



United States  
Environmental Protection Agency



The U.S. EPA's Oil Program Center Report

Volume 4 Number 6

**Contents**

Questions and Answers on the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, Subpart J, Product Schedule 40 CFR 300.900..... 1

Region 5 Maps Inland Waterways for Spill Response ..... 2

National Pollution Funds Center Seminar ..... 2

Peer-reviewed Bioremediation Guidance Document ..... 3

Axton Road Gasoline Leak ..... 3

Anonymous Tip Leads to Discovery of Diesel Spill ..... 3

Field Guide for Oil Spills in Fast Currents ..... 4

Inland Spills Conference ..... 4

Avista-Coyote Transformer Spill 4

Fire and Smoke Plume at Petro-Chemical Plant in Texas ..... 5

Region 8 Exercises ..... 5

ERT Training Courses ..... 6

Recent Spills in Brief ..... 6

**Questions and Answers on the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, Subpart J, Product Schedule 40 CFR 300.900**

Due to increased interest in the listing process and proper use of alternative countermeasures (ACMs) for oil spills, the Product Schedule manager produced this fact sheet for stakeholders interested in understanding Subpart J of the NCP. This fact sheet describes the protocols for listing ACMs on the Product Schedule. ACMs for oil spills include bioremediation agents, dispersants, and surface washing agents that may be authorized for use during an oil spill response.

Background information:

- Alternative countermeasures range from simple absorbents that soak up the oil for collection and removal to complex chemical and biological agents intended to disperse or biodegrade the oil.
- The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) Subpart J Product Schedule (40 CFR 300.900) established a process that manufacturers must follow to have an oil spill product listed and evaluated by EPA and Regional Response Teams (RRTs). The RRT plans for and may respond to oil

spills when the on-scene coordinator (OSC) considers the use of an alternative countermeasure. Fifteen different federal agencies may also provide assistance.

- A product must be listed on the NCP before it can be considered for use in an oil spill cleanup. RRTs convene to determine the appropriateness of using an oil spill cleanup technology at a particular oil spill site and provide advice to the OSC.

**What is the Product Schedule?**

Section 311(d)(2) of the Clean Water Act, as amended by section 4201(a) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, authorizes the President to prepare a “schedule of dispersants, other chemicals, and other spill mitigating devices and substances, if any, that may be authorized for use on oil discharges...” The EPA prepares and maintains this schedule. The Product Schedule contains five product categories:

Dispersants—used to break up oil on the water’s surface, causing it to disperse down into the water column where natural forces can degrade the oil droplets. (Marine/Coastal waters only)

Surface washing agents—used on solid surfaces only to lift and float oil to better absorb or vacuum it up.

Surface collecting agents—used to control the thickness layer of oil to aid mechanical recovery. Also known as “herding agents.”

Bioremediation agents—microbes, nutrients, enzymes, or a combination intended to encourage the degradation of the oil.

Miscellaneous oil spill control agents—any other spill mitigating agents, such as chemical or biological based sorbents and elastizers.

### **Where can one find the procedures for listing a product on the NCP Product Schedule?**

The general requirements are found at 40 CFR 300.900, and the required toxicity and effectiveness protocols are found in Appendix C to Part 300 of the NCP (40 CFR 300.920). You can also call 202-260-2342 or visit the Oil Program website at: [www.epa.gov/oilspill](http://www.epa.gov/oilspill)

### **What testing must be conducted for different types of products?**

In order to be listed on the Product Schedule, a dispersant must obtain an effectiveness value of 50% + or - 5% for the Dispersant Effectiveness Test.

Bioremediation agent submissions must include the successful results of a 28 day Bioremediation Agent Effectiveness Test.

### **Who may submit data on a product for listing?**

The owner and/or manufacturer of the product, or authorized representative.

### **How does EPA decide whether to list a product?**

EPA’s Oil Program Center conducts a review of the raw data and required information to confirm that the data are complete and valid.

EPA will inform the submitter, in writing within 60 days, after receipt of complete technical product data, of its decision on adding the product to the Schedule.

Additional information or a sample of the product may be required (300.920(a)(2)).

The data requirements are designed to provide sufficient information to FOSCs and RRTs to determine whether, and in what quantities, a product may be used to control a particular oil discharge.

### **What does having a product listed on the Schedule mean?**

Inclusion of a product on the NCP Product Schedule means only that the data submission requirements have been satisfied. The product may then be authorized for use on a particular oil spill by FOSCs and RRTs. To prevent possible misrepresentation or misinterpretation, all product labels, literature, or advertisements that refer to placement on the Schedule must either reproduce the entire EPA letter announcing the placement on the Schedule or include the disclaimer set forth in Section 300.920(e). This disclaimer stresses that EPA does not endorse the product.

### **Who manages the data?**

EPA has a designated Product Schedule Manager who receives requests and data as described above. Referring companies to this EPA representative can save time and ensure that they are given the most accurate and useful information. If the product is listed, EPA will post the company’s product information on the Oil Program Center website and share the information with RRTs and OSCs in all regions. The RRTs and FOSCs can then use this information when determining the appropriateness of using a listed product.

The Product Schedule Manager is William Nichols. If you have further questions regarding the NCP Product Schedule, he can be reached at 703-603-9918 or by e-mail at [nichols.nick@epa.gov](mailto:nichols.nick@epa.gov).

***Please note: Once a product is listed, the NCP does not mandate the use of that product by the RRT, state, industry, or any oil spill response organization.***

## **Region 5 Maps Inland Waterways for Spill Response**

EPA Region 5 has initiated a project to collect and map information about environmentally and economically sensitive resources in the Region’s inland waterways. Entitled the Inland Spill Response Mapping Project, this activity brings together several partners for the portions of the Upper Mississippi River, Ohio River, and Great Lakes Basins that fall within EPA Region 5. The project provides community planners and oil spill responders with spatial information about resources at risk during a spill.

Partners in the project include EPA Region 5, the Great Lakes Commission (GLC), the U.S. Geological Survey Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center (UMESC), and the Upper Mississippi River Basin Association (UMRBA). EPA Region 5 provides funding and project coordination, GLC and UMRBA collect data, and UMESC processes the data and automates the information using geographical information system (GIS) software.

Currently, the project has generated 35 Inland Sensitivity Atlases for mapping areas throughout EPA Region 5. The Atlases include data layers, maps, and other information necessary for preparing and responding quickly to oil spills. Such information is critical to the Area Contingency Plans that are required under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990. For more information, visit the EPA Region 5 Inland Spill Response Data and Maps web page at [www.umesc.usgs.gov/epa\\_atlas/overview.html](http://www.umesc.usgs.gov/epa_atlas/overview.html)

### **National Pollution Funds Center Seminar**

The National Pollution Funds Center Funds Use Seminar will be held on July 23 and 24, 2002, at the Marriott Salt Lake City Downtown Hotel. Topics that will be covered during this seminar include: submission of fund incident documentation; use of financial management, cost documentation, and fund access tools; on-shore facility response issues (EPA/USCG), and much more. For more

information on the seminar and registration, visit [www.uscg.mil/hq/npfc/npfc.htm](http://www.uscg.mil/hq/npfc/npfc.htm) or contact Jan Vorhees, NPFC Outreach Coordinator at 202-493-6719.

## Peer-reviewed Bioremediation Guidance Document

EPA's Office of Research and Development has published a guidance document that details the use of bioremediation for oil contamination of certain marine and freshwater environments. The document presents an approach for the design of bioremediation processes pertinent to cleanup of oil-contaminated marine shorelines and freshwater wetlands. It evaluates current practices and state-of-the-art research results pertaining to bioremediation of hydrocarbon contamination relative to the types and amounts of amendments used, frequency of application, assessment of the extent of bioremediation, sampling, and analysis. The scope of the document is limited to marine shorelines and freshwater wetlands because of definitive results from recently completed, EPA-sponsored field studies. The document, entitled "Guidelines for the Bioremediation of Marine Shorelines and Freshwater Wetlands," is available on the EPA Oil Spill Program website at [www.epa.gov/oilspill/docs/bioremed.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/oilspill/docs/bioremed.pdf).

Based on various studies conducted in marine and freshwater environments, the researchers concluded that bioremediation should be considered for spill sites depending upon the cleanup, restoration, and habitat protection objectives as well as other factors that might impact the success of the effort. Specifically, in certain marine environments where background nutrient concentrations might be near the level for maximum stimulation of intrinsic biodegradation to occur, it was concluded that natural attenuation might be the appropriate response action. This is dependent, however, on the need to protect resources at risk. For example, if a bird migration occurs at the same time every year and a spill takes place prior to the arrival of the migration, active bioremediation could be considered appropriate even though natural

attenuation would otherwise be the response action. In a freshwater wetland, if significant penetration of oil into the subsurface has occurred following a spill incident, anaerobic conditions might greatly slow the process of biodegradation, rendering it ineffective. However, if ecosystem restoration is the primary objective in a freshwater wetland rather than accelerating oil disappearance, nutrient addition could be very effective. If significant penetration has not taken place in the wetland, bioremediation may be a viable response option. Thus, responders should take into consideration the oxygen and nutrient balance at a given site as well as the resources at risk in their decision-making process.

For more information on the document and supporting studies, contact Albert D. Venosa, Ph.D., EPA Office of Research and Development (513-569-7668, [venosa.albert@epa.gov](mailto:venosa.albert@epa.gov)).

## Axton Road Gasoline Leak

An accident involving a semi-tanker carrying 8,200 gallons of gasoline owned by Mid Mac Enterprises occurred on May 16, 2002 in Ferndale, Washington. No injuries occurred, and the cause of the accident is still under investigation. The truck overturned into a 25-30 foot deep ravine near East Main Street where it turns into Axton Road, about ½ mile east of Interstate 5. Initial reports indicated that most of the gasoline had leaked, but only about 700 gallons of gas actually escaped. Approximately 7,500 gallons were recovered from the tanker. About 100 residences and a small strip mall were evacuated for a day and a half during the recovery. Power was shut off to deter an ignition and explosion, but was restored within a couple days. West Axton Road was closed during the major cleanup while the authorities tried to determine whether the gas that had spilled into Deer Creek had reached the Nooksack River into which it feeds. Almost 400 cubic yards of soil and rubble-like material were removed. The material removed was replaced with clean material brought in to rebuild the driveway structure that was affected. There were also drainage pond-like areas

on either side of the driveway that were treated and cleaned up. These areas, along with the creek, were treated with booms and absorbent pads as a precaution after the major cleanup had occurred. For more information, contact EPA Region 10 On-Scene Coordinator, Mike Sibley at 202-553-1886.

## Anonymous Tip Leads to Discovery of Diesel Spill

On March 5, 2001, EPA Region 7 received an anonymous phone call about a spill in Cuba, Crawford County, Missouri. The spill occurred on March 4, 2001, in a commercial area, apparently owned by Voss Truck Port, at the corner of the intersection of Interstate-44 and Highway 19. Preliminary reports stated that the Voss Truck Port diesel spill occurred because a driver failed to close a check valve on an above-ground storage tank (AST), allowing the AST to gravity feed four underground storage units and overflow. It is alleged that drivers wire-open the check valves which quickens their runs. The 20,000-gallon spill and conflicting information given to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) by the facility owner prompted EPA on-scene coordinators (OSCs), to respond to determine onsite conditions and cleanup measures.

The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF) was opened on March 7, 2001, by Janice Kroone, an EPA OSC, to fund MDNR's oversight of cleanup operations and to fund a trip for EPA to visit the site to conduct the SPCC Inspection. Total funding allotted was \$18,000. Two EPA OSC's responded to the spill. An MDNR representative was onsite during the majority of the cleanup and was working with Voss Oil Company and their



Boom across Pleasant Valley Creek

contractors (Environmental Works of Springfield, Missouri) to conduct the cleanup. The diesel fuel was pushed downstream with leaf blowers into Pleasant Valley Creek near a newly constructed underflow dam, to be vacuumed up. Diesel-contaminated dirt was dug up by a backhoe and placed onto Visqueen (a commercial product to cover waste) for sampling and disposal. On March 13, 2001, it was determined by MDNR that the site no longer posed an eminent danger to a waterway, and was no longer considered an emergency response; therefore, the site was turned over to the MDNR Hazardous Waste Program Tanks Section, Remediation Unit, to complete the cleanup. The potentially responsible party oversaw the Remediation Unit removal, including installing extraction wells and continued excavation of contaminated soils. As of March 25, 2002, approximately 57 percent of the originally allotted OSLTF funds were remaining. To date there has been no disposal of waste. Voss will investigate waste disposal options, to be approved by MDNR for the final disposition of all waste generated.

For more information about this incident, please contact Eric Nold, On-Scene Coordinator, EPA Region 7 at 913-551-7488.

### **Field Guide for Oil Spills in Fast Currents**

The U.S. Coast Guard Research and Development Center published *Oil Spill Response in Fast Currents: A Field Guide*, in October 2001. Multiple government agencies, U.S. Coast Guard units, and commercial spill response firms contributed to the field guidance.

The field guidance is intended to provide advice, strategies, and tactics to spill planners, responders, and monitors/field observers to improve spill response in fastwater conditions. It is reported that from 1992 to 1996, over 58 percent of oil spills larger than 100 gallons have occurred in waters that routinely exceed 1 knot. According to the field guidance, controlling and recovering oil spills in water above one knot is difficult to

accomplish because oil entrains under booms and skimmers in swift currents. Timely response efforts are required in order to minimize environmental damage, economic losses, and associated cleanup costs.

The guidance primarily consists of practical applications of research conducted for the U.S. Coast Guard concerning technology assessment of fast-water oil spill response. It provides a decision guide to determine what specific methodologies and techniques can be used in currents ranging from one to five knots under various spill response scenarios. Figures and pictures accompany tactics and methodologies to provide users with a full explanation. The field guidance also covers hydrodynamic issues, individual tactics, fast-water skimmers, and support equipment, such as boats and anchors. Appendices to the guidance provide additional background information needed to make decisions during a response in fastwater conditions.

*Oil Spill Response in Fast Currents: A Field Guide*, is available to download in PDF format from their web site at <http://www.rdc.uscg.gov/rdcpages/On-line-Reports-Page-2002.htm>, or you can link there directly from the What's New section of the Freshwater Spills Information Clearinghouse web site ([www.freshwaterspills.net](http://www.freshwaterspills.net)).

### **Inland Spills Conference**

The twenty-sixth annual Inland Spills Conference and Exhibits is scheduled to be held in Columbus, Ohio on September 30, 2002 through October 3, 2002. This year new sponsorships have been created to draw additional participation from the private sector. New sponsors include the Ohio Manufacturer's Association, the Ohio Environmental Services Association, and the Ohio Chemistry Technology Council. Additionally, the Spill Control Association of America (SCAA) is looking to expand outreach for marketing efforts in the exhibits hall. The goal of this year's exhibits is to provide conference attendees an opportunity to view the latest advances in both spill and remedial response equipment and

services. In addition, there will be a cocktail reception in the exhibit area on the first day of the conference from 5:30-7:00 pm. This reception is open to all registered conference attendees and speakers. Prior to the conference, a golf outing has been scheduled to be held at a local course on September 29, 2002. For details on the conference and all special events, visit SCAA's web site at [www.scaa-spill.org](http://www.scaa-spill.org), or call Marc Shaye at 313-962-8255.

### **Avista-Coyote Transformer Spill**

On May 6, 2002, a large transformer in Boardman, Oregon caught fire, releasing most of its contents into the environment. The transformer stored approximately 17,000 gallons of non-PCB containing oil. The spill threatened a nearby holding pond, the Columbia River, and the surrounding environment. The transformer is owned by Avista Utilities of Spokane, Washington and is part of the Coyote Springs Power Plant. The cause of the transformer malfunction is unknown; however, an employee of the plant suggested that it may have resulted from a short in the internal windings.

EPA On-Scene Coordinator (OSC), Dan Heister was notified of the spill by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ). The OSC and the Superfund Technical and Response Team (START) mobilized to the site to further assess the transformer spill. They were met on site by Kevin Booth, the Environmental Compliance Coordinator for Avista Utilities, who provided them with a material safety data sheet (MSDS) of the oil. The product was identified as Diala Oil AX, manufactured by Shell. The MSDS required Avista Utilities to notify the National Response Center (NRC) if the spill reached surface water.

A containment vault located beneath the transformer was filled with oil and water. Cleanup crews tried to recover the remainder of the spilled oil. Trenches were constructed in an effort to contain the oil. Two Spenser Environmental vac-trucks collected the oil following stabilization of the insulators above the transformer. The disposal site for the

waste was not yet determined at that time.

The spill produced a stained path, approximately 100 yards long and 20 feet wide, leading up to a holding pond adjacent to the transformer. A sheen was visible on the western section of the pond. Water was being pumped from the eastern side, but the pump was eventually shut off. The sheen did not appear to have migrated to the eastern side of the pond. Able Clean-up Technologies, Inc. of Spokane, Washington was contracted to conduct the cleanup activities for the holding pond. As of 13 hours following the transformer fire, the NRC had not been contacted, even though the spill had reached surface water.

The State of Oregon will provide regulatory oversight for the remainder of the cleanup activities. Enforcement actions are pending discussions with the ODEQ and other relevant authorities.

For more information, contact On-Scene Coordinator, Dan Heister, EPA, Region 10, at 503-326-6869.

## Fire and Smoke Plume at Petro-Chemical Plant in Texas

On May 1, 2002, EPA Region 6 On-Scene Coordinator (OSC) Richard Franklin responded to an oil and chemical fire at the Third Coast Packaging facility in Pearland, Texas. The Friendswood Texas Fire Department requested EPA's assistance with air monitoring of the contaminants of concern, including glycol products and lubricant oils, such as antifreeze, transmission fluid, motor oils, and mineral oils. Located on fifteen



Aerial view of fire in Pearland, Texas

acres of property that include many aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), three packaged products warehouses, and office and building structures, Third Coast Packaging conducts automotive/petrochemical blending, packaging, and distribution operations at its facility. The fire, which produced a large, low-hanging plume of smoke, was discovered at approximately 1:00 AM when a security guard noticed it at the rear of the facility and notified local authorities.

Due to a lack of fire hydrants in the area and an inability to transport large volumes of water to the site, the fire was allowed to burn through the early morning hours and it was not completely extinguished. Many hot spots remained and a small contaminant plume continued on-site for several more hours. Winds from the south caused the plume of smoke and potential contaminants to travel north over nearby residential housing resulting in an evacuation of about 100 homes within a one-mile radius of the site. No injuries were reported.

The facility had a combined capacity of over 2,500,000 gallons of product material contained inside its 91 ASTs, many of which were destroyed or structurally compromised. In addition to OSC Franklin, Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission Strike Team Coordinators Bob Brock and Jim Indest, firefighters from 15 local fire departments, the EPA Superfund Technical Assistance and Response Team (START), USCG Gulf Strike Team (GST), responded on-scene to contain the fire. The EPA OSC and the TNRCC Strike Team Coordinators set up a unified command post and were instrumental in responding to this incident. OSHA, FBI, ATF, and the Chemical Safety Board also conducted separate investigations at the site. In addition, OSC Franklin mobilized EPA's Project Safeguard aircraft to the site to provide aerial photographs and assistance with plume analysis and delineation.

The potentially responsible party (PRP) assumed cleanup responsibility, hired Williams Firefighter Inc. to suppress flare ups and hot spots as well as Garner

Environmental Services to contain and remove chemicals, fire-fighting runoff water, and contaminated soils and vegetation from the ditches. Local drainage ditches were quickly blocked by the county in order to prevent any chemical spills or runoff water from flowing off the property to the nearby waterway, Cowarts Creek, located a quarter of a mile south of the site. Garner also constructed an earthen berm around the facility to control any runoff that could occur from additional fire-fighting activities or rainfall.

EPA continuously performed perimeter air monitoring in a one to two-mile radius of the incident. Particulate matter readings recorded in neighboring residences, the hospital, the nursing home, and the elementary school were significantly below action levels provided by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR); however, readings recorded at the facility and immediate downwind locations were significantly above ATSDR levels. Later in the day, data from the Project Safeguard aircraft indicated very little offsite movement of other chemical contaminants.

At least 10 residential homes located directly adjacent to the incident have obvious significant soot damage and may require interior and exterior home cleaning. EPA is working with ATSDR to determine a sampling protocol to identify all properties requiring cleaning. The PRP hired Cotton Companies to perform the residential interior and exterior home cleaning as well as an industrial hygienist to serve as the overall safety coordinator. For more information, contact EPA Region 6 OSC, Richard Franklin at 214-665-2785.

## Region 8 Exercises

EPA Region 8 will be conducting unannounced exercises during the weeks of July 29, August 5, September 9, September 16, and September 23, 2002, as required by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA). Any facility that has successfully completed a government-initiated exercise within the past 36

months will not be selected. Facilities will be determined by a random process. The selected facilities will be required to deploy adequate equipment to respond to a probable oil spill. These exercises were developed using information from the Facility Response Plan. The names of the selected facilities will not be made available before the exercise. If EPA Region 8 determines that the response of a selected facility is inadequate or insufficient, EPA will require revisions to that facility's plans. Please contact Martha Wolf, EPA Region 8 at 303-312-6839 with any questions about this announcement.

### ERT Training Courses

The following Oil Program Training courses will be available for registration. These courses are intended for on-scene coordinators (OSCs) from EPA, USCG, and state and local responders involved in inland oil spill prevention and cleanup. For more information, contact the registrar at 513-569-7537.

**Course Title:** Fastwater Course  
**Course Description:** Provides hands-on practical oil spill training on fast water rivers. Participants will spend three days learning appropriate techniques for boom deployment and oil recovery from fast water. This course includes minimal classroom instruction with strenuous field activity. Taught by EPA, former EPA, and former State and Bureau of Reclamation responders.

**Course Location:** Black Canyon Dam on the Payette River, northwest of Boise, Idaho

**Course Schedule:** The week of August 26, 2002

**Course Title:** Inland Oil Spill Course  
**Course Description:** Hands-on course demonstrating oil recovery methods in slow/backwater and marsh environments. Emphasis is placed on product recovery techniques in the subsurface in order to prevent discharges to waterways. Participants will spend five and one-half days learning safe boat handling techniques, boom deployment, map reading and global positioning system (GPS) usage, ATV operation, and proper

oil recovery techniques.

**Course Location:** TARA Wildlife Center, northwest of Vicksburg, Mississippi

**Course Schedule:** The week of September 16, 2002

**Course Title:** Inland Oil Spill Training Course

**Course Description:** Covers portions of the CWA, OPA '90, and the NCP; and provides practical information for the control and cleanup of inland oil spills.

**Course Location:** To be determined, based on demand from Regions

**Course Schedule:** To be determined, based on demand from Regions

\$500,000 and are estimated to reach at least \$2 million.

### Pipeline Leak Causes Spill on Louisiana Coast

On April 6, 2002, an oil leak from a BP pipeline resulted in a 90,000 gallon crude oil spill on the southeastern Louisiana coast. According to BP spokesman Daren Beaudou, the spill was the result of a three-inch hole in the pipe that may have been caused by a boat propeller. BP stopped the flow of oil soon after the rupture was detected. Two days later, a diver placed a clamp over the leak to cease the flow of residual oil. Wildlife experts were flown to the site to examine any potential damage to wildlife in the area. An oil soaked bird was found; however, no other injuries or death to marine life were found. Officials are concerned about shrimp, crabs, and oysters in the area since many are currently in their larval stages. Impacts may not be known until harvests are collected.

### Recent Spills in Brief

#### Spill in the Great Lakes

The largest spill in the Great Lakes within the last 12 years was discovered on April 10, 2002 in the Rouge River in Detroit, Michigan. The spill of at least 10,000 gallons of industrial-grade waste oil did not appear to contain PCBs or other toxic chemicals, according to preliminary tests. Although originally thought to have been caused by sewer and storm-drain runoff, the source of the spill is still unknown. According to EPA Spokesman Don de Blasio, a detective team made up of several federal agencies will collect samples from every River Rouge industry and compare them to the slick. The environmental impacts of the spill are still unknown, although about 70 birds have been found with oil on their feathers according to representatives of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department. Cleanup costs, to date, have run to

#### Soy Bean Oil Spill in South Carolina

A spill of 3,000 gallons of soy bean oil occurred on April 24, 2002, on the Wando River in Charleston, South Carolina. The spill was the result of a break in a bladder tank containing the oil during offloading from the M/V Sealand Atlantic. Reportedly, the oil was very difficult to find or see, but the recovery operations have been ongoing with sorbent materials. According to U.S. Coast Guard officials, it is believed that most of the spilled oil has collected under nearby docks. No wildlife impacts have been observed. NOAA Hazmat was assisting the U.S. Coast Guard by providing weather forecasts; information on tides, currents, and spill trajectory; and other general information on the fate and effects of soy bean oil.

#### Oil Spill Discovered After 12 Years in Washington, D.C.

After 12 years, a gasoline spill, which had migrated into a residential area of Northeast Washington, D.C., has been disclosed to residents of the neighborhood. Although residents complained for years about gasoline smells present in their neighborhood, neither the residents nor Washington, D.C. officials were informed about the spill until late last year. However, Chevron indicated that the company complied with the law by notifying Maryland officials after discovery of a spill emanating from a Maryland station in 1989. Not until February 2001, did the company realize that the plume had migrated to Washington, D.C., when a well indicating migration had tested positive for gasoline. Results of recent tests have shown the gasoline plume to be at least 1,300 feet long, which is more than four times the typical fuel spill in a residential area. The plume was also found to contain high levels of benzene in a few locations. However, officials stress that there is



Spill response in Michigan

## Recent Spills (cont.)

no immediate health hazard since residents of the area depend on public drinking water and the gasoline is in groundwater several feet deeper than the basements in the neighborhood. Since initial cleanup efforts failed based on the migration of fuel across the Washington, D.C. line, EPA has become involved to ensure that the affected groundwater and soil are cleaned up to a high standard. Chevron produced a short-term remediation plan on May 10, 2002, and implemented a long-term cleanup plan on June 14, 2002.

### Fire at Shell Chemical Plant in Texas

On May 13, 2002, a fire occurred at the Shell Chemical Plant in Houston, Texas. No injuries were reported, and the company has been conducting air monitoring that has indicated no environmental health concerns. START personnel from EPA Region 6 responded to assess and provide assistance as needed. The chemical processing plant had been inspected by EPA Region 6 and was found to maintain a current Facility Response Plan under the Oil Pollution Act, which aided the quick assessment of the environmental impacts of the fire and the resources needed to contain the fire. The Office of Emergency and Remedial Response will continue to monitor this situation. Further information regarding this incident can be obtained by contacting Richard Franklin, EPA Region 6 On-Scene Coordinator (OSC), at 214-665-2785.

### Update on the Tranguch Gasoline Spill Site in Pennsylvania

On April 25, 2002, representatives from EPA, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and the State Health Department briefed local officials and citizen representatives on the status and schedule for site restoration work planned for the Tranguch Gasoline Spill Site in Hazleton, Pennsylvania. The focus of the meeting was on the individual property reports that EPA is preparing for each affected household, which EPA delivered to property owners at the beginning of May 2002. Of major concern to the attendees were property value issues related to the site. To date, EPA has pumped and treated over 3 million gallons of groundwater and removed 28,000 cubic yards of soil from the spill site. A follow-up public meeting will be held to address residents' questions and concerns related to the individual property reports, as well as to review EPA's upcoming plans for completing cleanup of the site. For further information, please contact EPA OSC, Steve Jarvela at 215-814-3259.

### Oil Spill into Caravajal Creek, Dominican Republic

A pipeline discharged approximately 10,000



Tank at Dominican Republic spill site

gallons of fuel oil into the Caravajal Creek in Santo Domingo, in the Dominican Republic. The discharge was reported on April 8, 2002, and apparently originated from a pipeline operated by Falconbridge. The Caravajal Creek flows into the Haina River. The Dominican government requested EPA technical assistance to estimate environmental consequences and cleanup costs. An OSC from EPA Region 2, Puerto Rico, arrived in Santo Domingo on April 12, 2002. The source of the spill was contained, and efforts to clean up the oil included the responsible party's efforts with primitive bucket cleanup recovery methods. The OSC estimated that an actual 65,000 gallons of fuel was discharged into the creek. EPA's Office of Emergency and Remedial Response continues to monitor the situation. For more information, please contact OSC Angel Rodriguez at 737-977-5830.

### Abandoned Oil Production Facility

The abandoned Ed I. Estis-Blanche L. Smith facility, located near Franklin, Louisiana was referred to the EPA for consideration for an OPA response action. The site includes a barge in a slip, a tank farm in a secondary containment berm, and an oil well. The total estimated volume of oil and sludge for this facility is 4,840 bbls. The facility is bordered by an Intracoastal Canal Waterway (ICW), and drainage from the site flows directly into the ICW. The site's above ground storage tanks (ASTs) are in poor condition, with rust and corrosion causing oil leaks into the secondary containment. The barge is also rusted and lacks secondary containment. The oil well is corroded, and it has been reported that it periodically causes sheens.

The leaking oil well was discovered by the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR) during an orphan well inspection at the site the week of February 18, 2002. LDNR requested assistance from EPA to plug the well, and EPA OSC Mike Ryan arrived at the site on February 27, 2002, to meet with the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers (USACE) START-2 Environmental Restoration contractor, the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR), and the USACE contractor. A planning meeting was held on March 8, 2002, to discuss the scope of work to plug the well.

The responsible party (RP) was formally offered by EPA the chance to conduct the required cleanup action. When the RP declined, EPA began work at the site as an Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund-financed cleanup action. The work to plug the leaking well was conducted by USACE, the U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Environmental Services, START-2 Environmental Restoration contractor, LDNR, and other groups from March 23-29, 2002. The cost for cleanup of the facility as of March 22, 2002, was \$1,108,582.34. Additional cleanup activities are planned for the remainder of the site including residual oil in ASTs, containment structures, and the barge.



Mobilizing response equipment in Louisiana

## About The Update

The goal of the EPA Oil Program Center *Update* is to provide straightforward information to keep EPA Regional staff, other federal agencies and departments, industries and businesses, and the regulated community current with the latest developments. The *Update* is produced quarterly, using a compilation of several sources. The views expressed here are not necessarily those of the US EPA.



**United States  
Environmental Protection Agency  
5203G  
Washington, DC 20460**

**Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

First-Class  
Postage and Fees Paid  
EPA  
Permit No. G-35

United States  
Environmental Protection Agency

OSWER  
Office of Emergency and Remedial Response  
Oil Program Center 5203G

EPA 540-N-02-002  
OSWER 9360.8-41  
July 2002

Beatriz Oliveira, Editor,  
Oil Program Center  
703/603-1229

David Lopez, Director  
Oil Program Center  
703/603-8760  
Ariel Rios Building  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Mail Code 5203G  
Washington, D.C. 20460