

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

June 15, 2006

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	PCB 06-183
	)	(Enforcement - Water)
LAZAR BROTHERS TRUCKING, INC., an	)	
Illinois corporation,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

ORDER OF THE BOARD (by A.S. Moore):

On June 6, 2006, the Office of the Attorney General, on behalf of the People of the State of Illinois (People), filed a two-count complaint against Lazar Brother Trucking, Inc (Lazar). *See* 415 ILCS 5/31(c)(1) (2004); 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.204. The People allege that Lazar violated sections 12(b) and 12(f) of the Environmental Protection Act (Act) (415 ILCS 5/12(b), 12(f) (2004) and section 309.202(a) of the Board’s regulations (35 Ill. Adm. Code 309.202(a)). The People further allege that Lazar violated these provisions by performing small construction activities without applying for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit and by failing to obtain a permit from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency before constructing a sewer. The complaint concerns Lazar’s trucking facility located at 91 Sola Drive, Gilberts, Kane County.

The Board finds that the complaint meets the content requirements of the Board’s procedural rules and accepts the complaint for hearing. *See* 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.204(c), (f), 103.212(c). A respondent’s failure to file an answer to a complaint within 60 days after receiving the complaint may have severe consequences. Generally, if respondent fails within that timeframe to file an answer specifically denying, or asserting insufficient knowledge to form a belief of, a material allegation in the complaint, the Board will consider respondent to have admitted the allegation. 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.204(d).

The Board directs the hearing officer to proceed expeditiously to hearing. Among the hearing officer’s responsibilities is the “duty . . . to ensure development of a clear, complete, and concise record for timely transmission to the Board.” 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.610. A complete record in an enforcement case thoroughly addresses, among other things, the appropriate remedy, if any, for the alleged violations, including any civil penalty.

If a complainant proves an alleged violation, the Board considers the factors set forth in Sections 33(c) and 42(h) of the Act to fashion an appropriate remedy for the violation. *See* 415 ILCS 5/33(c), 42(h) (2004). Specifically, the Board considers the Section 33(c) factors in determining, first, what to order the respondent to do to correct an on-going violation, if any, and, second, whether to order the respondent to pay a civil penalty. The factors provided in

Section 33(c) bear on the reasonableness of the circumstances surrounding the violation, such as the character and degree of any resulting interference with protecting public health, the technical practicability and economic reasonableness of compliance, and whether the respondent has subsequently eliminated the violation.


With Public Act 93-575, effective January 1, 2004, the General Assembly changed the Act's civil penalty provisions, amending Section 42(h) and adding a new subsection (i) to Section 42. Section 42(h)(3) now states that any economic benefit to respondent from delayed compliance is to be determined by the "lowest cost alternative for achieving compliance." The amended Section 42(h) also requires the Board to ensure that the penalty is "at least as great as the economic benefits, if any, accrued by the respondent as a result of the violation, unless the Board finds that imposition of such penalty would result in an arbitrary or unreasonable financial hardship."

Under these amendments, the Board may also order a penalty lower than a respondent's economic benefit from delayed compliance if the respondent agrees to perform a "supplemental environmental project" (SEP). A SEP is defined in Section 42(h)(7) as an "environmentally beneficial project" that a respondent "agrees to undertake in settlement of an enforcement action . . . but which the respondent is not otherwise legally required to perform." SEPs are also added as a new Section 42(h) factor (415 ILCS 5/ 2(h)(7) (2004)), as is whether a respondent has "voluntary self-disclosed . . . the non-compliance to the [Illinois Environmental Protection] Agency" (415 ILCS 5/42(h)(6) (2004)). A new Section 42(i) lists nine criteria for establishing voluntary self-disclosure of non-compliance. A respondent establishing these criteria is entitled to a "reduction in the portion of the penalty that is not based on the economic benefit of non-compliance." 415 ILCS 5/42(i) (2004).

Accordingly, the Board further directs the hearing officer to advise the parties that in summary judgment motions and responses, at hearing, and in briefs, each party should consider: (1) proposing a remedy for a violation, if any (including whether to impose a civil penalty), and supporting its position with facts and arguments that address any or all of the Section 33(c) factors; and (2) proposing a civil penalty, if any (including a specific total dollar amount and the portion of that amount attributable to the respondent's economic benefit, if any, from delayed compliance), and supporting its position with facts and arguments that address any or all of the Section 42(h) factors. The Board also directs the hearing officer to advise the parties to address these issues in any stipulation and proposed settlement that may be filed with the Board.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

I, Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, certify that the Board adopted the above order on June 15, 2006, by a vote of 4-0.



Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk  
Illinois Pollution Control Board