#### BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)
Complainant,	)
<b>v.</b>	) PCB No. 11-45 (Enforcement – Air)
COLUMBUS FOODS COMPANY, INC., an Illinois corporation,	) ) )
Respondent.	)

#### **NOTICE OF FILING**

To: Christopher W. Matern 205 West Wacker Drive

**Suite 1600** 

Chicago, Illinois 60606

To: Bradley P. Halloran

James R. Thompson Center

100 W. Randolph St., Suite 11-500

Chicago, Illinois 60601

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on this date I filed with the Clerk of the Pollution Control Board of the State of Illinois, a MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM HEARING REQUIREMENT and STIPULATION AND PROPOSAL FOR SETTLEMENT, copies of which are attached hereto and herewith served upon you.

Respectfully submitted,

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS LISA MADIGAN, Attorney General of the State of Illinois

MATTHEW J. DUNN, Chief Environmental Enforcement/Asbestos Litigation Division

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office, 12/09/2011

BY:

NDREW // NICHOLAS

Assistant Attorney General Environmental Bureau 69 W. Washington St., Suite 1800 Chicago, Illinois 60602 312/814-2069

Dated: December 9, 2011

#### BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)
Complainant,	) )
<b>v.</b>	) PCB No. 11-45 ) (Enforcement – Air)
COLUMBUS FOODS COMPANY, INC., an Illinois corporation,	) )
Respondent.	) )

#### MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM HEARING REQUIREMENT

NOW COMES Complainant, PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, by LISA MADIGAN, Attorney General of the State of Illinois, and pursuant to Section 31(c)(2) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act ("Act"), 415 ILCS 5/31(c)(2) (2010), moves that the Illinois Pollution Control Board grant the parties in the above-captioned matter relief from the hearing requirement imposed by Section 31(c)(1) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/31(c)(1) (2010). In support of this motion, Complainant states as follows:

- 1. The parties have reached agreement on all outstanding issues in this matter.
- 2. This agreement is presented to the Board in a Stipulation and Proposal for Settlement, filed contemporaneously with this motion.
- 3. All parties agree that a hearing on the Stipulation and Proposal for Settlement is not necessary, and respectfully request relief from such a hearing as allowed by Section 31(c)(2) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/31(c)(2) (2010).

## Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office, 12/09/2011

WHEREFORE, Complainant, PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, hereby requests that the Board grant this motion for relief from the hearing requirement set forth in Section 31(c)(1) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/31(c)(1) (2010).

Respectfully submitted,

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS LISA MADIGAN ATTORNEY GENERAL

MATTHEW J. DUNN, Chief Environmental Enforcement/Asbestos Litigation Division

BY:

ANDREW J. NICHOLAS

Environmental Bureau Assistant Attorney General 69 W. Washington St., Suite 1800 Chicago, Illinois 60602 312/814-2069

Dated: December 9, 2011

#### BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
Complainant,	)	
v.	)	PCB No. 11-45 (Enforcement – Air)
COLUMBUS FOODS COMPANY, INC., an Illinois corporation,	)	
Respondent.	)	

#### STIPULATION AND PROPOSAL FOR SETTLEMENT

Complainant, PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, by LISA MADIGAN, Attorney General of the State of Illinois, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency ("Illinois EPA"), and COLUMBUS FOODS, INC. ("Respondent") ("Parties to the Stipulation"), have agreed to the making of this Stipulation and Proposal for Settlement ("Stipulation") and submit it to the Illinois Pollution Control Board ("Board") for approval. This stipulation of facts is made and agreed upon for purposes of settlement only and as a factual basis for the Board's approval of this Stipulation and issuance of relief. None of the facts stipulated herein shall be introduced into evidence in any other proceeding regarding the violations of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act ("Act"), 415 ILCS 5/1 et seq. (2010), and the Board's Regulations, alleged in the Complaint except as otherwise provided herein. It is the intent of the Parties to the Stipulation that it be a final adjudication of this matter.

#### I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

#### A. Parties

- 1. On February 14, 2011, a Complaint was filed on behalf of the People of the State of Illinois by Lisa Madigan, Attorney General of the State of Illinois, on her own motion and upon the request of the Illinois EPA, pursuant to Section 31 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/31 (2010), against the Respondent.
- 2. The Illinois EPA is an administrative agency of the State of Illinois, created pursuant to Section 4 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/4 (2010).
- 3. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Respondent was and is an Illinois corporation that is authorized to transact business in the State of Illinois. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Respondent owned and operated a vegetable oil manufacturing facility located at 849 North Troy Street, Chicago, Cook County, Illinois ("site").
- 4. Beginning in 1996, on a date better known to the Respondent, the Respondent began manufacturing biodiesel fuel from used vegetable oil at the site.
- 5. On July 17, 2009, an explosion occurred at the site. As a result of the explosion, the Respondent no longer operates at the site.

#### B. Allegations of Non-Compliance

Complainant contends that the Respondent has violated the following provisions of the Act and Board regulations:

# Count I Construction of Emission Sources Without a Permit

Violation of Section 9(b) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/9(b) (2010), and Section 201.142 of the Board's Air Pollution Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 201.142.

#### Count II Operation of Emission Sources Without a Permit

Violation of Section 9(b) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/9(b) (2010), and Section 201.143 of the Board's Air Pollution Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 201.143

#### Count III Failure to Submit Annual Emissions Reports

Violation of Section 9(a) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/9(a) (2010), Section 201.302(a) of the Board's Air Pollution Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 201.302(a), and Section 254.137 of the Illinois EPA's Air Pollution Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 254.137.

#### C. Non-Admission of Violations

The Respondent represents that it has entered into this Stipulation for the purpose of settling and compromising disputed claims without having to incur the expense of contested litigation. By entering into this Stipulation and complying with its terms, the Respondent does not affirmatively admit the allegations of violation within the Complaint and referenced within Section I.B herein, and this Stipulation shall not be interpreted as including such admission.

#### D. Compliance Activities to Date

The Respondent is no longer operating at the Site. Following the July 17, 2009 explosion, the Respondent removed all of its equipment and razed the building.

#### II. APPLICABILITY

This Stipulation shall apply to and be binding upon the Parties to the Stipulation. The Respondent shall not raise as a defense to any enforcement action taken pursuant to this Stipulation the failure of any of its officers, directors, agents, employees or successors or assigns to take such action as shall be required to comply with the provisions of this Stipulation. This Stipulation may be used against the Respondent in any subsequent enforcement action or permit

proceeding as proof of a past adjudication of violation of the Act and the Board Regulations for all violations alleged in the Complaint in this matter, for purposes of Sections 39 and 42 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/39 and 42 (2010).

#### III. IMPACT ON THE PUBLIC RESULTING FROM ALLEGED NON-COMPLIANCE

Section 33(c) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/33(c) (2010), provides as follows:

In making its orders and determinations, the Board shall take into consideration all the facts and circumstances bearing upon the reasonableness of the emissions, discharges, or deposits involved including, but not limited to:

- 1. the character and degree of injury to, or interference with the protection of the health, general welfare and physical property of the people;
- 2. the social and economic value of the pollution source;
- 3. the suitability or unsuitability of the pollution source to the area in which it is located, including the question of priority of location in the area involved;
- 4. the technical practicability and economic reasonableness of reducing or eliminating the emissions, discharges or deposits resulting from such pollution source; and
- 5. any subsequent compliance.

In response to these factors, the Parties to the Stipulation state the following:

- 1. Human health and the environment were threatened and the Illinois EPA's information gathering responsibilities hindered by the Respondent's alleged violations.
  - 2. There may have been social and economic benefit to Respondent's facility.
  - 3. Operation of the facility was suitable for the area in which it occurred.
- 4. Obtaining permits prior to construction and operation of Respondent's emission units at the site, compliance with the terms of the permits, and submission of annual emissions

reports was both technically practicable and economically reasonable.

5. Respondent is no longer operating its emission units and all equipment has been removed. The building was razed. All that remains at the site is an empty lot.

#### IV. CONSIDERATION OF SECTION 42(h) FACTORS

Section 42(h) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/42(h) (2010), provides as follows:

In determining the appropriate civil penalty to be imposed under . . . this Section, the Board is authorized to consider any matters of record in mitigation or aggravation of penalty, including but not limited to the following factors:

- 1. the duration and gravity of the violation;
- 2. the presence or absence of due diligence on the part of the respondent in attempting to comply with requirements of this Act and regulations thereunder or to secure relief therefrom as provided by this Act;
- 3. any economic benefits accrued by the respondent because of delay in compliance with requirements, in which case the economic benefits shall be determined by the lowest cost alternative for achieving compliance;
- 4. the amount of monetary penalty which will serve to deter further violations by the respondent and to otherwise aid in enhancing voluntary compliance with this Act by the respondent and other persons similarly subject to the Act;
- 5. the number, proximity in time, and gravity of previously adjudicated violations of this Act by the respondent;
- 6. whether the respondent voluntarily self-disclosed, in accordance with subsection i of this Section, the non-compliance to the Agency; and
- 7. whether the respondent has agreed to undertake a "supplemental environmental project," which means an environmentally beneficial project that a respondent agrees to undertake in settlement of an enforcement action brought under this Act, but which the respondent is not otherwise legally required to perform.

In response to these factors, the Parties to the Stipulation state as follows:

1. The Respondent allegedly failed to obtain a permit prior to constructing and

operating emission units at the site. In addition, the Respondent failed to submit annual emissions reports to the Illinois EPA. The alleged violations began on a date better known by the Respondent and continued to July 17, 2009. But for the July 17, 2009 explosion, the Illinois EPA would not have learned about the site and Respondent's noncompliance with the Act and Board and Illinois EPA regulations.

- 2. The Respondent cooperated given the limited availability of records following the July 17, 2009 explosion at the site by providing the State with information related to its operation once the Illinois EPA notified it of its noncompliance.
- 3. Respondent realized an economic benefit by failing to obtain a permit. The \$50,000.00 civil penalty assessed against the Respondent includes such benefit amount.
- 4. Complainant has determined, based upon the specific facts of this matter, that a penalty of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) will serve to deter further violations and aid in future voluntary compliance with the Act and Board regulations.
- 5. To Complainant's knowledge, Respondent has no previously adjudicated violations of the Act.
  - 6. Self-disclosure is not at issue in this matter.
- 7. The settlement of this matter does not include a supplemental environmental project.

#### V. TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

#### A. Penalty Payment

1. The Respondent shall pay a civil penalty in the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) within thirty (30) days from the date the Board adopts and accepts this Stipulation.

#### C. Payment Procedures

All payments required by this Stipulation shall be made by certified check or money order payable to the Illinois EPA for deposit into the Environmental Protection Trust Fund ("EPTF"). Payments shall be sent by first class mail and delivered to:

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Services 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, IL 62794-9276

The name, case number and the Respondent's federal tax identification, 36-2660220, number shall appear on the face of the certified check or money order. A copy of the certified check or money order and any transmittal letter shall be sent to:

Environmental Bureau Illinois Attorney General's Office 69 West Washington Street Chicago, Illinois 60602

#### D. Future Compliance

- 1. In addition to any other authorities, the Illinois EPA, its employees and representatives, and the Attorney General, her employees and representatives, shall have the right of entry into and upon the site which is the subject of this Stipulation, at all reasonable times for the purposes of conducting inspections and evaluating compliance status. In conducting such inspections, the Illinois EPA, its employees and representatives, and the Attorney General, her employees and representatives, may take photographs, samples, and collect information, as they deem necessary.
- 2. This Stipulation in no way affects the responsibilities of the Respondent to comply with any other federal, state or local laws or regulations, including but not limited to the

Act and the Board Regulations.

3. The Respondent shall cease and desist from future violations of the Act and Board Regulations that were the subject matter of the Complaint.

## E. Release from Liability

In consideration of the Respondent's payment of the \$50,000.00 penalty, its commitment to cease and desist as contained in Section V.D.3. above, and upon the Board's approval of this Stipulation, the Complainant releases, waives and discharges the Respondent from any further liability or penalties for the violations of the Act and Board Regulations that were the subject matter of the Complaint herein. The release set forth above does not extend to any matters other than those expressly specified in Complainant's Complaint filed on February 14, 2011. The Complainant reserves, and this Stipulation is without prejudice to, all rights of the State of Illinois against the Respondent with respect to all other matters, including but not limited to, the following:

- a. criminal liability;
- b. liability for future violation of state, federal, local, and common laws and/or regulations;
  - c. liability for natural resources damage arising out of the alleged violations; and
- d. liability or claims based on the Respondent's failure to satisfy the requirements of this Stipulation.

Nothing in this Stipulation is intended as a waiver, discharge, release, or covenant not to sue for any claim or cause of action, administrative or judicial, civil or criminal, past or future, in law or in equity, which the State of Illinois may have against any person, as defined by Section

3.315 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.315, or entity other than the Respondent.

## F. Enforcement and Modification of Stipulation

Upon the entry of the Board's Order approving and accepting this Stipulation, that Order is a binding and enforceable order of the Board and may be enforced as such through any and all available means.

#### G. Execution of Stipulation

The undersigned representatives for the Parties to the Stipulation certify that they are fully authorized by the party whom they represent to enter into the terms and conditions of this Stipulation and to legally bind them to it.

WHEREFORE, the Parties to the Stipulation request that the Board adopt and accept the foregoing Stipulation and Proposal for Settlement as written.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

LISA MADIGAN Attorney General	
State of Illinois	
MATTHEW J. DUNN, Chief Environmental Enforcement/ Asbestos Litigation Division  BY:  ROSEMARIR CAZEAU, Chief Environmental Bureau Assistant Attorney General  DATE:  DATE:  Name: Title:	BY:  JOHN J. KIM, Interim Director  DATE:  L(7) 1
DATF.	

## Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office, 12/09/2011

WHEREFORE, the Parties to the Stipulation request that the Board adopt and accept the

foregoing Stipulation and Proposal for Settlement as written.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

LISA MADIGAN Attorney General State of Illinois

MATTHEW J. DUNN, Chief Environmental Enforcement/ Asbestos Litigation Division

Asbestos Litigation Division	
BY: ROSEMARIE CAZEAU, Chief	BY:
Environmental Bureau Assistant Attorney General	Th. A 27777
DATE:	DATE:
COLUMBUS FOODS, INC.	
BY: auliliant See	and the
Name: Paulette Gaglio Title: Pre 51 DENT	ardo.
DATE: /2 /5/2411	

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, ANDREW J. NICHOLAS, an Assistant Attorney General, do certify that I caused to be served on this 9<sup>th</sup> day of December 2011, the foregoing Motion for Relief From Hearing Requirement, Stipulation and Proposal for Settlement, and Notice of Filing, upon the persons listed on said Notice by placing same in an envelope bearing sufficient postage with the United States Postal Service located at 100 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois.

ANDREW J. NICHOLAS