaceman / Tom Short

Location: Dover, Ohio (Tuscarawas County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107 (applicable section)

Type of Order: Consent Decree

Date of Order: September 10, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design/Remedial Action, RFI/CMS

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$3 million

Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to perform a RCRA facility investigation (RFI) and conduct the remedial design/remedial action (RD/RA).
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: SOUTHEAST ROCKFORD GROUNDWATER SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: City of Rockford, Illinois.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Turner / Russell Hart
Location: Rockford, Illinois (Winnebago County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: April 8, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Action
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$3.3 million
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to perform a remedial action cleanup of groundwater contamination at the Southeast Rockford Groundwater Site. The remedial action will be performed pursuant to an Illinois EPA Record of Decision (ROD) issued in September, 1995. The ROD calls for the attenuation of the groundwater through natural sources, monitoring, and containment, as well as the elimination of current and potential routes of human exposure to the contaminated groundwater.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: SOUTH GREEN AVENUE SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: MichCon Consolidated Gas Co.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Anastasio / Ralph Dollhopf
Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: July 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$5 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to perform a comprehensive site investigation and EE/CA, provide a recommendation concerning a site cleanup alternative, and then implement the cleanup alternative.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: SPRINGFIELD ARMATURE SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Sherer Industrial Group.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thor Ketzback / Carol Graszer-Ropski
Location: Springfield, Ohio (Clark County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: July 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct an extent of contamination study for the Springfield Site.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Akzo Coatings, Inc.; Chrysler Corp.; Detrex Corp.; Federal Sere Works; Ford Motor Co.; General Motors Corp.; Great Lakes Division of National Steel Corp.; HNA Holdings, Inc. (fka Hoechst Celanese Corp.); TRW, Inc.; Michelin North America, Inc., Successor to Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Co.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Richard Clarizio / Kevin Adler
Location: Davisburg, Michigan (Oakland County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: September 14, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design/Remedial Action
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$4 - 13 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendants to perform a Remedial Design/Remedial Action consisting of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)- and lead (Pb)-laden soils treatment, volatile organic compounds (VOCs)-laden soils treatment, and groundwater pump and treatment. The order also requires that institutional controls (deed restrictions) be established.

Quantitative Reduction(s): PCBs (soil), amount and % unavailable.
 Lead (Pb) (soil), amount and % unavailable.
 VOCs (soil and groundwater), amount and % unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
 Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: STICKNEY LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: City of Toledo, Ohio.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sherry Estes / Michael Gifford
Location: Toledo, Ohio (Lucas County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: March 6, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to accept leachate from the Stickney Landfill Site at its publicly-owned treatment works, as long as the leachate is within certain analytical parameters.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.

Superfund Site Name: STICKNEY/TYLER LANDFILLS SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Allied Signal, Inc.; AP Parts International, Inc.; Blade Communications, Inc.; BFI Systems of North America, Inc. successor to Browning-Ferris Industries, Inc.; Centerior Energy Corp.; Chevron USA, Inc.; Chrysler Corp.; City of Toledo (municipal corporation); Cooper Industries; Cytec Industries, Inc.; Dana Corp.; E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co.; EnviroSAFE Services of Ohio, fka "Fondessey Enterprises, Inc."; Flower Hospital; Gencorp, Inc.; Mercy Hospital of Toledo, Ohio, Inc.; Owens-Illinois, Inc. and Libbey Glass, Inc.; Riverside Hospital, Northcoast Health Systems, Inc.; St. Charles Hospital of Oregon, Ohio; St. Lukes Hospital; St. Vincent Medical Center, Inc.; Toledo Hospital, Promedica Health Systems, Inc.; City Auto Stamping Division of Shellar-Globe Corp.; Waste Management of Ohio, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Sherry Estes / Michael Gifford
Location: Toledo, Ohio (Lucas County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106, 107, and 122
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: February 27, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal, Provide Site Access
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$26 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to design, finance, and construct the multi-layer cover systems proposed in U.S. EPA's Enforcement Action Memoranda issued 1-22-96 for the Stickney Avenue and Tyler Street Landfills and the central portion of the XXKem facility.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
 Environmental restoration and improved land use.
 Increased public awareness.
 Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: SUN MACHINE PARTS & TOOLING SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Sun Machine Parts & Tooling Co.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Alan Walts / Debbie Regel
Location: Chicago, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: October 6, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$343,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to remove from its facility (and dispose properly of) an undetermined amount of sulfuric acid.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄), amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: TAR LAKE SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: 56th Century Antrim Iron Co., Inc.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Mary Fulghum / Richard Dollhopf
Location: Mancelona, Michigan (Antrim County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: May 26, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal, Site Access
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$8 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct a time-critical removal of wood tar from a two-acre lagoon.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Wood tar (water, soil), 25,000 cubic yards.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: TEXACO REFINERY SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Texaco, Inc.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Martin / Beth Henning and Kevin Turner
Location: Lawrenceville, Illinois (Lawrence County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: October 27, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$200,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to remove acid sludge material from a residential neighborhood.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Acid sludge (soil), 485 tons.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health protection.

Superfund Site Name: TOLEDO TIE TREATMENT SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Kerr McGee Chemical, LLC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael J. McClary / Deborah Orr
Location: Toledo, Ohio (Lucas County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Settlement: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: December 24, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not applicable - Respondent refused to comply with order.
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to remove hazardous substances from the site, including soil removal.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not applicable - Respondent refused to comply with order.
Environmental Benefit(s): Not applicable - Respondent refused to comply with order.

Superfund Site Name: TRI-COUNTY/ELGIN LANDFILLS SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Waste Management of Illinois, Inc.; Tri-County Landfill Co.
Attorney/Program Contacts: William Clune / John O'Grady
Location: South Elgin, Illinois (Kane County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 107
Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order
Date of Order: September 24, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remedial Design/Remedial Action
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$16.65 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to: (1) Perform a remedial action (“RA”) by implementing the approved 100% Final Remedial Design (“RD”) for the remedy described in the Record of Decision for the Site, dated 9-30-92, as modified by an Explanation of Significant Difference, dated 4-23-98, and (2) Perform a Remedial Design for the groundwater treatment remedy described in the Record of Decision for the Site, dated 9-30-92, and deferred by the 6-25-96 Explanation of Significant Differences, and to implement the design by performing a Remedial Action.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: TYLER STREET LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Ronald Gorney; Mark Gorney; Linn Gorney.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Sherry Estes / Michael Gifford

Location: Toledo, Ohio (Lucas County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 104 and 106

Type of Settlement: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: October 3, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Site Access

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to provide site access to allow other parties to complete response activities at the Tyler Landfill Superfund Site. The order also requires the relocation of used automobiles, and temporary and permanent restriction on the use of the property.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: UNIROYAL PLASTICS - HILL STREET SUPERFUND SITE

Prospective Purchasers: State of Indiana; City of Mishawaka.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Hedi Bogda-Cleveland / Valerie Mullins

Location: Mishawaka, Indiana (St. Joseph County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB

Applicable Statute: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107
Type of Settlement: Prospective Purchasers Agreement
Date of Settlement: August 13, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Not applicable
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not applicable
Original/Final Penalty: Not applicable
SEP: Not applicable
Injunctive Relief Description: No violation occurred and no order was issued. A Prospective Purchaser's Agreement was negotiated between U.S. EPA and the State of Indiana and the City of Mishawaka, Indiana to purchase land which is part of the Superfund Site.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not applicable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Not applicable.

Superfund Site Name: UNITED SCRAP LEAD SUPERFUND SITE
PRPs: Atlas Lederer Co. (fka Atlas Metals, Inc.); General Motors Co.; Sims Bros., Inc.; Herman Strauss, Inc.; David J. Joseph Co.; Navistar International Transportation Corp.; Consolidated Rail Corp.; AK Steel Corp.; Baker Iron & Metal Co., Inc.; Bill's Battery Co., Inc.; Cherrington Scrap Metals, Inc.; RMS Properties Corp. (fka Chillicothe Iron & Metals Co.); Cohen Bros., Inc.; Dobrow Industries, Inc.; D. Kirschner & Son, Inc.; Eagle Iron Co., Inc.; J. Topy & Sons; Midwest Corp.; Muskingum Iron & Metal Co.; Wilmington Iron & Metal Co., Inc.; Worley Steel & Supply Co., Inc.; Commercial Metals Co.; U.S. Department of Defense; U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs; U.S. Postal Service; Bailen Bros., Inc.; United Scrap Lead Co.; United Scrap Lead Co., Inc.; Charles Z. Bailen; Estate of Edward Bailen.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sherry Estes / John O'Grady
Location: Troy, Ohio (Miami County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106 and 107
Type of Settlement: Consent Decree
Date of Order: September 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Remedial Design/Remedial Action, Provide Site Access, Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Site Access, Labeling/Manifesting
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$19.5 million
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to remove 20,000 cubic yards of lead (Pb)-contaminated soil and 56,000 cubic yards of lead-based battery casing chips.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Lead (soil), 95% reduction.
Lead (battery chips), 100% reduction.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Superfund Site Name: VELSICOL CHEMICAL CO. LANDFILL
SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: Velsicol Chemical Co., Inc.; NWI Land Management, Inc.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Gaylene Vasaturo / B. Reiner and S. Borries

Location: St. Louis, Michigan (Gratiot County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 104 (not violated; applicable section)

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: June 18, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Site Access

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to provide site access.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: XXKEM SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: City of Toledo, Ohio.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Sherry Estes / Michael Gifford

Location: Toledo, Ohio (Lucas County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Sections 106, 107, and 122

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order

Date of Order: June 8, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal, Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Labeling/Manifesting, Site Access

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$350,000

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to design, construct, and demonstrate the performance of a source control/leachate extraction system at the XXKem Site. The system is to be designed to prevent the movement of leachate contaminated

from the sludge remaining at the bottom of a closed disposal lagoon at XXKem from migrating to the Stickney Landfill Site and, ultimately, potentially to the Ottawa River.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Superfund Site Name: YEOMAN CREEK LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE

PRPs: City of Waukegan, Illinois; Waukegan Public School District #60; Browning-Ferris Industries of Illinois, Inc.; Browning-Ferris Industries, Inc.; Dexter Corp.; Outboard Marine Corp.; Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Stuart Hersh / Matthew Ohl

Location: Waukegan, Illinois (Lake County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB

Statute Violated: CERCLA, Section 106

Type of Order: Unilateral Administrative Order (Emergency Response)

Date of Order: April 28, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Other

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available

Original/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to effectuate an interim, active landfill gas management system designed to intercept laterally-migrating landfill gas from the perimeter of the northern portion of the Site. Landfill gases were being measured at monitoring points within the basements of structures adjacent to the Site at levels exceeding 100 percent of the lower explosive limit (LEL).

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Clean Water Act

Statute Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief: 57
Total cost value of injunctive relief: \$72,767,041
Average cost value of injunctive relief: \$1,276,615
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties: 16
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs: 2

Case Name: In re: AIR MASTER SYSTEMS, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Allan Batka
Location: Muskegon, Michigan (Muskegon County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 307 and 308
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 15, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease discharges of regulated pollutants.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: ALLIANCE, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Catherine Collins
Location: Alliance, Ohio (Stark County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: November 26, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Testing, Monitoring/Sampling,
Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$5,000/year
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement more thorough sludge testing and monitoring techniques to ensure that land-applied sludge does not exceed ceiling concentration limits of regulated contaminants.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Cadmium-contaminated soil, 134 kg/year.
Nickel-contaminated soil, 1.7 kg/year.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA (ALCOA)
Attorney/Program Contacts: Cynthia Kawakami / Purita Angeles
Location: Lafayette, Indiana (Tippecanoe County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 308 and 309
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
[Combined Finding of Violation and Information Request]
Date of Order: January 27, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Permit Application, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA information concerning the Respondent's permit and permit applications, plant operations, wastewater generation and treatment, raw materials used, discharge monitoring, PCB sources, enforcement history, toxicity tests, and water usage.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA (ALCOA)
Attorney/Program Contacts: Robert Guenther / John McGuire
Location: West Chicago, Illinois (Du Page County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 307
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Testing, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to monitor on a weekly basis its wastewater discharge(s) for chromium, hexavalent chromium, zinc, oxygen and grease, and to submit to U.S. EPA quarterly reports on these discharges to ensure continued compliance with the CWA.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: ANCOTECH, INC. (Industrial User)

Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Bettye Carter

Location: Dearborn Heights, Michigan (Wayne County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 307 and 402

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: November 20, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Auditing, Monitoring/Sampling, Reporting, Information Letter Response, Permit Application

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$50,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: Unavailable.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: ASHLAND, CITY OF WWTP

Attorney/Program Contacts: Lillian Pinzon / Valdis Aistars

Location: Ashland, Ohio (Ashland County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: April 30, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$125,000 / \$5,000

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to track correctly the cumulative pollutant loading rate for all pollutants in the sludge.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: BISPING CONSTRUCTION, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Valdis Aistars
Location: New Lenox, Illinois (Will County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: June 4, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to land-apply septage in accordance with regulatory requirements.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: BLUFFTON, CITY OF POTW
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Michael McDonough
Location: Bluffton, Indiana (Wells County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 309
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 19, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to ensure maximization of flow prior to discharge in wet weather.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: BRUSHY LAKE HUNTING CLUB; ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES (DNR); BALLARD BROS. EXCAVATING CO.

Attorney/Program Contacts: William Clune / David Schulenberg

Location: Walkerville Township, Illinois (Greene County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 404 and 301

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: May 5, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration, Removal, Permit Application

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available (determination of amount required as part of Order)

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to restore the wetlands to their original condition (removal of fill). It also requires Ballard Bros. Excavating to apply for the permits required for excavating activities.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: CAMBRIDGE, CITY OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL CENTER

Attorney/Program Contacts: Susan Muller / Purita Angeles

Location: Cambridge, Ohio (Guernsey County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 308 and 309

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
[Combined Finding of Violation and Information Request]

Date of Order: January 28, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Testing, Recordkeeping

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA information concerning discharge monitoring results, compliance activities (both completed and planned), bypass events, chlorination studies, toxicity tests, plant equipment and operations, inspections, communication with the State, and activities as a pretreatment control authority.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: CLINTON, CITY OF WWTP

Attorney/Program Contacts: Cynthia King / Mike McDonough

Location: Clinton, Indiana (Vermillion County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: May 4, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$3,000 / \$1,000

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct a metals analysis of its sludge prior to land application, and to not land apply the sludge if it exceeds the limits for metals (in particular, cadmium), for land-applied sludge.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Cadmium (potentially), amount and % reduction unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge. Potential ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: COLUMBUS, CITY OF - JACKSON PIKE WWTP

Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Bettye Carter

Location: Columbus, Ohio (Franklin County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 402

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: July 7, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Auditing, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Reporting, Information Letter Response, Permit Application

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$50,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement additional effluent monitoring procedures, and to locate and eliminate the sources for exceeded effluent limits.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: CONSOLIDATED RAIL CORP. - ASHTABULA COAL DOCK
Attorney/Program Contacts: Richard Nagle / Murray Lantner and Barbara Carr
Location: Ashtabula, Ohio (Ashtabula County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 309 and 311, OPA Section 1001
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: January 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Recordkeeping, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$22,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$304,000 / \$150,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to write a new SPCC plan and install additional containment around some of its above-ground storage tanks (ASTs).
Quantitative Reduction(s): Total suspended solids (TSS), amount and % reduction unavailable.
pH, amount and % change unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: CONSOLIDATED RECYCLING CO., INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: James Cha / Carol Staniec
Location: Tell City, Indiana (Perry County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 307
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: March 25, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$528,491
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$125,000 / \$50,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install a pretreatment system.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Biological oxygen demand (BOD), 4844 mg/L.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: CRAWFORDSVILLE, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Berman / Eloise Hahn
Location: Crawfordsville, Indiana (Montgomery County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 402 and 405
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: March 18, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$125,000 / \$98,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement plant improvements over a period of time. These improvements will ensure the Respondent remains within permit limits for various pollutants.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Varying reductions (amount and % reductions unavailable) in fecal coliform, total residual chlorine, biological oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids (TSS), nitrogen, cyanide, copper, zinc, molybdenum, nickel, and pathogens.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: CRESCIO, JOHN
Attorney/Program Contacts: Eva Hahn / Greg Carlson
Location: Randolph, Wisconsin (Columbia County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 404
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: May 14, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to restore one acre of wetlands by capping all tile outletting from the Respondent's property and extending the current ditch plug from its present length to 150 feet.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: CURTIS EXCAVATING, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Robert Guenther / Greg Carlson
Location: Portage, Wisconsin (Columbia County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 301
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: May 11, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$50,000 / \$15,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to institute increased monitoring and recordkeeping at its asbestos removal sites. The order also requires the Respondent to execute wetlands restoration by disabling drain tile, installing ditch plugs, and re-seeding.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: ELLIOT METAL PROCESSING, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Sangsook Choi
Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 308
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 17, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping, Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA information concerning facility operations, discharge controls, and monitoring reports.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: FABIAN, ROWLAND
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Turner / Greg Carlson
Location: Lake Station, Indiana (Lake County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, NWI
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 301
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: June 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$50,000 (estimated)
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease dredging and dumping on/in a wetlands area.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration/improved land use.

Case Name: In re: FEDERAL MOGUL CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Sudhir Desai
Location: Greenville, Michigan (Montcalm County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 309
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: June 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA daily monitoring reports.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: GERBYSHAK, THOMAS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Eva Hahn / Greg Carlson
Location: Crivitz, Wisconsin (Marinette County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 404
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 6, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to restore one acre of lakeside wetlands.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: U.S. v. GLIDDEN CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Jeffrey Cox / Murray Lantner
Location: Huron, Ohio (Erie County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 402
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: January 21, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$1,368,153 / \$1,555,000 (proposed was bottom line)
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to do the following: (a) cease its discharge of process wastewater to the Huron River and Winkler's Ditch; (b) install a minimum of three groundwater monitoring wells near its new sewer line, and conduct periodic testing to determine if the new line is situated above the uppermost aquifer; and (c) conduct biannual visual inspections of its old sewer line, and conduct periodic monitoring of the old line's flow and of adjacent groundwater.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: GREENFIELD BAYOU DITCH AND LEVEE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT
Attorney/Program Contacts: John Tielsch / Greg Carlson
Location: Terre Haute, Indiana (Vigo County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 404
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: May 8, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to restore 42 acres of wetlands.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: GRUNIG, DIETER dba GRUNIG ADMINISTRATION
Attorney/Program Contacts: Deborah Carlson / Greg Carlson
Location: Kittson, Minnesota (Unknown County)
Geographic Initiative(s): Unknown
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 404
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order (assessing penalty)
Administrative Compliance Order (injunctive relief)
Date of Order: Administrative Penalty Order: July 15, 1998
Administrative Compliance Order: July 20, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$40,000 / \$5,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to complete a wetlands restoration plan on the Respondent's property.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: HIBBING, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Lillian Pinzon / Valdis Aistars
Location: Hibbing, Minnesota (Saint Louis County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: April 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$69,000 / \$6,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to track correctly the cumulative pollutant loading rate for all pollutants in the sludge.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: HOYING, VERN, AND BRACKET BUILDERS,
STEVE KLOSTERMAN, AND KLOSTERMAN
DEVELOPMENT

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Nash / Wayne Gorski and David Schulenberg
Location: Troy, Ohio (Miami County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 301
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: June 24, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration, Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$7,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to plant trees in wetlands and to create a buffer strip between wetlands and surrounding non-wetlands areas.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: HUNTINGTON, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Kurt Lindland / Mike McDonough
Location: Huntington, Indiana (Huntington County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 309
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: November 12, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$15,000 / \$5,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to sample sludge for compliance with molybdenum standards before land application (instead of testing after land application).
Quantitative Reduction(s): Molybdenum (potential), amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: IONIA, CITY OF, DEPT. OF PUBLIC UTILITIES
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Clyde Marion
Location: Ionia, Michigan (Ionia County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 305
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: October 16, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) correct misinformation concerning the digester temperature obligations in meeting Class B pathogen reduction requirements; (2) increase the frequency of sludge monitoring to 4 times per year instead of 3; and (3) meet analysis and reporting requirements.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: U.S. v. J & L SPECIALTY STEEL, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Joseph Williams / Murray Lantner
Location: Louisville, Ohio (Stark County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 402
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: April 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$425,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$365,000 / \$200,000
SEP: 3 SEPs totaling \$373,265 (Public Health, Pollution Prevention, Other)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to reroute wastewater from Outfall 001 to its treatment plant.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Acute toxicity (water), 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: KARL KRUSA FARMS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Stephen Mendoza / Greg Carlson
Location: Bluffs, Illinois (Scott County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 404
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: March 24, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration, Removal, Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires wetlands restoration by the Respondent.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: KEWANEE BOILER MANUFACTURING CO., INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Ed Messina / Barbara Carr
Location: Kewanee, Illinois (Henry County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 311
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: January 2, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Training, Testing, Storage/Disposal Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$250,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$57,441 / \$35,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to develop and implement a plan for secondary containment, involving the construction of concrete or steel walls and/or berms, periodic testing, personnel training, and safety meetings.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: LAKEHEAD PIPE LINE CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Gaylene Vasaturo / Amy Nerbun
Location: Duluth, Minnesota (St. Louis County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 402 and 404
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: August 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration Plan
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease drilling activity that could result in the discharge of pollutants (drilling mud) into the spring run and Millhurst Fen, and to provide information and a restoration plan for U.S. EPA approval.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: LOHMAN EXCAVATION AND DEMOLITION,
MELVIN T. SAAD AND MARLENE J. SAAD,
ERIE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #1
Attorney/Program Contacts: Debra Carlson / Kenneth Tenny
Location: Erie, Illinois (Whiteside County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 404
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: December 1, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents—who are, in this order, the Erie School District and Lohman Excavation—to cease the discharge of demolition debris into the Rock River, and

to remove the debris which had been deposited into the River.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: LOHMAN EXCAVATION AND DEMOLITION,
MELVIN T. SAAD AND MARLENE J. SAAD,
ERIE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #1

Attorney/Program Contacts: Debra Carlson / Kenneth Tenny

Location: Erie, Illinois (Whiteside County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 404

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: December 5, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents—who are, in this order, Melvin T. Saad and Marlene J. Saad—to cease the discharge of demolition debris into the Rock River, and to remove the debris which had been deposited into the River.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: MICHIGAN PEAT AND BAY-HOUSTON
TOWING CO.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Jacqueline Kline / Robert Cvengros and Allan Batka

Location: Minden City, Michigan (Sanilac County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CWA, Section 301

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: February 2, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration, Removal, Emissions/Discharge Change

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$600,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to complete a partial restoration of a source peat bog, and to cease discharges to wetlands and to the Black River Drain (a channel that leads to a tributary of Lake Huron). The Respondent may then either apply to the Army Corps of Engineers for a CWA Section 404 permit, or submit to EPA a plan for complete site restoration.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Nonquantifiable reductions of arsenic, lead, total suspended solids, total phosphorous, mercury, sulfide, barium, magnesium, calcium, iron, and aluminum.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: MIDDLETOWN, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Murray Lantner
Location: Middletown, Ohio (Butler County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 402
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: December 10, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to reissue Industrial User Permits to eliminate the use of unauthorized removal credits, to comply with sludge requirements, and to meet all effluent limitations.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Cyanide, 30 lbs/day, daily maximum (37.5% reduction).
Cyanide, 20 lbs/day, monthly average (44% reduction).
Ammonia, amount and % unavailable.
Phenols, amount and % unavailable.
Cadmium (sludge), amount and % unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: U.S. v. NORTH VERNON, CITY OF STP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Timothy Chapman / James Novak
Location: North Vernon, Indiana (Jennings County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 309
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: April 7, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change, Testing, Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$5.45 million
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$50,000
SEP: \$110,000 (Environmental Restoration and Protection)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to implement extensive improvements to the publicly-owned treatment works (POTW) collection (sewer) system and the treatment works, and to implement quality assurance procedures to assure improved sampling and monitoring and testing. The order also requires that the Respondent retrain and replace critical personnel.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Biological oxygen demand (BOD), 95% reduction.
 Total suspended solids (TSS), 95% reduction.
 Fecal coliform, 95% reduction.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
 Actual ecosystem protection.
 Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: U.S. v. NORTHEAST REGIONAL SEWER DISTRICT (WESTERLY WWTP)

Attorney/Program Contacts: Jane Woolums / Thomas Bramscher
Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 301
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: September 22, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$60 million
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$40,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to replace its physical-chemical treating process with a biological one.

Quantitative Reduction(s): 100% reduction in each of copper, tin, phenols, fecal coliform, pH, total suspended solids (TSS), dissolved oxygen, and BOD.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: PERRY CREEK CRANBERRY CORP. AND
TIMOTHY FINCH

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Nash / Greg Carlson

Location: Black River Falls, Wisconsin (Jackson County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 404

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: March 4, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Restoration

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to restore wetlands. Involved in this restoration will be the pushing of dirt with a bulldozer to remove it from wetlands which had been impacted by earlier bulldozing, and to return it to the reservoir from which it was dredged. The remaining restoration will be limited to monitoring to ensure that invasive species (e.g., purple loosestrife) do not degrade the wetland habitat.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: In re: PIQUA, CITY OF WWTP

Attorney/Program Contacts: Kris Vezner / Sudhir Desai

Location: Piqua, Ohio (Miami County)

Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: April 24, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$50

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$36,000 / \$21,000

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA a statement certifying its intent to comply with the requirements listed at 40 CFR 503.18.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased program effectiveness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: PURECYCLE, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sean Mulroney / Steve Renninger
Location: Cincinnati, Ohio (Hamilton County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 311
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: October 3, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA a work plan for removal, and to remove oil waste from rooftop tanks adjacent to Mill Creek. The order also requires the removal of 106 oil waste drums, and the decontamination and decommissioning of those drums.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Oil (water), 40,000 gallons.
Oil waste drums, 106 drums, 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: RECLAMATION COMPANY
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Ihsan Eler
Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 308 and 309
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$30,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: Unavailable - the program reported no information.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health protection.

Case Name: In re: RESEARCH OIL
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Kenney / Murray Lantner
Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 307
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: December 10, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$245,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement better monitoring and sampling techniques to monitor both incoming wastes and wastewater discharged to the NEORSD (Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District) sewer system. The Respondent must also maintain a complete set of records for such monitoring.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Cyanide (water), amount and % reduction unavailable.
 Toxic organics (water), amount and % reduction unavailable.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: RESEARCH OIL
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Kenney / Murray Lantner
Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 307
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: August 6, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None (costs reflected in 12-10-97 order)
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order clarifies the 12-10-97 order.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: ROCK ISLAND, CITY OF (MAIN STP)
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / William Tong
Location: Rock Island, Illinois (Rock Island County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 402
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: February 13, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Remediation, Information Letter Response
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$822,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires treatment plant and sewer improvements which will reduce sewer overflows.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: SOUTH BEND, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Kenneth Tenny
Location: South Bend, Indiana (St. Joseph County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 307 and 402
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: August 7, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Information Letter Response, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) incorporate standards and requirements into industrial user permits; (2) evaluate industrial user spill control plans; (3) escalate enforcement of industrial users; and (4) improve reporting to U.S. EPA and the State.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: SOUTH HAVEN, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Turner / Dana Rzeznik
Location: Valparaiso, Indiana (Porter County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 308
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: June 24, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling and Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$7500
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease accepting waste from industrial sources and to provide a schedule for plant improvements.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: TROY LABORATORIES, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Ihsan Eler
Location: Rochester, Michigan (Oakland County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 307 and 308
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$30,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: Unavailable - the program reported no information.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health protection.

Case Name: In re: U.S.S. KOBE STEEL CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Leslie Kirby / Ihsan Eler
Location: Lorain, Ohio (Lorain County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 308 and 309
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 23, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Auditing, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) submit to U.S. EPA copies of its discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) and monthly operating reports (MORs) until notified to stop doing so; (2) submit a description of the nature, average rate of production, and standard industrial classification of the operations carried out at the facility; and (3) submit a description of the existing wastewater treatment facilities and process treatment, if any.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: UNION-ROME TOWNSHIPS SUBSEWER DISTRICT WWTP

Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Bettye Carter

Location: Chesapeake, Ohio (Lawrence County)

Geographic Initiative(s): TRI

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 402

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: June 24, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Auditing, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Reporting, Information Letter Response, Permit Application

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$50,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to implement additional effluent monitoring procedures, and to locate and eliminate the sources for exceeded effluent limits.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Total suspended solids (TSS), 85 mg/L (100% reduction).

Lead (Pb), 18 mg/L (100% reduction).

Biological oxygen demand (BOD), 127 mg/L (100% reduction).

pH, 6.3 (100% reduction).

Chlorine, 0.68 mg/L (100% reduction).

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Increased public awareness.

Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: UNITED SEPTIC, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Valdis Aistars
Location: Bristol, Illinois (Kendall County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: May 15, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to land apply sewage in accordance with requirements.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: VIKTRON WEST CHICAGO
Attorney/Program Contacts: None / Purita Angeles
Location: West Chicago, Illinois (DuPage County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 308 and 309
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
[Combined Finding of Violation and Information Request]
Date of Order: May 12, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Permit Application, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA information concerning its discharge monitoring efforts, permit, permit application, base monitoring report, corrective actions taken or planned and their costs, and the Respondent's compliance status.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: WCI STEEL, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Nicole Cantello / Murray Lantner
Location: Warren, Ohio (Trumbull County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 402
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: December 8, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Emissions/Discharge Change,
Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$400,000 capital + \$100,000 per year
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease unauthorized discharges of wastewater containing chlorine, and to comply with pH, zinc, and oil and grease limits at other outfalls.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Total residual chlorine, 100% reduction.
Oil and grease, amount and % reduction unavailable.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: WCI STEEL, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Nicole Cantello / Murray Lantner
Location: Warren, Ohio (Trumbull County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 402
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: May 18, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Emissions/Discharge Change,
Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None (reflected in 12-8-97 order)
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order clarifies and reiterates the 12-8-97 order.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None (reflected in 12-8-97 order).
Environmental Benefit(s): None (reflected in 12-8-97 order).

Case Name: In re: WADSWORTH, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Lillian Pinzon / Ihsan Eler
Location: Wadsworth, Ohio (Medina County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 301 and 402
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: July 20, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$45,000
Original/Final Penalty: \$125,000 / \$70,600
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) cease the discharge of metals in excess of approved limits for WWTPs; (2) increase the monitoring frequency of its industrial users; and (3) require its industrial users to install equipment to reduce toxic discharges to the WWTP and/or cease the production of toxic discharges.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Copper, 3.2 lbs/day (100% reduction). Chlorine, 100% reduction.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection. Actual ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge. Reductions beyond compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: WEST CHICAGO, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Eva Hahn / John McGuire
Location: West Chicago, Illinois (DuPage County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Sections 308 and 309.
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 17, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100,000 per year
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to implement fully the pretreatment program.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: WILLMAR, CITY OF WWTP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Kevin Chow / Allan Batka
Location: Willmar, Minnesota (Kandiyohi County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: CWA, Section 405
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: December 16, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$3.3 million
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$2,000 / \$1,250
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to construct a new sludge storage facility, giving the WWTP five to six months of storage capacity and enough time to receive sampling results and take appropriate measures to prevent land application of sludge with excess levels of contaminants.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

Statute Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief:	7
Total cost value of injunctive relief:	\$100
Average cost value of injunctive relief:	\$14
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties:	7
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs:	0

Case Name: In re: ARROW PLASTIC MANUFACTURING CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Susan Perdomo / Terence Bonace
Location: Elk Grove Village, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: FIFRA, Section 2
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: May 12, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Stop Sale, Use and Removal
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$7,000 / \$5,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to change the label on its cutting board product (it was a producer of an unregistered antimicrobial product).
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: CHEMIX CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Anastasio / Thomas Crosetto
Location: Berea, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE
Statute Violated: FIFRA, Section 7
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: January 23, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$ 5,000 / \$4,400
SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit annual pesticide producer establishment reports as required by Section 7 of FIFRA.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: DALBY, DAVID; PCI CHEMICAL CORP;
KEYLAB CHEMICAL CORP.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Sabrina Argentieri / Terence Bonace

Location: Racine, Wisconsin (Racine County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB

Statute Violated: FIFRA, Section 13

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: April 16, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Other

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$36,400 / \$5,000

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to no longer produce and sell pesticides.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: DIAS, INC.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Martin / Terry Bonace

Location: Kalamazoo, Michigan (Kalamazoo County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: FIFRA, Section 12(a)

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: November 14, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Stop Sale

Cost of Injunctive Relief: None

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$4,200 / \$1,500

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease its sale of an unregistered pesticide.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Actual ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: ERIE AG SERVICE
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Nash / Thomas Crosetto
Location: Erie, Illinois (Whiteside County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: FIFRA, Section 7
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: June 3, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$10,000 / \$0
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to relinquish its FIFRA Registration Number, and to provide evidence that the Respondent had gone out of business prior to the time period for which Section 7 reports were due.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: FIELDCREST FERTILIZER CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Brian Barwick / Terence Bonace
Location: Madison, Minnesota (Lac Qui Parle County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: FIFRA, Section 7
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: February 12, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$5,500 / \$2,750
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to file its pesticide report for calendar year 1996.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: SCIENTIFIC PEST CONTROL CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Mary Fulghum / Terence Bonace

Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: FIFRA, Section 14
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: February 17, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$3,000 / \$1,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to stop the sale of a pesticide until it has been registered.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Statute Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief:	23
Total cost value of injunctive relief:	\$2,852,050
Average cost value of injunctive relief:	\$124,002
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties:	13
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs:	3

Case Name:	In re: ALBERT LEA OIL, OPERATOR OF
Attorney/Program Contacts:	Thomas Kenney / Yves Reme
Location:	Albert Lea, Minnesota (Freeborn County)
Geographic Initiative(s):	UM
Statute Violated:	RCRA, Section 9006
Type of Order:	Field Citation
Date of Order:	July 8, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief:	Testing, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief:	Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty:	\$450 / \$450
SEP:	None
Injunctive Relief Description:	The order requires the Respondent to conduct tank tightness testing and release detection monitoring.
Quantitative Reduction(s):	None.
Environmental Benefit(s):	Potential human health and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name:	In re: ALBERT LEA OIL, OWNER OF
Attorney/Program Contacts:	Thomas Kenney / Yves Reme
Location:	Albert Lea, Minnesota (Freeborn County)
Geographic Initiative(s):	UM
Statute Violated:	RCRA, Section 9006
Type of Order:	Field Citation
Date of Order:	July 30, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief:	Testing, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief:	Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty:	\$300 / \$300
SEP:	None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct tank tightness testing and release detection monitoring.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: ARMCO, INC.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Terry Branigan / Vergel Santos

Location: Mansfield, Ohio (Richland County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB

Statute Violated: N/A - no violations occurred; authorizing section: RCRA 3013

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order

Date of Order: September 30, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Analysis and Reporting

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available

Proposed/Final Penalty: None

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) collect and analyze soil and sediment samples to determine the nature and extent of contamination in connection with the following units: the location of an old coke pile, a processing area for slag generated by the facility's electric arc furnaces, an old landfill (closed 1979) in which electric arc furnace dust was landfilled for many years, the ravine between the slag processing area and the landfill, a spent pickle liquor recovery area, and a deep injection well in which 11 million gallons of spent pickle liquor were disposed between 1968 and 1971; (2) determine the nature and extent of contaminated leachate discharged to Rocky Fork Creek in connection with these units; (3) to characterize the hydrogeology under the facility; and (4) to determine the nature and extent of contamination in the groundwater at the facility.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: CELLO-FOIL PRODUCTS, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Cynthia King / Paul Little
Location: Battle Creek, Michigan (Calhoun County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3004(g)
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: September 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Original/Final Penalty: \$227,844 / \$60,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease burning hazardous waste in its boiler (the Respondent did not possess interim RCRA status or a permit, which authorize this activity).
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Compliance with RCRA regulations.

Case Name: In re: DETROIT, CITY OF (47 FACILITIES)
Attorney/Program Contacts: Mary McAuliffe / Ann Wentz
Location: Detroit, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 9006
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: December 12, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$829,673 / \$100,000
SEP: \$940,000 (Emergency Planning and Preparedness)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to close leaking underground storage tanks, and perform associated monitoring, sampling, and recordkeeping, at 47 facilities throughout the City of Detroit.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: ELECTRONIC SUPPORT SYSTEMS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Krueger / Denise Reape
Location: West Chicago, Illinois (Du Page County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3010
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: January 21, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$649,111 / \$15,000
SEP: \$226,890 (Pollution Prevention and Pollution Reduction)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to ensure it is in compliance with RCRA generator and toxic substances discharge requirements.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: GENERAL MOTORS CORP., DELPHI
AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Williams / Ken Bardo
Location: Vandalia, Ohio (Montgomery County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3008(h)
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 23, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Remediation, Removal, Site Access
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$500,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to remove the chlorinated solvent DNAPL from the nearby aquifer, control the migration of groundwater contamination, sample private wells, investigate releases on- and off-site, determine what corrective measures are necessary, and implement corrective measures to attain RCRA cleanup standards.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: GENERAL MOTORS CORP., PONTIAC TRUCK
GROUP
Attorney/Program Contacts: Kathleen Schnieders / Michael Valentino
Location: Pontiac, Michigan (Oakland County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI

Statute Violated: N/A - no violations occurred; authorizing section: RCRA, Section 3008(h)
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Monitoring/Sampling, RFI/CMS
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$1,050,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to perform interim remedial measures at one solid waste management unit (SWMU) and a RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) and Corrective Measures Study (CMS) at four additional SWMUs and evaluate the most appropriate remediation alternative on a SWMU-specific basis. U.S. EPA will retain oversight of all corrective action activities.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: GREEN WAY COOPERATIVE #3
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Kenney / Yves Reme
Location: Rochester, Minnesota (Olmsted County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 9006
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: June 19, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$750 / \$750
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct release detection monitoring, and to notify government authorities of its existing tank.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: HERITAGE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Attorney/Program Contacts: Ed Messina / Michael Cunningham
Location: Indianapolis, Indiana (Marion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None

Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3014
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: February 27, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$10,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$150,274 / \$8,407
SEP: \$590,000 (Pollution Reduction)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide more specific information on the sources of used oils, especially those with high concentrations of halogens.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: LAFARGE CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sean Mulroney / Ann Kerbs
Location: Alpena, Michigan (Alpena County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3008
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: April 6, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$400,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$105,425 / \$44,800
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to operate its two cement kilns with a limit switch that will indicate when fuel flow to the kilns is on or off. The order also requires the Respondent to install an automatic waste feed cutoff, and to upgrade its calculating and recording computer by March 31, 1999.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge. These actions exceed compliance requirements.

Case Name: In re: LAKE WEST SERVICE STATION
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Kenney / George Halloran
Location: Chicago, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 9003

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: October 9, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$450
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$450 / \$450
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide an adequate leak detection method for its UST, and to provide adequate line tightness testing for its underground piping system.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: MICHIGAN WASTE SYSTEMS, INC.
(Woodland Meadows Landfill-North)
Attorney/Program Contacts: Larry Johnson / Ann Kerbs
Location: Wayne, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3008
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: April 14, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$600,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$35,300 / \$18,815
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: characterize fully the uppermost aquifer at the facility, including a delineation of the extent of sand lenses; install an adequate groundwater monitoring system with nested wells in the sane and basal till; and submit a Groundwater Assessment Plan.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: MIDWEST METALLICS, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sherry Estes / John Gaitskill
Location: Summit, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3013
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: July 31, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Site Access
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to develop a representative sampling plan to determine if a pile of auto shredder residue, or “auto fluff,” is hazardous pursuant to RCRA (due to high concentrations of lead (Pb)). This plan will assist in planning for the material’s disposal.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: MIDWEST METALLICS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sherry Estes / John Gaitskill
Location: Summit, Illinois (Cook County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC
Statute Violated: N/A - no violations occurred; authorizing section:
RCRA 3013
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 4, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100,000
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct a RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) and Corrective Measures Study (CMS), determine the appropriate remediation measures to be taken, and to conduct any necessary intermediate measures.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: MORTON INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Anastasio / Lisa Capron
Location: West Alexandria, Ohio (Preble County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: N/A - no violations occurred (obligations are imposed automatically regardless of fault); authorizing section:
RCRA, Section 3008(h)

Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: September 25, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Site Assessment, RFI/CMS
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct a RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) and Corrective Measures Study (CMS), determine the appropriate remediation measures to be taken, and to conduct any necessary intermediate measures.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.
Increased public awareness.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: OCCIDENTAL CHEMICAL CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Turner / Tamara Ohl
Location: Kenton, Ohio (Hardin County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3008
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: December 8, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Removal, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$105,600
Proposed/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to perform on-site remediation of its Kenton, Ohio chemical manufacturing facility. Specifically, the Respondent must sample, cap, and remove contaminated soil near a rail spur on the facility premises, maintain a security fence, and impose deed restrictions on future use of the facility's property.
Quantitative Reduction(s): [Amount and % reductions unavailable.]
Benzo(a)pyrene, Benzo(b)fluorathene., Benzo(a)anthracene, and Di-benzo(a,h)anthracene.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: PIERCE & STEVENS CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Kevin Chow / Patrick Kuefler
Location: Carol Stream, Illinois (Du Page County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3005
Type of Order: Joint Administrative Penalty Order (complaint only) and Administrative Compliance Order
Date of Order: August 14, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Recordkeeping, Labeling/Manifesting, Permit Application, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available (required by order to submit)
Original/Final Penalty: \$123,695 / Not yet determined
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to: (1) cease to store hazardous waste without a RCRA permit; (2) submit inspection logs for inspections required under RCRA; (3) develop and implement a plan for the closure of hazardous waste management units.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge. Maintenance of integrity of regulatory program.

Case Name: In re: RHÔNE-POULENC BASIC CHEMICALS
Attorney/Program Contacts: Robert Thompson / Ivonne Vicente
Location: Hammond, Indiana (Lake County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, NWI
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3004
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: June 10, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$40,000
Original/Final Penalty: \$94,380 / \$40,480
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to install in all of its tanks both a new temperature and pressure gauge as well as a new alarm system.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and worker protection.

Case Name: In re: ROSS INCINERATION SERVICES
Attorney/Program Contacts: David Mucha / Julianne Socha
Location: Grafton, Ohio (Lorain County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3002
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order (Imminent and Substantial Endangerment)
Date of Order: February 6, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Original/Final Penalty: None
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to cease its feed operations until U.S. EPA approves them. The Respondent experienced an explosion in one of its feed mechanisms, which was part of the Respondent's commercial hazardous waste incinerator.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: SHELL CHEMICAL CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Larry Johnson / Ivonne Vicente
Location: Belpre, Ohio (Washington County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 3004
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: January 21, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$46,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$53,000 / \$45,747
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit to U.S. EPA a closure plan. The Respondent stopped burning hazardous waste in May 1995.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: THEIN WELL CO., INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Kenney / Yves Reme
Location: Rochester, Minnesota (Olmsted County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 9006
Type of Order: Field Citation
Date of Order: July 8, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping, Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$750 / \$750
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to provide notification to the state of one tank being out of service and of another being temporarily closed. Release detection monitoring is also required by the order.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: TOLEDO ZOO
Attorney/Program Contacts: Thomas Kenney / Louis Sass
Location: Toledo, Ohio (Lucas County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: RCRA, Section 9003
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: November 7, 1997
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$450 / \$450
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct release detection monitoring.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection.

Safe Drinking Water Act

Statute Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief: 7
Total cost value of injunctive relief: \$32,184
Average cost value of injunctive relief: \$4,598
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties: 0
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs: 0

Case Name: In re: BOYCE, LEON R. (ADAIR #2 WELL)
Attorney/Program Contacts: William Wagner / Jeffrey McDonald
Location: Township 16 North, Range 10 West, Section 13, Michigan (Bever Lake Oil Field)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: SDWA, Section 1421
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: January 28, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Use Reduction, Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$67,580 / \$5,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent, to whom the well was recently sold, to submit to U.S. EPA missing monitoring information.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential ecosystem protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: FINKBEINER, FRANK G.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Robert Guenther / Denise Young and Jeff McDonald
Location: Posey County, Indiana
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statute Violated: SDWA, Section 1421
Type of Order: Administrative Compliance Order, with penalty
Date of Order: August 4, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$29,500 / \$0 (Indiana assumed primacy)

SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to monitor well contamination pursuant to UIC permit requirements. No penalty was collected because Indiana assumed primacy in enforcement.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: HOPE OIL CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Sabrina Argentieri / Chad Kincheloe
Location: Delton, Michigan (Barry County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: SDWA, Section 1421
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: May 14, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$100
Original/Final Penalty: \$12,610 / \$1,500
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct testing on its injection well to verify the mechanical integrity of the well to ensure that there were no leaks in the casing, tubing, or annulus. Such leaks potentially cause the movement of injected fluids into or between an underground source of drinking water (USDW) and the well, thereby contaminating the USDW.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: HOSKINS MANUFACTURING CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Jeffrey Cox / Nathan Wisner
Location: New Paris, Indiana (Elkhart County)
Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB
Statute Violated: SDWA, Section 1423
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order (assessing penalty)
Administrative Compliance Order (injunctive relief)
Date of Order: August 12, 1998
[Both orders, while separate and distinct, were issued jointly.]

Type of Injunctive Relief: Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$82,000 / \$54,764
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to hire an environmental consultant to conduct its active monitoring program, to re-write its standard operating procedures for its deep injection well, and to change its monitoring report format and methods to achieve and maintain permit compliance.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health, worker, and ecosystem protection. Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: HOSKINS MANUFACTURING CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Lillian Pinzon / Chad Kincheloe
Location: Charlevoix, Michigan (Charlevoix County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: SDWA, Section 1421
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: August 7, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Testing, Auditing, Recordkeeping, Training, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$16,849
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$87,300 / \$54,195
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct an environmental management system audit, revise its standard operating procedures manual, and develop a training class for plant managers, foremen, and operators. The order also required the Respondent to install the required automatic shut-off system and to conduct mechanical integrity testing on its well.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: KEARNS, ROBERT
Attorney/Program Contacts: Monesh Chabria / Jeffrey McDonald
Location: Reed City, Michigan (Osceola County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: SDWA, Sections 1421 and 1422

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: July 8, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Other
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$15,235
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$14,000 / \$0 (inability to pay)
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to plug its injection well.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: SAMSON HYDROCARBONS CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Susan Muller / Denise Young
Location: Newaygo County, Michigan
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: SDWA, Section 1421
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: March 11, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: None
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$26,750 / \$5,100
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to submit monthly and quarterly monitoring reports for the Louis Navarre #2 Well, and to demonstrate mechanical integrity.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Toxic Substances Control Act

Statute Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief:	7
Total cost value of injunctive relief:	\$4,450
Average cost value of injunctive relief:	\$636
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties:	7
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs:	2

Case Name:	In re: ANTIOCH UNIVERSITY
Attorney/Program Contacts:	Terry Branigan / Terry Bonace
Location:	Yellow Springs, Ohio (Greene County)
Geographic Initiative(s):	None
Statute Violated:	TSCA, Section 15
Type of Order:	Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order:	March 11, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief:	Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief:	Not available
Original/Final Penalty:	\$37,000 / \$7,863
SEP:	\$49,700 in Pollution Prevention
Injunctive Relief Description:	The order requires the Respondent to develop and maintain annual documents logs, and to remove combustible materials from transformer enclosures.
Quantitative Reduction(s):	None.
Environmental Benefit(s):	Potential human health and worker protection.

Case Name:	In re: COLUMBUS TORAH SCHOOL
Attorney/Program Contacts:	Alan Walts / John Love
Location:	Columbus, Ohio (Franklin County)
Geographic Initiative(s):	None
Statute Violated:	TSCA, Section 203
Type of Order:	Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order:	June 29, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief:	Monitoring/Sampling, Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief:	\$4,450
Original/Final Penalty:	\$4,400 / \$0
SEP:	None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct an initial asbestos inspection, and to complete an asbestos management plan, as required by TSCA.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Case Name: In re: EAST OHIO GAS CO.

Attorney/Program Contacts: John Steketee / Kendall Moore

Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)

Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE

Statute Violated: TSCA, Section 15

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: July 13, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Auditing, Recordkeeping

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal

Original/Final Penalty: \$1,247,460 / \$193,260

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to institute increased monitoring and recordkeeping at asbestos removal sites.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.

Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: GARRISON-JONES ARCHITECTS, INC.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Lillian Pinzon / John Love

Location: Carbondale, Illinois (Jackson County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM

Statute Violated: TSCA, Section 15

Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order

Date of Order: August 3, 1998

Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping

Cost of Injunctive Relief: Minimal

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$23,000 / \$10,500

SEP: None

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to identify previously unreported asbestos containing materials (ACBM). Specifically, the order requires the reporting of 2,400 square feet of ACBM in Jordan Elementary School and 30 square feet of ACBM in Centralia Junior High School (approximately 600 linear feet).

Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: HALCO TERMINAL, INC.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Tom Williams / Scott Cooper
Location: Green Bay, Wisconsin (Brown County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: TSCA, Section 15
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: March 3, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Monitoring/Sampling
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$70,000 / \$14,000
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondent to conduct the cleanup of PCB-contaminated soil to reach compliance with TSCA.
Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available - the order includes monitoring/sampling to determine the extent of contamination.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health, worker, and ecosystem protection.

Case Name: In re: MARION STEEL CO.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Jeffery Trevino / John Love
Location: Marion, Ohio (Marion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB
Statute Violated: TSCA, Section 15
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: February 26, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Recordkeeping
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$62,500 / \$1,000
SEP: \$154,500 (Pollution Prevention)
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to develop and maintain complete annual records and a written annual document log for PCB-containing items at its facility for 1983 to 1991, and to notify U.S. EPA of PCB waste handling activities.
Quantitative Reduction(s): None.
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health protection.
Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: In re: STERN, RICHARD M., REGINA STERN, LYNDA COSLOV, JUDY GUTTMAN, as CO-EXECUTORS OF THE ESTATE OF ERNEST STERN, and MICHAEL MANUSZAK, JR., as ANCILLARY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ESTATE OF ERNEST STERN

Attorney/Program Contacts: Susan Perdomo / Kendall Moore
Location: Cleveland, Ohio (Cuyahoga County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, CLE
Statute Violated: TSCA, Section 15
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: March 10, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Remediation, Removal, Testing
Cost of Injunctive Relief: Not available
Original/Final Penalty: \$142,000 / \$122,700
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Respondents to excavate polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-contaminated soil on the affected site, and conduct groundwater and soil tests to verify that no PCB contamination remains.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.
Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection. Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Multi-Media

Multi-Media Summary for Fiscal Year 1998

Number of cases with injunctive relief: 3
Total cost value of injunctive relief: \$5,860,000
Average cost value of injunctive relief: \$1,953,000
Number of injunctive relief cases with penalties: 3
Number of injunctive relief cases with SEPs: 2

Case Name: In re: NATIONAL STEEL CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Timothy Chapman / Spiros Bourgikos (Air), Silvia Palomo (Superfund), Zetta West (RCRA/Hazardous waste), Yves Reme (RCRA/UST), Ken Zolnierczyk (TSCA)
Location: Ecorse, Michigan (Wayne County)
Geographic Initiative(s): GLB, SEMI
Statutes Violated: CAA, Section 112
CERCLA, Section 103
RCRA, Sections 3002, 3004, 9003
TSCA, Section 6
Type of Order: Administrative Penalty Order
Date of Order: April 17, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Storage/Disposal Change, Recordkeeping, Labeling/Manifesting
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$160,000
Proposed/Final Penalty: \$270,423 / \$53,942
SEP: \$416,037 (Pollution Reduction and Emergency Planning and Preparedness)
Injunctive Relief Description: (1) During the inspection, the Respondent corrected various RCRA hazardous waste and TSCA polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) violations discovered during the inspection. The hazardous waste violations consisted of cleaning up spilled hazardous waste and removal of flammable materials from within 5 meters of PCB Transformers.
(2) The CACO requires that Respondent do the following with respect to hazardous waste (RCRA):

- (a) Ensure that all hazardous waste containers are properly covered unless hazardous waste is being added to, or removed from, such containers, as required by 40 C.F.R. §§ 262.34(a)(1)(i) and 265.173(a), and Michigan Administrative Code (“MAC”) 299.9306(1)(a)(i);
 - (b) Maintain and operate all less-than-90-day hazardous waste accumulation areas in such manner as to ensure the minimization of an unplanned sudden or non-sudden release of hazardous waste to the environment, as required by 40 C.F.R. §§ 262.34(a)(4) and 265.31, and MAC 299.9301(2)(b), 299.9306(1)(d) and 299.9606;
 - (c) Properly identify all less-than-90-day hazardous waste containers with accumulation start date, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 262.34(a)(2) and MAC 299.9306(1)(b), and the words “hazardous waste,” as required by 40 C.F.R. § 262.34(a)(3) and MAC 299.9306(1)(c);
 - (d) Ensure that all hazardous wastes generated by Respondent at the Facility are properly characterized prior to disposal, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 262.11 and MAC 299.9302(1);
 - (e) Develop documents and/or records that set forth a written job description for every employee whose job at the facility is related to hazardous waste management under the less-than-90-day accumulation standard, as required by 40 C.F.R. §§ 262.34(a)(4) and 265.16(d), and MAC 299.9306(1)(d);
 - (f) Ensure that all hazardous waste notice and manifesting activities fully comply with 40 C.F.R. § 268.7 and MAC 299.3911(1); and
 - (g) Update the evacuation plan in the Facility’s Contingency Plan by including the signal(s) for evacuation and describing an alternate evacuation route, as required by 40 C.F.R. §§ 262.34(a)(4), 265.51(a) and 265.52(f), and MAC 299.9306(1)(d).
- (3) The CACO requires that Respondent do the following with respect to underground storage tanks (USTs):

- (a) Within 30 days of the filing of this CACO, monitor the release detection equipment associated with any active UST system, continue to perform such monitoring every 30 days thereafter, and maintain records of the monthly monitoring results and dates, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 280.41(a);
- (b) Within 30 days of the filing of this CACO, ensure that it notifies the implementing state agency of any actual or potential release of regulated substance(s) from any of its UST systems, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 280.50(c);
- (c) Within 30 days of the filing of this CACO, adequately conduct inventory control at UST systems MP-4A and MP-11A and any other UST system where Respondent utilizes the inventory control method of release detection, and maintain records of each daily and monthly inventory reconciliation, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 280.43(a)(1); and
- (d) By December 22, 1998, upgrade, replace or close all UST systems in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 280.21.

Quantitative Reduction(s): None
Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.
 Increased federal, state, and local government knowledge.

Case Name: U.S. v. REFINED METALS CORP.
Attorney/Program Contacts: Michael Anastasio / John Adenuga
Location: Beech Grove, Indiana (Marion County)
Geographic Initiative(s): None
Statutes Violated: RCRA, Section 3005, CAA, Sections 109 and 110
Type of Order: Consent Decree
Date of Order: August 31, 1998
Type of Injunctive Relief: Storage/Disposal Change, Remediation,
 Monitoring/Sampling, Emissions/Discharge Change
Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$5 million
Original/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$210,000
 - \$105,000 for RCRA
 - \$105,000 for CAA
SEP: None
Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to: (1) effectuate the closure of indoor and outdoor waste piles and a surface

impoundment by submitting a closure plan to the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) and implement the plan, and (2) complete a RCRA corrective action program to determine the nature and extent of releases or potential releases of hazardous waste at the facility and to mitigate any release(s) to the environment.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Lead, 50% in groundwater.
Cadmium, 50% in groundwater.

Environmental Benefit(s): Actual human health and ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.

Case Name: U.S. v. SHERWIN-WILLIAMS CO.

Attorney/Program Contacts: Reginald Pallesen / Walters Francis

Location: Chicago, Illinois (Cook County)

Geographic Initiative(s): UM, GLB, GC

Statutes Violated: CAA, Section 307
CWA, Sections 109 and 110
EPCRA, Section 312
RCRA, Section 3005

Type of Order: Consent Decree

Date of Order: December 1, 1997

Type of Injunctive Relief: Industrial Process Change, Remediation,
Storage/Disposal Change

Cost of Injunctive Relief: \$700,000

Proposed/Final Penalty: \$25,000 per day of violation / \$4.7 million

SEP: \$1.1 million (2 SEPs, both Environmental Restoration and Protection)

Injunctive Relief Description: The order requires the Defendant to establish and maintain compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements, including specific hazardous waste handling practices. The order requires that the Defendant, as a part of this compliance mandate, install closed-cleaning systems to control VOC emissions on all paint production vessels at the facility; to close hazardous waste management units at the site; and to undertake facility-wide corrective action, including action to address historic landfills at the site.

Quantitative Reduction(s): Not available.

Environmental Benefit(s): Potential human health and worker protection.
Actual ecosystem protection.
Environmental restoration and improved land use.