Paratus

EPA Region 8 Emergency Preparedness Newsletter

Volume XI No. 2 April 2021 Quarterly Newsletter

Welcome to the EPA Region 8 Preparedness Newsletter.
Feel free to page through the entire newsletter or click on the links to the stories you want to read first.

Next Page

Upper Ingram Gulch Abandoned Mine Waste Cleaned Up – A Successful Good Samaritan Collaboration

Approximately 40% of headwaters in rivers and streams in the West, which are the source of drinking water for thousands of people, have been impacted by discharges from inactive or abandoned hardrock mines (Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2000). As part of its mission to protect human health and the environment, EPA and other federal agencies have authority to clean up abandoned hardrock mines and other historic mine tailings that are sources of contamination. Due to limited resources, very few of these abandoned mine sites can be addressed each year unless they are determined to contain substantial hazardous waste contamination and listed on the National Priority List (Superfund sites). To leverage cleanup of watersheds and enhance Agency/Community partnerships, EPA's Good Samaritan Initiative is an Agency-wide effort to enable non-liable parties ("Good Samaritans") to voluntarily clean up smaller, low-risk sites. The Upper Ingram Gulch Good Samaritan Project and others are an excellent demonstration of resilient watershed restoration that can be achieved through partnership with the community.

Ingram Gulch is an intermittent tributary to Gold Run and Fourmile Creeks located within the Fourmile watershed near the town of Salina, approximately eight miles west of the City of Boulder in the Rocky Mountain foothills in north-central Colorado. Boulder County, about 30 miles northwest of Denver, has a long history of hard-rock mining for gold, silver, tungsten, and other metals. This type of mining activity started in the mid-to late 1800s and continued until the 1920s. In 2010, a wildfire burned 6,000 acres, much of which was within the Fourmile Watershed. With the vegetation removed, hundreds of legacy mine waste piles were now visible and subject to erosion from wind, rain, and snowmelt. A flood in 2013 (a Federal Disaster Area designation) further disturbed and eroded many of the tailings piles adjacent to streams and gulches. Upper Ingram Gulch had multiple piles within the immediate channel that contained elevated arsenic levels and other heavy metals. This situation became a concern for Pine Brook Water District which supplies drinking water to over 400 homes using a diversion on Fourmile Creek. The Fourmile watershed also provides drinking water to hundreds of private well owners in the Fourmile Canyon area.

Next Page Return to Top

Upper Ingram Gulch Abandoned Mine Waste Cleaned Up –Continued

The Good Samaritan Fourmile Watershed Coalition, the "Good Samaritan" entity for the Upper Ingram project, is a non-governmental organization comprised of local landowners, community members, and other stakeholders focused on stream restoration and disaster recovery efforts in Fourmile Canyon and the surrounding watershed. In April 2018, the Coalition received Community Development Block Grant - Disaster Recovery funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to address watershed impacts in Ingram Gulch from the 2013 Colorado flood event.

Work on the Upper Ingram Gulch project began on January 30, 2020, with the primary objectives of improving water quality in the Fourmile Creek and its tributaries, and the introduction of aquatic plants and terrestrial habitat. The mine waste piles were relocated from the immediate drainage to a drier location on higher ground where regularly flowing water will not transport the contaminated tailings into the Ingram Gulch channel, Gold Run Creek and then Fourmile Creek.

The project included the design and implementation of channel improvements; floodplain enhancements and stabilization with the development of in-stream habitat; waste rock pile removal, and re-vegetation with native plants. Sections of the channel were realigned to improve and stabilize channel configuration to convey flows without further erosion of waste rock piles or mobilization of contaminated sediments downstream. The project lasted about four months and was completed in late April 2020.

EPA's Region 8 On-Scene Coordinator (OSC) D. Nguyen summarized the project, "It was my pleasure to work with such dedicated community partners to transform a burned-out drainage into a meandering mountain stream with an active and effective floodplain. It was a great experience and I look forward to future opportunities." Maya MacHamer, Director of the Boulder Watershed Collective added, "In addition to improved water quality, working with the EPA throughout the project has enabled a significant amount of organizational learning and capacity building that sets the foundation for future restoration. We are so appreciative to have such a committed and knowledgeable team to assist us in navigating the complex and challenging regulatory and design processes associated with abandoned mine lands restoration."

Next Page Return to Top

Loveland, CO I-25 Diesel Spill

At approximately 0100 on March 20, 2021, a tanker truck carrying 11,500 gallons of diesel fuel was involved in a rollover accident on I-25 (near Mile Marker 255) in Loveland, Larimer County, Colorado. The tanker lost the entirety of its load, plus the contents of its two saddle tanks (250 gallons each). This section of I-25 is currently under construction, and the tanker ended upside down, straddling the divide between the north-bound lanes of I-25, and a center construction area. Diesel fuel soaked into the asphalt, as well as draining into storm drains on both the east and west side of the highway. The spilled fuel traveled north from these drains into an irrigation ditch on the west side of I-25 that flows into the Big Thompson River, roughly 3/8 of a mile north of the accident scene.

The discharge location occurred on I-25 just north of its intersection with Highway 402/34 near mile marker 255. The impacted area included both north and south-bound lanes of I-25, as well as a construction area between the two. There are residential neighborhoods 1,000 feet east of the incident location. To the west of the interstate is a private residential property, which includes a large (approximately 15 acres in area) pond. Adjacent to the north of the residential property is a State Wildlife Area which lies along the Big Thompson River. The area is also home to a system of drainage and irrigation ditches that travel both north to the Big Thompson River and east to agricultural lands in Larimer County.

Next Page Return to Top

Loveland, CO I-25 Diesel Spill - Continued

Description of Threat

A total of just under 12,000 gallons of diesel fuel was involved in this discharge, Per 40 CFR 300.5, the NCP defines this discharge as a major one (>10,000 gallons). The proximity of the impacted drainage pathways leading directly to the nearby Big Thompson River posed a serious threat of the diesel fuel reaching the river.

The Big Thompson River is a tributary to the South Platte River, which serves as a source of both drinking and irrigation and brings recreational and economic value to the State of Colorado. Diesel fuel constituents can attach to particles in the soil or water and, in water, may sink down into the sediment. Chemicals that attach to soil or other matter (e.g., marsh sediment) may remain in the environment for more than a decade.

The close proximity to the residential neighborhoods also prompted the need for community air monitoring. According to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, diesel fuel is a highly flammable liquid with a high vapor pressure and poses a high fire hazard if not contained and removed. Diesel fuel may evaporate into the air when spilled onto soils or surface waters in an open environment.

Diesel fuel can enter the human body when breathed in through the air, when ingested in food containing diesel, and when skin comes into contact with it. Breathing diesel fuel vapors for a long time may damage the kidneys, increase blood pressure, or lower the blood's ability to clot. Constant skin contact (for example, washing) with diesel fuel may also damage the kidneys. Hence, there was concern that the discharge may have posed a threat to public health in the nearby neighborhoods.

Preliminary Removal Assessment/Removal Site Inspection Results

Due to the presence of a major discharge and its threat to the Big Thompson River and the nearby community, EPA On-Scene Coordinator (OSC) Valeriy Bizyayev immediately recognized the need for federal assistance and coordination with local response authorities. EPA OSC Bizyayev entered into Unified Command with Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), Colorado State Patrol (CSP) and Loveland Fire Rescue Authority (LFRA). CDOT hired an environmental clean-up contractor to immediately start diesel recovery efforts on the interstate. LFRA conducted fire suppression, life safety operations, and constructed underflow dams to keep oil out of the River. CSP controlled traffic and helped prioritize state/local resources. EPA, in consultation with Unified Command, secured additional contractor resources to accelerate oil recovery efforts.

Next Page Return to Top

Loveland, CO I-25 Diesel Spill Continued

EPA contractors arrived on-scene on the morning of March 20, 2021. They immediately began assisting the effort to remove recoverable diesel fuel from the drainage ditches and improving the functionality of the control points (underflow dams, check dams, and boom locations) installed by the LFRA and CSP. The contractors also modified site drainage so that all water (and hence all draining diesel) flowed to the control points along the drainage ditches on the west side of I-25. Fuel recovery operations continued overnight on March 20 and into March 21. During this period, CDOT contractors continued to remove free product from in and around the roadway as well as removing impacted soil and asphalt from the spill area.

Progress Metrics

Waste Stream	Medium	Quantity
Recovered Oil	Oil	5,000 gallons
Removed Oil/Water	Water	120,000 gallons

Next Page Return to Top

Loveland, CO I-25 Diesel Spill Continued

In addition to EPA actions to accelerate oil recovery efforts, EPA conducted community air monitoring to assess and protect the residential communities close to the incident location. Air monitoring in the communities was conducted on March 20 and March 21, 2021 with no detections over community action levels. EPA also conducted visual inspections and collected water samples to help determine if diesel fuel had reached the Big Thompson River. No fuel or sheen was observed on the river, and laboratory data received on March 22, 2021 confirmed diesel range organics and gasoline range organics were below the reporting limit or non-detectable limits.

By March 21, 2021, the interstate had been closed for over 24 hours. CDOT, in consultation with EPA and other Unified Command members, decided to reopen the interstate as quickly as possible. EPA expressed the concern that the interstate was not fully remediated and there could be potential impacts associated with opening. However, EPA recognized that there were other, non-environmental public health and safety aspects associated with continued interstate closure and deferred the final decision on when to reopen to the state agencies. At this time, CDOT focused resources on preparing the interstate for safe passage and EPA focused on continual mitigation efforts to recover oil and prevent impacts the Big Thompson River. The interstate was reopened roughly 36 hours after the accident.

A heavy storm, bringing significant rain and snow, began in the area on the afternoon of March 21, 2021. With the approval of Unified Command, EPA completed the redirection of drainage to central collection points along the western drainage and consolidated the footprint of oil recovery operations. EPA also reenforced the underflow dams, booming locations and collection points. The heavy winter weather arrived and made night operations unsafe. All crews under Unified Command demobilized from the Site by 1730 on March 21, 2021. At that time there was no observable "free product' in or around the spill scene, and the control points were thought robust enough to stop any spread of diesel overnight.

EPA arrived back on site at 0730 on March 22, 2021 to evaluate the effectiveness of the containment measures that had been left in place. These measures proved successful and no diesel made it into the river during the winter storm. It was at this time that EPA began to transition oil recovery efforts back to CDOT's clean up contractor. EPA and our contractors demobilized from the site on the afternoon of March 22, 2021.

Next Page Back to Top

Local Government Reimbursement (LGR) for Haz Mat Response

Overview

The Local Governments Reimbursement (LGR) program operates under the authority of 40 CFR Part 310—Reimbursement to Local Governments for Emergency Response to Hazardous Substance Releases. The purpose of the LGR program is to provide funds, in the form of reimbursements for expenses, to local, county, and tribal governments that respond to a hazardous substance release in their jurisdiction. These funds are limited to $25,000 per incident and are only available if the applying government is not at fault for the release. EPA's goal is to give financial assistance to government entities that do not have a budget allocated for emergency response and cannot otherwise provide adequate response measures.

NOTE: Incidents involving petroleum products including petroleum, natural gas, crude oil, or any other specified fractions thereof that are not specifically designated as CERCLA hazardous substances **DO NOT QUALIFY** under this program. Some mixed waste may be allowable. Under CERCLA, potentially responsible parties are liable for cleanup costs. Under the LGR program, if a local government is the responsible party, they would not be eligible for reimbursement.

Determining Eligibility

To be eligible for the LGR program, your local government must meet the following requirements:

- The applicant must be a general-purpose unit of local government.
- Local governments that are eligible to receive reimbursement under the LGR program include any general-purpose unit of local government, such as a county, parish, city, town, township, and municipality. Federally recognized Indian Tribes are also eligible for reimbursement under the LGR program.
- States are NOT eligible for reimbursement under the LGR program.
- States may not request reimbursement on the behalf of a local government or a federally recognized Indian Tribe within the state.
- The applicant must have legal jurisdiction over the site where the incident occurred.

Only one request for reimbursement will be accepted for each eligible incident. When more than one local government has participated in such a response, the local government that has legal jurisdiction over the site where the incident occurred must submit the application. The application can be made on behalf of all participating local governments. If multiple local governments or agencies have jurisdiction over the site, then the respondents must decide which single government or agency will submit the reimbursement request.

Reimbursement cannot be made to a responsible party.

If the local government applying for reimbursement is also the responsible party, the application will be denied. Responsible parties are liable for response cost regardless of whether or not they are a local government.

Examples of Activities Covered:

- Controlling the release source
- Containing released substances
- Controlling runoff that could contaminate drinking water sources
- Temporary site security measures

Next Page Return to Top

Local Government Reimbursement (LGR) for Haz Mat Response Cont'd.

Examples of Materials and Expenses covered:

- Expendable materials and supplies
- Rental or leasing of equipment
- Special technical services and laboratory costs
- Evacuation services
- Compensation of overtime wages
- Decontamination of equipment

Examples of Materials and Expenses NOT covered:

- Disposable materials and supplies already owned by a local government
- Purchase of durable goods
- Employee fringe benefits (including comp time)
- Employee out of pocket expenses
- Legal expenses
- Medical expenses
- Administrative costs

Under the EPA LGR Program, costs associated with the gross removal of methamphetamine (meth) labs and their related wastes may be eligible for reimbursement. These costs may include overtime wages related to hours spent securing the site or performing decontamination, costs for equipment purchased specifically for the response and contractor cleanup costs incurred by the local government for gross removal. However, costs related to long-term remediation actions as described in these voluntary guidelines (e.g., hiring a remediation contractor, conducting pre- and/or post-remediation sampling, developing a remediation cleanup plan and outdoor remediation) are generally not eligible for reimbursement under the LGR Program.

Examples of Materials and Expenses Covered for Meth Responses:

- Overtime hours related to site security
- Performing proper disposal measures
- Equipment/materials purchased specifically for the response for cleanup purposes

Examples of Materials and Expenses NOT Covered for Meth Responses:

- Overtime hours related to routine law-enforcement activities (i.e., search warrant, surveillance, interviews, investigation)
- Equipment/materials not purchased specifically for the response or not used for cleanup purposes
- Personal items

Next Page Return to Top

Local Government Reimbursement (LGR) for Haz Mat Response - Cont'd.

Requirements for Reimbursement

Once a local government has decided to apply for reimbursement, there are a number of basic requirements that must be met to comply with the regulations of the LGR program. When completing the LGR application, local governments should pay special attention to the following requirements to facilitate the reimbursement process:

Reimbursement Cannot Supplant Local Funds Normally Provided for A Response

In other words, if a local government budgets for emergency response activities, it must draw from this budget to pay for the cost of a response. However, if a local government's funds have been depleted, then it may be eligible for reimbursement under EPA's LGR program. In addition, other items that may not be budgeted for (e.g., overtime pay, unanticipated materials and supplies) may also be reimbursable under the LGR program.

Cost Recovery Must Be Pursued Prior To Applying for Reimbursement

The applicant must complete the Cost Recovery Summary Table, included in the application, to document the background and current status of cost recovery efforts. It should be clear that all available sources of cost recovery (i.e., responsible parties and their insurance, the state, and local government insurance) have been pursued. Although not required, it is recommended that a copy of all related correspondence also be included in the application to document the applicant's cost recovery efforts. Potential cost recovery sources should be given a minimum of 60 days to respond before an LGR application is filed. By signing on the last page of the application, a local government is certifying that cost recovery was pursued.

Detailed Cost Documentation Must Be Submitted with The Application

The applicant must complete the detailed Cost Breakdown Table, included in the application. All costs for which reimbursement is being requested must be listed and supporting documentation (e.g., invoices, sales receipts, time sheets, or rental agreements) must be attached. (Please note: Costs incurred for long-term remedial measures do not qualify under the LGR program. Reimbursement is made only for temporary emergency measures conducted in response to hazardous substance releases or threatened releases).

The Application Must Be Signed by The Local Government's Highest Ranking Official

Examples of the highest-ranking official include: Mayor, City Manager, Board of Commissioners Chair, County Judge, or head of a federally recognized Indian Tribe. In instances where the highest-ranking local official is unable to sign the application form, a letter of delegation along with the application that authorizes a delegate to sign the application on his or her behalf, must be submitted.

Applications Must Be Submitted to EPA Within One Year of the "Date of Response Completion"

For the LGR program, the date of completion is the date when all field work has been completed and all project deliverables (e.g., lab results, technical expert reports, or invoices) have been received by the local government.

The LGR Application can be found at: https://www.epa.gov/emergency-response/local-governments-reimbursement-lgr-application

Questions? Contact Region 8 Tina Artemis at 303-312-6765 or the LGR Helpline at: (800) 431-9209; lgr.epa@epa.gov

Next Page Return to Top

PFAS in Drinking Water

EPA is announcing final determinations to regulate perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) in drinking water. Additionally, the agency is proposing to require monitoring for 29 per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in drinking water under the fifth Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 5). Today's actions represent important milestones in EPA's extensive efforts under the PFAS Action Plan to help communities address PFAS nationwide.

By issuing final regulatory determinations, the agency is taking the next step to regulate two contaminants, PFOS and PFOA, under the processes laid out in the Safe Drinking Water Act. EPA will now initiate the process to develop a national primary drinking water regulation for these two PFAS, which will include further analyses, scientific review, and opportunity for public comment. Additionally, EPA intends to fast track evaluation of additional PFAS for future drinking water regulatory determinations if necessary information and data become available. The agency has also decided not to regulate six contaminants that do not meet the criteria provided under the Safe Drinking Water Act for regulation: 1,1-dichloroethane, acetochlor, methyl bromide, metolachlor, nitrobenzene, and 1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (known as Royal Demolition eXplosive or RDX).

EPA is also moving forward to collect new PFAS data under UCMR 5. The new data will be used to better understand occurrence and prevalence of 29 PFAS in the nation's drinking water. The UCMR 5 proposal includes monitoring for six PFAS that were part of UCMR 3, now using new analytical methods that support lower reporting levels. EPA also proposes that an additional 23 PFAS be monitored using methods developed by EPA. In addition to PFAS, UCMR 5 proposes monitoring for lithium in drinking water.

In addition, EPA announced next steps to address PFAS in wastewater, where appropriate. The agency announced an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to collect data and information regarding manufacturers of PFAS and the presence and treatment of PFAS in discharges from these facilities. EPA is also requesting information regarding PFAS formulators—facilities that produce a variety of PFAS products and materials from PFAS feedstocks. The information collected through this action will help inform whether these industrial sources warrant regulation through national Effluent Limitation Guidelines (ELGs) to address PFAS discharges.

For additional information on EPA's regulatory determinations for PFOS and PFOA and on UCMR 5, visit www.epa.gov/safewater

Next Page Return to Top

PFAS -Continued

Background on PFAS

Aggressively addressing PFAS substances has been an active and ongoing priority for EPA. In carrying out EPA's mission to protect human health and the environment, over the past two years EPA has delivered results for every key commitment made under the PFAS Action Plan.

In December 2019, EPA accomplished a key milestone in the PFAS Action Plan by publishing a new validated method to accurately test for 11 additional PFAS in drinking water. Method 533 complements EPA Method 537.1, and the agency can now measure 29chemicals.

EPA also asked for information and data on other PFAS substances, as well as sought comment on potential monitoring requirements and regulatory approaches.

- In November 2020, EPA issued a memo detailing an interim National Pollutant Discharge Elimination (NPDES) permitting strategy for PFAS. The agency also released information on progress in developing new analytical methods to test for PFAS compounds in wastewater and other environmental media.
- In January 2021, EPA announced final determinations to regulate PFOS and PFOA in drinking water and a proposal to require monitoring for 29 PFAS in drinking water under the fifth Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule.
- In January 2021, EPA finalized Effluent Guidelines Program Plan 14 and announced an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to collect data and information regarding PFAS manufacturers that will help inform whether these industrial sources warrant regulation through national ELGs to address PFAS discharges.
- In December 2019, EPA issued Interim Recommendations for Addressing Groundwater Contaminated with PFOA and PFOS, which provides guidance for federal cleanup programs (e.g., CERCLA and RCRA) that will also be helpful to states and tribes. The recommendations provide a starting point for making site-specific cleanup decisions and will help protect drinking water resources in communities across the country.
- In December 2020, EPA issued Interim Guidance on the Destruction and Disposal of PFAS and Materials Containing PFAS for public input.
- EPA is working on the proposed rule to designate PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances under CERCLA. In the absence of the rule, EPA has used its existing authorities to compel cleanups.
- In July 2020, EPA issued a final regulation that can stop products containing PFAS from entering or reentering the marketplace without EPA's explicit permission.

Next Page Return to Top

NASTTPO Annual Meeting

The Annual Meeting for the National Association of SARA Title III Program Officials is scheduled virtually for April 20, 2021. Registration can be accomplished by visiting the link below. The meeting will feature updates from EPA, PHMSA, and DHS, as well as updates from the NASTTPO Officers and Regional and Tribal Representatives. You are invited to attend! Send any inquiries to tom.bergman@deq.ok.gov.

https://nasttpo.com/

2021 Regional Response Team (RRT) 8

2021 Regional Response Team (RRT) 8

Tuesday, April 20, 2021, 10:00 AM MST (12:00PM EST)

2-Day Virtual Spring Meeting

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

Meeting Call-in Number: 1-202-991-0477 **Passcode:** 343586644#

Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Documents

EPCRA: http://www2.epa.gov/epcra

NRT Hazardous Materials Emergency Planning Guidance: https://www.nrt.org/Main/Resources.aspx?ResourceType=Hazards%20(Oil,%20Chemical,%20Radiological,%20etc)&ResourceSection=2

Actions to Improve Chemical Facility Safety and Security – A Shared Commitment: https://www.osha.gov/chemicalexecutiveorder/index.html

EPCRA Requirements: https://www.epa.gov/epcra

EPCRA On-Line Training: https://www.epa.gov/epcra/epcra-non-section-313-online-training-states-tribes-lepcs-local-planners-and-responders

EPCRA Fact Sheets: https://www.epa.gov/epcra/epcra-fact-sheets

EPCRA Regional Contacts: https://www.epa.gov/epcra/epcra-regional-contacts

Next Page Back to Top

Risk Management Program FAQ's

RMP Contractor Related Requirements

Facilities subject to the Program 3 Prevention Program requirements in 40 CFR Part 68 must include in their Risk Management Plan the date of the most recent review or revision of contractor safety procedures in Section 7.14 and the date of the most recent review or revision of contractor safety performance in Section 7.15. What are the requirements related to contractor procedures and performance?

Facilities where contractors perform maintenance or repair, turnaround, major renovation, or specialty work on or adjacent to a covered process are required to check safety performance, provide safety and hazards information, ensure safe practices, and verify that the contract owner or operator meets certain obligations (§68.87(b)). The obligations of the contract owner or operator include providing and documenting training for contract employees on job-related and process hazards and the emergency action plan (§68.87(c)). The contract owner or operator must also assure that contract employees follow safety rules of the stationary source and advise the owner or operator on contract work hazards (§68.87(c)).

Additional information can be found in Chapter 7, on page 7-16, of the General Guidance on Risk Management Programs for Chemical Accident Prevention (40 CFR Part 68) (EPA555-B-04-001). This document is available at the following URL:

https://www.epa.gov/rmp/guidance-facilities-risk-management-programs-rmp#general

Remote Coordination with Local Authorities

The Risk Management Program regulations require owners and operators of stationary sources to coordinate their response needs annually, or more frequently if necessary, with local emergency planning and response organizations (40 CFR §68.93(a)). If a stationary source is in a remote location and in-person annual coordination is deemed impractical, can owners and operators conduct coordination activities with local authorities remotely?

Yes. Where necessary, owners and operators and local authorities may conduct coordination activities remotely using methods such as conference calls, webinars, and email (82 FR 4594, 4656; January 13, 2017).

Who Must Develop an Emergency Response Program?

The risk management program regulations require the owner or operator of a covered stationary source to develop and implement an emergency response program as described in 40 CFR §68.95, which must include an emergency response plan, emergency response equipment procedures, employee training, and procedures to ensure the program is up-to-date. Do all facilities subject to the risk management program regulations have to develop an emergency response program?

No. As provided in §68.90(a), only the owner or operator of a stationary source with Program 2 and Program 3 processes, whose employees will respond to accidental releases of RMP-regulated substances, must comply with the requirements of §68.95.

Next Page Return to Top

EPA Region 8 Preparedness Program

We will increase EPA Region 8 preparedness through:

- Planning, training, and developing outreach relations with federal agencies, states, tribes, local organizations, and the regulated community.

- Assisting in the development of EPA Region 8 preparedness planning and response capabilities through the RSC, IMT, RRT, OPA, and RMP.

- Working with facilities to reduce accidents and spills through education, inspections, and enforcement.

To contact a member of our Region 8 EPA Preparedness Unit team, review our programs or view our organization chart, click this link.

Region 8 SERC Contact Information

Colorado
Mr. Greg Stasinos, Co-Chair
Phone: 303-692-3023
greg.stasinos@state.co.us

Mr. Mike Willis, Co-Chair
Phone: 720-852-6694
mike.willis@state.co.us

North Dakota
Mr. Cody Schulz, Chair
Phone: 701-328-8100
nddes@nd.gov

Montana
Ms. Delila Bruno, Co-Chair
Phone: 406-324-4777
dbruno@mt.gov

South Dakota
Mr. Dustin Willett, Chair
Phone: 800-433-2288
Kelsey.Newling@state.sd.us

Utah
Ms. Kim Shelley , Co-Chair
Phone: 801-536-4404
kshelley@utah.gov

Mr. Jess Anderson Co-Chair
Phone: 801-965-4062
jessanderson@utah.gov

Wyoming
Mr. Dale Heggem, Chair
Phone: 307-777-7321
dale.heggem@wyo.gov

RMP Region 8 Reading Room: (303) 312-6345

RMP Reporting Center: The Reporting Center can answer questions about software or installation problems. The RMP Reporting Center is available from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday - Friday:(703) 227-7650 or email RMPRC@epacdx.net.

RMP: https://www.epa.gov/rmp **EPCRA:** https://www.epa.gov/epcra

Emergency Response: https://www.epa.gov/emergency-response

Lists of Lists (Updated August 2020)

Questions? Call the Superfund, TRI, EPCRA, RMP, and Oil Information Center at (800) 424-9346 (Monday-Thursday).

To report an oil or chemical spill, call the National Response Center at (800) 424-8802.

U.S. EPA Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street (8SEM-EM)
Denver, CO 80202-1129
800-227-8917

This newsletter provides information on the EPA Risk Management Program, EPCRA, SPCC/FRP (Facility Response Plan) and other issues relating to Accidental Release Prevention Requirements. The information should be used as a reference tool, not as a definitive source of compliance information. Compliance regulations are published in 40 CFR Part 68 for CAA section 112(r) Risk Management Program, 40 CFR Part 355/370 for

Return to Top