Case Conclusion Data Sheet

Please click here for instructions for completing the form

Program Contact: Jeffrey Bratko
Phone: 6-6816

ORC Attorney: Susan Tennenbaum/R5/USEPA/US
Phone: 6-0273

Status: ☒ Draft ☐ Final ☐ Update

CASE BACKGROUND

1. ORC DOCKET Matter Number:
2. Regional Hearing Clerk Docket Number:
3. Program Docket Number:

4. Judicial Court Docket Number:
*5. Case Name (Add Defendants if other than case name)
Additional Defendants :

FACILITY INFORMATION

6. EPA Program Facility ID: 3903500635
*7. Facility Name: MORGAN ADVANCED CERAMICS a.k.a. Morgan Electro Ceramics
*8. Facility Street Address: 232 FORBES ROAD City: BEDFORD
State: OH Zipcode: 44146 County:

*9. Primary 4-digit NAICS/SICCode: **3679**
10. Other 4-digit NAICS/SIC codes:

STATUTES AND AUTHORIZING SECTION INFORMATION

***Media Program** CAA
*11. Statute(s) and Section(s) Violated: CAA 110, CAA 112, CAA 502
*12. Authorizing Section for Administrative Actions: CAA 113D
***Violation Type :** **Emissions, NESHAP, Operation & Maintenance (O&M)**

ACTION TYPE

*13. Action Type: **Administrative penalty order (with or without injunctive relief)**

*14. Administrative Complaint Issuance Date:
*15. Final Administrative Penalty Order Issuance Date:
*16. Administrative Compliance Order Date:
*16a. Notice of Determination Date:

17. Civil Judical Referral Date:
18. Civil Judicial Complaint Filed:
19. Consent Decree Lodge Date:
*20. Consent Decree Entry Date:

21. Was this a multi-media action? ○ Yes ● No

23. Was this action part of a geographic initiative: ○ Yes ● No
24. Which (Check all that apply)? NE Ohio

24a. Priority/Sector **Air Toxics**

25. Was this Agency activity taken in response to Environmental Justice Concerns? ○ Yes ● No
26. Is this a Small Business? ○ Yes ● No
26a. Was this a self-disclosure? ○ Yes ● No
27. Was Alternative Dispute Resolution used in this action? ○ Yes ● No

QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION

*28. Injunctive Relief/Compliance Activity: Include both actions completed prior to final settlement/order and actions to be taken by violator to return to compliance or meet additional requirements. Select responses from the following list. At least one action must be chosen: Emissions/discharge (install modify controls), Permit application, Recordkeeping, Training

*29. Provide Description of Injunctive Relief/Compliance Activity:

Although the CAFO does not require injunctive relief, prior to siging the CAFO the company did replace some violating equipment, did repair some equipment, did apply for permits, did improve recordkeeping and did institute training to improve recordkeeping .

*30. Cost of actions described in previous question (Actual cost data supplied by violator is preferred figure)
Physical actions: $33592.00 Non-Physical Actions: $0.00

31. Acres in Violation:

32. Quantitative environmental impact of injunctive relief/compliance actions described in previous questions:
REDUCTIONS/ELIMINATIONS:

*Pollutant/Land Use	*Amount	*Units/Acres (Express in annual amounts)	*Percent% (of pollutant reduced/removed)	*Media
HC53	3000	Pounds/Year		Air

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS (SEPs)

PENALTY

37. Proposed Penalty: $133342.00

38. Assessed Penalty: **$133342.00**

39. If Shared Federal Share:

40. If Shared State or Local Share:

41. For multi-media actions: Federal amounts by Statute

Statute	Amount
CAA	$133342.00
CERCLA	
CWA 402	
CWA 311	
CWA 404	
EPCRA 304/312/325	
EPCRA 313	
FIFRA	
RCRA	
RCRA/UST	
SDWA/UIC	
TSCA	

COST RECOVERY (SUPERFUND ONLY)

42. Amount of cost recovery award: State and/or Local government:
Other:

---

*PLEASE ADD ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, INCLUDING SHORT CASE SUMMARY: This case involved degreasers that did not recieve required permits and which were violating MACT standards . The company had problems with excess emissions from the degreasers due to leaks. The company also failed to keep accurate records of the amount of perchloroethylene it was adding to its degreaser . Although both Ohio EPA and U.S.EPA took enforcement action, it was agreed that U .S.EPA would take the lead in resolving the case because many of the violations occurred at a time when the State did not have delegation to implement and enforce the MACT .