



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION IX 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

JAN 0 8 2009

Via Certified Mail: 7000 0520 0025 3711 8706 Return Receipt Requested

Joe Simi General Manager Alco Iron and Metal Company 2201 West Washington Street, Suite 21 Port Road 22 Stockton, CA 95203

Subject: Findings of Violations and Order for Compliance EPA Docket No. CWA-309(a)-09-006

Dear Mr. Simi:

On March 20, 2008, representatives of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) conducted a Clean Water Act compliance inspection at Alco Iron and Metal Company's Port of Stockton Facility. On July 17, 2008, EPA sent you a copy of the inspection report and requested that you install Best Management Practices (BMPs) and make revisions to the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Monitoring Program Plan (Monitoring Program).

Based on the inspection, EPA today issues the enclosed Findings of Violation and Order for Compliance requiring Alco Iron and Metal Company to take specific actions to bring the Facility into compliance with the Clean Water Act, including the following:

- Prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for the Facility which fully complies with California's General Industrial Activities Storm Water Permit (Industrial Permit). The SWPPP must fully describe all industrial activities, including fueling and material storage areas, and describe all associated BMPs;
- 2. Submit a report detailing the circumstances surrounding the spill of unknown material that occurred during the week of March 13, 2008. The report shall, at a minimum, identify the material spilled, set forth the quantity of material spilled, and explain the circumstances surrounding the spill. Respondent shall also include in the report copies

of any notifications to State or Federal authorities;

- 3. Prepare and submit a Monitoring Program that fully complies with the Industrial Permit; and
- 4. Complete several additional tasks identified in the Order, within the time specified.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Ellen Blake of my staff at (415) 972-3496.

Sincerely,

Alexis Strauss, Director Water Division

Enclosures

cc: Nova Clemenza, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Richard Aschieris, Port of Stockton Jeff Wingfield, Port of Stockton

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 9 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, California 94105

IN THE MATTER OF:

Alco Iron and Metal Company 2201 West Washington Street, Suite 21 Port Road 22 Stockton, CA 95203-7554 Docket No. CWA 309(a)-09-006

FINDINGS OF VIOLATION AND ORDER FOR COMPLIANCE

Proceedings under Section 308(a) and 309(a) of the Clean Water Act, as amended, 33 U.S.C. Sections 1318(a), and 1319(a)

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The following Findings of Violation are made and Order for Compliance (Order) issued pursuant to the authority vested in the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by Sections 308(a) and 309(a)(3), (a)(4), and (a)(5)(A) of the Clean Water Act, as amended (the Act or CWA), 33 U.S.C. §§ 1318(a), and 1319(a)(3), (a)(4), and (a)(5)(A). This authority has been delegated to the Regional Administrator of EPA, Region 9, and re-delegated by the Regional Administrator to the Director of the Water Division of EPA, Region 9. Notice of this action has been given to the State of California.

FINDINGS OF VIOLATION

- 1. Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), prohibits the discharge of pollutants into navigable waters of the United States, except in compliance with the Act, including Section 402, 33 U.S.C. § 1342.
- 2. Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, establishes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. Under Section 402, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, EPA and states with EPA-approved NPDES programs are authorized to issue permits governing the discharge of pollutants from regulated sources.
- 3. Section 402(p) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p), and EPA's implementing regulations at 40 CFR § 122.26, require NPDES permit authorization for discharges of storm water associated with industrial activity. Facilities engaged in industrial activity, as defined by 40 CFR § 122.26(b)(14), must obtain NPDES permit authorization if they discharge or

propose to discharge storm water into waters of the United States. Pursuant to 40 CFR §§ 122.26(a)(1)(ii) and 122.26(c), dischargers of storm water associated with industrial activity are required to apply for an individual permit or to seek coverage under a promulgated storm water general permit.

- 4. Scrap Materials Recycling, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) 5093, falls under SIC Major Group 50 and, pursuant to 40 CFR § 122.26(b)(14)(vi), is an industrial activity subject to the discharge and permitting requirements under Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342.
- 5. Section 308(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1318(a), and its implementing regulations authorize EPA to, inter alia, require the owner or operator of any point source to establish records, make reports, or submit other reasonably required information, including individual and general NPDES permit applications.
- 6. Pursuant to Section 308(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1318(a), and 40 CFR § 122.21, any person who discharges or proposes to discharge storm water associated with industrial activity must submit an application for an NPDES permit 180 days prior to commencing industrial activity.
- 7. The State of California has an EPA-approved NPDES program, and issues permits, including storm water permits, through its State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards). Since 1991, the State Board has adopted two successive statewide NPDES general permits for discharges of storm water associated with industrial activity. The permit that is currently effective, General Permit No. CAS000001/Water Quality Order No. 97-03-DWQ (General Permit) was adopted on April 17, 1997.
- 8. All facility operators seeking coverage under the General Permit must submit a notice of intent to comply (NOI) to the State Board 14 days prior to commencing industrial operations. Industrial storm water dischargers that do not submit an NOI must submit an application for an individual NPDES permit. (General Permit, Provision E(1), pg. 6 and Attachment 3 to the General Permit.)
- 9. The General Permit requires facility operators to develop and implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) prior to commencing industrial operations. (General Permit, Section A(1)(a), pg. 11). The purpose of the SWPPP is to identify sources of industrial storm water pollution and to identify and implement site-specific best management practices (BMPs) to control discharges.
- 10. The SWPPP must include, <u>inter alia</u>, a narrative description of the storm water BMPs to be implemented at the facility for each potential pollutant and its source as well as a site map (or maps) that identifies: (a) facility boundaries and an outline of facility drainage areas, (b) the storm water collection and conveyance system, (c) an outline of impervious

Alco Iron and Metal Company

Docket No. CWA-309(a)-09-006

areas, (d) locations where materials are directly exposed to precipitation, and (e) areas of industrial activity. (General Permit, Section A(4), pg. 12, 13 and Section A(8), pg. 17.)

- 11. Facility operators must reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activity in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges using best available technology economically achievable (BAT) for toxic pollutants and best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) for conventional pollutants. (General Permit, Effluent Limitation B(3), pg. 4.)
- 12. Facility operators must develop a written monitoring program, and must conduct quarterly visual observations of non-storm water discharges, monthly visual observations of storm water events, and prescribed storm water sampling and analysis. (General Permit, Section B(1), (3), (4), and (5), pg. 24-27.) In addition, facility operators must submit an annual report to the Regional Board that summarizes visual observations and sampling and provides a comprehensive site compliance evaluation. (General Permit, Section B(14), pg. 35.) A copy of the written monitoring program as well as records of inspections, steps taken to reduce or prevent discharges, and the annual report must be maintained for at least five years and must be available at the facility for review by facility employees or inspectors. (General Permit, Section B(13), pg. 34.)
- 13. The Port of Stockton (Port) is a division of the City of Stockton, a municipality and a "person" under CWA Section 502(5), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(5). The majority of the property within the Port's boundaries is owned by the Port and leased to tenants operating in various industrial categories. The remaining properties are privately owned and operated.
- 14. The Port does not assume responsibility for compliance with storm water requirements at any of its tenant facilities. Therefore, industrial operators within the Port's boundaries must independently obtain coverage under the General Permit.
- 15. Alco Iron and Metal Company (Alco Iron and Metal or Respondent) is a California corporation, licensed to do business in California and is thus a "person" under CWA Section 502(5), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(5).
- Alco Iron and Metal operates a facility within the Port's boundaries, located at 2201 West Washington Street, Port Road 22, Stockton, California (Facility). Respondent is engaged in scrap materials recycling at the Facility, an industrial activity classified under SIC 5093.
- Respondent submitted an NOI to the State Board. The State Board assigned Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Number 5S39I021347 to Respondent for the Facility on December 17, 2007.
- 18. Rainfall events at the Facility that exceed 0.1 inches are generally sufficient to generate storm water runoff. Data from the Stockton Metro Airport Weather Monitoring Station,

3

Alco Iron and Metal Company

Docket No. CWA-309(a)-09-006

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

approximately six miles from the Facility, indicate that there were approximately 164 days with more than 0.1 inches of rainfall at the Facility from November 1, 2003 through September 1, 2008.

19. Storm water runoff at the Facility discharges through sheet flow to storm drains located adjacent to the Facility to a concrete conveyance channel (the "South Ditch") that flows to a retention basin and then to the San Joaquin River. The storm drains, South Ditch, and the retention basin are owned by the Port and are part of its municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4). The Port's MS4 is a "point source" as defined by Section 502(14) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14).

20. The storm water discharged from the Facility contains "pollutants," including industrial waste, as defined by Section 502(6) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(6), and is storm water discharge associated with industrial activity as defined by EPA regulations in 40 CFR § 122.26(b)(14).

21. The San Joaquin River is a "navigable water" within the meaning of Section 502(7) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7), and a "water of the United States" as defined by EPA regulations in 40 CFR § 122.2.

22. Portions of the San Joaquin River have been listed under Section 303(d) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d), as an impaired water body for low dissolved oxygen, electrical conductivity, selenium, and mercury among other pollutants.

23. On March 20, 2008, a representative of EPA, accompanied by Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board staff, inspected the Facility to evaluate Respondent's compliance with the General Permit. The inspection report is attached and incorporated by reference, and contains evidence that Respondent:

- a. Failed to develop a complete SWPPP, as required by the General Permit (General Permit, Section A, pg. 11-23), including:
 - 1. Failed to develop an adequate site map, as required by the General Permit (General Permit, Section A(4), pg. 12);
 - 2. Failed to include all Potential Pollutant Sources, such as the fueling area, as required by the General Permit (General Permit, Section A(6), pg. 15); and
 - 3. Failed to include BMPs to be implemented to control each potential pollutant and its source, as required by the General Permit (General Permit, Section A(8), pg. 17).
- b. Failed to implement any BMPs at the Facility as required by the General Permit (General Permit, Section A, pg. 11-23), including:
 - 1. Failed to construct a berm at the south perimeter as stated in the SWPPP;
 - 2. Failed to implement adequate BMPs, such as containment or cover around the fueling area;
 - 3. Failed to implement adequate BMPs at the entrance and exit in order to prevent track-out; and

Alco Iron and Metal Company

- 4. Failed to properly implement adequate BMPs in order to prevent spills from reaching the South Ditch, a part of the City of Stockton's MS4.
- Failed to comply with the Monitoring Program and Reporting Requirements (Monitoring Program) of the General Permit (General Permit, Section B, pg. 24-45), including:
 - 1. Failed to conduct sampling or maintain records of sampling activities at all storm water discharge locations, as required by the General Permit (General Permit, Section B(5)(a), pg. 26, and Section B(13), pg. 34); and
 - Failed to conduct non-storm water visual observations and storm water discharge visual observations or maintain records of such observations, as required by the General Permit (General Permit, Section B(3) and B(4), pg. 25, 26, and Section B(13), pg. 34).
- 24. Based on the foregoing, EPA has determined that Respondent has violated the CWA as follows:
 - a. Respondent's failure to develop and implement an adequate SWPPP while engaged in industrial activity at the Facility violated the General Permit (General Permit, Provision E(2), pg. 6, and Section A, pg. 11-23), which was issued pursuant to Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, and thus violated Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a);
 - b. Respondent's failure to develop and implement adequate BMPs at the Facility violated the General Permit (General Permit, Effluent Limitation B(3) pg. 4), which was issued pursuant to Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, and thus violated Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a); and
 - c. Respondent's failure to develop and implement an adequate Monitoring Program while engaged in industrial activity at the Facility violated the General Permit (General Permit, Provision E(3) pg. 6, and Section B, pg. 24-45), which was issued pursuant to Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, and thus violated Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

ORDER FOR COMPLIANCE

Considering the foregoing Findings of Violations and the potential environmental and human health effects of the violations, EPA has determined that compliance in accordance with the following requirements is reasonable. Pursuant to the authority of Section 308 and 309 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1318 and 1319, it is hereby ordered that Respondent comply with the following requirements:

25. Immediately upon receipt of this Order, Respondent shall take all necessary measures to fully and properly comply with all terms and conditions of the General Permit.

5

26. Within 15 days of receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a photocopy of the current SWPPP to EPA. Respondent shall include any and all inspection reports,

Alco Iron and Metal Company

Docket No. CWA-309(a)-09-006

monitoring records, and annual reports required by the General Permit. If no such reports or records exist, Respondent shall state that no such records exist.

- 27. Within 15 days of receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a photocopy of the SWPPP that was in use at the Facility during the March 20, 2008 inspection.
- 28. Within 15 days of receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a certified statement indicating the date of its commencement of industrial activities at the Facility.
- 29. Within 21 days of receipt of this Order, Respondent shall complete interim cleanup and housekeeping measures (Interim Measures) for all of the Facility's areas of industrial activity, including but not limited to:
 - a. Implementation of adequate BMPs at the fueling station;
 - b. Implementation of adequate BMPs around material stockpiles; and
 - c. Implementation of interim perimeter BMPs to be installed until the permanent berm is installed.
- 30. Within 21 days of receipt of this Order, upon completion of the Interim Measures, Respondent shall submit a Notice of Completion to EPA, which shall include a list of the Interim Measures taken, the date each Interim Measure was completed, the person(s) responsible for overseeing completion of each Interim Measure, and copies of documents associated with the completion of the Interim Measures, such as contracts, permits, manifests, and photographs.
- 31. In performing the Interim Measures, care shall be taken to ensure they do not cause or contribute any runoff to waters of the United States, the municipal storm drains, or the municipal sewer system. Care shall be taken to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local waste storage and disposal requirements.
- 32. Within 21 days of the receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a report detailing the circumstances surrounding the spill of unknown material that occurred during the week of March 13, 2008. The report shall, at a minimum, identify the material spilled, set forth the quantity of material spilled, and explain the circumstances surrounding the spill. Respondent shall also include in the report copies of any notifications to State or Federal authorities.
- 33. Within 45 days of the receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a revised SWPPP to EPA that fully complies with the General Permit. The SWPPP revisions shall include, among all other required elements:
 - a. An accurate facility site map;
 - b. A listing of all potential pollutant sources and appropriate BMPs for, among other sources, fueling areas and material storage; and
 - c. A signature and certification for the SWPPP by Respondent's appropriate representative.

Alco Iron and Metal Company

6

Docket No. CWA-309(a)-09-006

- 34. Within 45 days of the receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a revised written Monitoring Program to EPA that fully complies with the General Permit.
- 35. Within 45 days of the receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a report to EPA on the costs associated with: development of the revised SWPPP, projected incremental annual costs associated with implementation of the revised SWPPP, development of the revised Monitoring Program, projected incremental annual costs associated with implementation of the revised Monitoring Program, and any other costs associated with complying with this Order.
- 36. Within 60 days of the receipt of this Order, Respondent shall submit a topographical survey of the facility to show accurate drainage pathways.
- 37. All reports submitted pursuant to this Order must be signed by a principal executive officer, ranking elected official, or duly authorized representative of Respondent (as specified by 40 CFR § 122.22 (b)(2)) and shall include the following statement:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, I certify that the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

38. All submissions requested by this Order shall be mailed to the following address:

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 9 Clean Water Act Compliance Office WTR-7 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Attention: Ellen Blake

All telephone inquiries should be made to Ellen Blake, Senior Environmental Scientist, at (415) 972-3496.

39. Respondents shall send a copy of all submissions required under this Order to:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board –Central Valley Region 11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200

Alco Iron and Metal Company

Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 Attention: Nova Clemenza

- 40. This Order shall be binding upon Respondent and its officers, directors, agents, employees, heirs, successors, and assigns.
- 41. This Order is not a permit under the CWA, and does not waive or modify Respondent's obligation and responsibility to ascertain and comply with all applicable federal, state, or local laws, regulations, ordinances, permits, or licenses.
- 42. This Order is not to be deemed an election by EPA to forgo any remedies available to it under the law, including without limitation, any administrative, civil, or criminal action to seek penalties, fines, or other appropriate relief under the Act. EPA reserves all rights and remedies, legal and equitable, available to enforce any violations cited in this Order and to enforce this Order.
- 43. Requests for information contained within this Order are not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act because it is not a "collection of information" within the meaning of 44 U.S.C. § 3502(3). It is directed to fewer than ten persons and is an exempt investigation under 44 U.S.C. § 3518(c)(1) and 5 CFR § 1320.4(a)(2).
- 44. Respondent may not withhold from EPA any information on the grounds that it is confidential business information. However, EPA has promulgated, under 40 CFR Part 2, Subpart B, regulations to protect confidential business information it receives. If legally supportable, a claim of business confidentiality may be asserted in the manner specified by 40 CFR § 2.203(b) for all or part of the information requested by EPA. EPA will disclose business information covered by such claim only as authorized under 40 CFR Part 2, Subpart B. If no claim of confidentiality accompanies the information at the time EPA receives it, EPA may make it available to the public without further notice.
- 45. Section 309(a), (b), (d) and (g) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(a), (b), (d) and (g), provides administrative and/or judicial relief for failure to comply with the CWA. In addition, Section 309(c) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(c), provides criminal sanctions for negligent or knowing violations of the CWA and for knowingly making false statements.
- 46. This Order shall become effective upon the date of receipt by Respondent.

Alexis Strauss, Director Water Division Date

Alco Iron and Metal Company

Docket No. CWA-309(a)-09-006

United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington D.C. 20460				
EPA NPDES Industrial Compliance Inspection Report				
NPDES Permit ID Number				
C A S 0 0 0 1 5 s 3 9 i 0 2 1 3 4 7				
5 0 9 3				
Section B: Data Name and Location of Inspected Entry Time/Date Permit Effective Date				
Alco Iron & Metal Co 3/20/08 3:00 p.m. 12/17/200 2201 W Washington St Ste 21 Port Rd 22 Exit Time/Date Permit Expire	2007 xpiration Date			
Stockton, CA 95203 3/20/08 4:00 p.m.				
Name(s) of On-Site Representatives Title(s) Joe Simi General Manager				
lame, Address of Responsible Official Title				
Joe Simi General Manager Receiving Water Phone Number				
South Ditch, via Port of Stockton MS4 209-939-9310, Contacted: YES_X_NO				
Cell 510-908-6578 Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection				
(S = Satisfactory, M = Marginal, U = Unsatisfactory, N = Not Evaluated)				
Permit Records/Reports Site Review Effluent/Receiving Waters	Self-Monitoring Program			
Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments (Attach additional sheets if necessary)				
Alco Iron and Metal Co is a recycler. The Facility sorts and prepares for shipment large ferrous and nor	non-ferrous scrap			
The representative, Joe Simi, said the Facility was a Storage Unit until it changed to process metals one month before this				
inspection.				
	controls to MSA inlate			
inspection. This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf				
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was narge of non- neter of the Facility.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was narge of non- neter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection from Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or con-	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection fro Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or co the other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater infinite Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or contended on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP contained no monitoring plan.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection from Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or con- the other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP is still in development.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection from Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or con- the other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP contained no monitoring plan. Mr. Simi said the SWPPP is still in development. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection from Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or con- the other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP contained no monitoring plan. Mr. Simi said the SWPPP is still in development. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the The Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection from Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or con- the other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP contained no monitoring plan. Mr. Simi said the SWPPP is still in development. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the The Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map. The site map is titled with two company names: A-1 Trucking and Storage, and ALCO Iron and Metal.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection from Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or con- the other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP contained no monitoring plan. Mr. Simi said the SWPPP is still in development. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the The Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater infine Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a discharg Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection from Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or conthe other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map. The site map is titled with two company names: A-1 Trucking and Storage, and ALCO Iron and Metal. The gates to the Facility are not protected by a gravel pad as indicated on the site map.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without con located at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater inf the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischar Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection fro Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or co the other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP contained no monitoring plan. Mr. Simi said the SWPPP is still in development. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the The Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map. The site map is tilled with two company names: A-1 Trucking and Storage, and ALCO Iron and Metal. The gates to the Facility are not protected by a gravel pad as indicated on the site map. There is no discussion of BMPs in the SWPPP.	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without conlocated at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater infit the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or not evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a dischard Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the timm EPA inspectors observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or conthe other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map. The site map is titled with two company names: A-1 Trucking and Storage, and ALCO Iron and Metal. The gates to the Facility are not protected by a gravel pad as indicated on the site map. There is no discussion of BMPs in the SWPPP. Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s) Agency/Office/Telephone Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s) Agency/Office/Telephone Name(s) and Signature(s) <td>infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was marge of non- meter of the Facility. Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection. the Facility perimeter.</td>	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was marge of non- meter of the Facility. Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection. the Facility perimeter.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without conlocated at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater infit the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a discharg Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perimeter he Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection for Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or conthe other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP is still in development. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map. The site map is titled with two company names: A-1 Trucking and Storage, and ALCO Iron and Metal. The gates to the Facility are not protected by a gravel pad as indicated on the site map. There is no discussion of BMPs in the	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was marge of non- meter of the Facility. Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection. the Facility perimeter.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without collocated at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater infine Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or not evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a discharg Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perime The Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection for Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or conthe other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map. The site map is titled with two company names: A-1 Trucking and Storage, and ALCO Iron and Metal. The gates to the Facility are not protected by a gravel pad as indicated on the site map. There is no discussion of BMPs in the SWPPP. Name(s) and Signature(s) of Insp	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection. the Facility perimeter.			
This Facility is over 5 acres in size. The Facility has no stormdrains. Stormwater discharges without conlocated at the perimeter of the Facility. Mr. Simi mentioned a plan to pond onsite and let Stormwater infit the Facility is graded so that there is no Stormwater runoff. Mr. Simi, told inspectors the Facility is graded to contain Stormwater onsite. Inspectors found little or no evidence of discharge to stormdrains located outside of the perimeter of the Facility. The Port of Stockton sent the Facility a letter in the week preceding this inspection, regarding a discharg Stormwater off the Facility. There was a spill of unknown liquid into the stormdrain on the south perimeter he Port representative said the spill made it to the South Ditch, and was observed by Port staff. The P the Facility to build a berm on the South perimeter where the spill occurred. No berm existed at the time EPA inspectors observed stockpiles of recycle materials uncovered and without adequate protection for Inspectors also observed a fueling area with two diesel tanks: one with no secondary containment or conthe other resting on a damaged palette. See photos DSCN0661 and DSCN0662. The SWPPP was developed by consultant Robin Spencer. The SWPPP was incomplete at the time of The SWPPP is still in development. The SWPPP was signed by Mr. Simi on 2/4/2008. The site map indicates "Berm around the Entire Perimeter" however there is no berm on any part of the Facility is not graded to direct Stormwater as indicated by flow direction arrows on the site map. The site map is titled with two company names: A-1 Trucking and Storage, and ALCO Iron and Metal. The gates to the Facility are not protected by a gravel pad as indicated on the site map. There is no discussion of BMPs in the	infiltrate. Mr. Simi said no grading. There was harge of non- meter of the Facility. e Port of Stockton told ime of this inspection. from Stormwater. cover, of this inspection. the Facility perimeter.			

Photo Log		
Image No.	Description	
DSCN0656.JPG	Facing east, metal stockpile with slight grading for in the background, near the red truck trailer.	
DSCN0657.JPG - DSCN0660.JPG	Numerous stockpiles of various metals on the with no protection from pollutant sources.	
DSCN0661.JPG	Fueling area. Steel container with no secondary containment, exposed without cover.	
DSCN0662.JPG	Diesel tank that is fork-lifted to fuel vehicles. Note the compromised palate.	
DSCN0663.JPG	Bales of metal exposed to runoff located on the North perimeter fence of the .	
DSCN0664.JPG	Stockpile of tin.	
DSCN0665.JPG	Exposed metals.	
DSCN0666.JPG	Exposed metals.	
DSCN0667.JPG	North perimeter of ALCO as seen from outside the . Note the discharge stains on the pavement in the foreground.	
DSCN0668.JPG	Same location as picture DSCN0667.JPG	
DSCN0669.JPG	Same location as picture DSCN0667.JPG, showing the proximity of the stormdrain to the North perimeter of the . Note the lack of controls to contain from the runoff of the stockpile.	



























