

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT R5-2011-0551

IN THE MATTER OF

LENO BETTENCOURT
STANISLAUS COUNTY

This Complaint is issued to Leno Bettencourt (hereinafter Discharger) pursuant to California Water Code (CWC) section 13268, which authorizes the imposition of Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) and CWC section 13323, which authorizes the Executive Officer to issue this Complaint. This Complaint is based on findings that indicate that the Discharger failed to submit technical reports pursuant to an Order issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region under the authority of CWC section 13267.

The Executive Officer of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Central Valley Water Board) finds, with respect to the Discharger's acts, or failure to act, the following:

1. The Discharger owns and operates the Bettencourt and Sons Dairy located at 5731 Downie Road, Denair, Stanislaus County.
2. The Dairy is regulated by the Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies, Order R5-2007-0035 (hereinafter General Order), which was issued by the Central Valley Water Board on 3 May 2007 (Exhibit A). Monitoring and Reporting Program R5-2007-0035 (hereinafter MRP) accompanies the General Order (Exhibit B). The General Order and the MRP contain reporting requirements for dairies regulated by the General Order. The General Order became effective on 9 May 2007.
3. The General Order and the MRP required that an Annual Report for the 2009 calendar year be submitted for regulated facilities by 1 July 2010 (2009 Annual Report), including the following components: a revised Annual Dairy Facility Assessment, with facility modifications implemented to date; and a status on facility retrofitting completed as proposed in the Nutrient Management Plan submittal that was due 1 July 2009.
4. The General Order required regulated facilities to submit a Waste Management Plan (WMP) by 1 July 2009. The General Order was amended by Order R5-2009-0029 to modify the compliance schedule, extending the deadline to submit a WMP to 1 July 2010 in order to give regulated parties additional time to come in to compliance. The WMP is required to have the following components: a retrofitting plan, with schedule, needed to improve storage capacity, flood protection, or design of production area; maps of the production area and land application area; a wastewater storage capacity evaluation; a flood protection evaluation; a production area design/construction evaluation; and documentation that there are no cross connections.

STATEMENT OF WATER CODE SECTIONS UPON WHICH LIABILITY IS BEING ASSESSED

5. An administrative civil liability may be imposed pursuant to the procedures described in CWC section 13323. An administrative civil liability complaint alleges the act or failure to act that constitutes a violation of law, the provision of law authorizing administrative civil liability to be imposed, and the proposed administrative civil liability.
6. Pursuant to CWC section 13267, subdivision (b), a regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharge or discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region..., shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports.
7. Pursuant to CWC section 13268, subdivision (a), any person failing or refusing to furnish technical or monitoring program reports as required by subdivision (b) of section 13267, or failing or refusing to furnish a statement of compliance as required by subdivision (b) of section 13399.2, or falsifying any information provided therein, is guilty of a misdemeanor and may be liable civilly in accordance with subdivision (b).
8. Pursuant to CWC section 13268, subdivision (b) (1), civil liability may be administratively imposed by a regional board in accordance with Article 2.5 (commencing with section 13323) of Chapter 5 for a violation or subdivision (a) in an amount which shall not exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day in which the violation occurs.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

9. On 2 September 2010, the Central Valley Water Board staff issued a Notice of Violation, notifying the Discharger that the 2009 Annual Report with appurtenant components had not been received. (Exhibit C.) The Notice of Violation also requested that the delinquent report be submitted as soon as possible to minimize potential liability.
10. On 2 September 2010, the Central Valley Water Board staff issued a Notice of Violation, notifying the Discharger that the Waste Management Plan with appurtenant components had not been received. (Exhibit D.) The Notice of Violation also requested that the delinquent report be submitted as soon as possible to minimize potential liability.
11. Under the MRP, the Executive Officer has authority pursuant to California Water Code section 13267 to order the installation of monitoring wells based on the threat that an individual dairy or dairies pose to water quality. On 4 February 2010, the Executive Officer issued a California Water Code section 13267 Order (13267 Order) to the Discharger that directed the Discharger to install groundwater monitoring wells, and to implement groundwater monitoring at the Dairy. (Exhibit E.) Specifically, the 13267 Order directed the Discharger to submit an acceptable groundwater monitoring well installation and sampling plan (MWISP) to the Central Valley Water Board by 30 April 2010. The 13267 Order notified the Discharger that failure to submit the MWISP could constitute a

misdeemeanor and may result in additional enforcement actions being taken against the Discharger, including the issuance of an Administrative Civil Liability Complaint pursuant to CWC section 13268.

12. On 29 September 2010, the Central Valley Water Board staff issued a Notice of Violation, notifying the Discharger that the MWISP had not been received. (Exhibit F.) The Notice of Violation also requested that the delinquent report be submitted as soon as possible to minimize potential liability.
13. Central Valley Water Board's compliance tracking system and case files indicate that the Board has not received the 2009 Annual Report, the Waste Management Plan, or the MWISP to date.
14. The Discharger is alleged to have violated the following sections of the General Order and of the MRP:
 - A) Provision E.3 of the General Order, which states:

“The Discharger shall comply with the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2007-0035 which is part of this Order, and future revisions thereto or with an individual monitoring and reporting program, as specified by the Central Valley Water Board or the Executive Officer.”
 - B) Provision E.13 of the General Order, which states in part:

“The Discharger must comply with all conditions of this Order, including timely submittal of technical and monitoring reports as directed by the Executive Officer.”
 - C) The MRP, which states in part:

“An annual monitoring report is due by 1 July of each year [T]he annual report shall cover information on crops harvested during the previous calendar year”
 - D) Required Reports and Notices H.1.b of the General Order, which states in part:

“The Discharger shall submit a Waste Management Plan for the production area of the dairy facility, prepared in accordance with Exhibit A. The Waste Management Plan shall provide an evaluation of the existing milk cow dairy's design, construction, operation, and maintenance for flood protection and waste containment”
15. The Discharger violated both the General Order and the MRP by failing to submit the 2009 Annual Report as directed by the MRP that accompanies the General Order, which contains reporting requirements for dairies regulated by the General Order.
16. The Discharger violated the General Order by failing to submit the Waste Management Plan as directed by the General Order.

17. The Discharger violated both the General Order and the 13267 Order issued by the Executive Officer on 29 January 2010 by failing to submit the MWISP plan as required by the 13267 Order and as directed by the MRP that accompanies the General Order (Exhibit A), which contains the requirements for implementing groundwater monitoring at dairies regulated by the General Order.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

1. **Violation No. 1:** The discharger failed to submit an annual report for 2009 by 1 July 2010 as required by the General Order and the MRP. As of the date of this Complaint this report is now 308 days late.
2. **Violation No. 2:** The discharger failed to submit a Waste Management Plan on 1 July 2010 as required by the General Order. As of the date of this letter this plan is now 308 days late.
3. **Violation No. 3:** The discharger failed to submit a MWISP by 30 April 2010. As of the date of this letter this plan is now 370 days late.

The Discharger has been out of compliance for a total of 986 days.

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY

18. On 17 November 2009, the State Water Board adopted Resolution No. 2009-0083 amending the Water Quality Enforcement Policy (Enforcement Policy). The Enforcement Policy was approved by the Office of Administrative Law and became effective on 20 May 2010. The Enforcement Policy establishes a methodology for assessing administrative civil liability. The use of this methodology addresses the factors that are required to be considered when imposing a civil liability. This policy can be found at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/enforcement/docs/enf_policy_final_111709.pdf.

19. The administrative civil liability was derived from the use of the penalty methodology in the Policy. In summary, this penalty assessment is based on a consideration of the failure to respond to requests made pursuant to CWC section 13267, subdivision (b), for Violations 1 through 3. The proposed civil liability takes into account such factors as the Discharger's culpability, history of violations, ability to pay and continue in business, and other factors as justice may require.

Violations under Water Code 13267 are assessed on a per day basis. However, the violations at issue are primarily reporting violations and therefore qualify for the alternative approach to penalty calculation under the Enforcement Policy. The failure to submit an annual report, a MWISP, and a WMP does not cause daily detrimental impacts to the environment or the regulatory program. It is appropriate to assess daily penalties for the first thirty (30) days, plus one violation for each additional thirty-day period.

For Violations 1 and 2, the days fined is reduced to 16 days; for Violation 3, the days fined is reduced to 18 days.

The required factors have been considered using the methodology in the Enforcement Policy, as explained in detail in Attachment A (Penalty Calculation for Civil Liability) and Attachment B.

20. The maximum penalty for the violations described above is \$986,000 based on a calculation of the total number of per-day violations times the statutory maximum penalty (986 total days of violation X \$1000). However, based on consideration of the above facts and after applying the penalty methodology, the Assistant Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board proposes that civil liability be imposed administratively on the Discharger in the amount of **sixteen thousand eight hundred dollars (\$16,800)** for the three violations cited above. The specific factors considered in this penalty are detailed in Attachment A. The Discharger's culpability, history of violations, and ability to pay and continue in business were considered, but did not change the amount of liability. Other factors as justice may require were considered, but circumstances warranting an adjustment under this step were not identified by staff or provided by the Discharger.

PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY

The Executive Officer proposes that the Discharger be assessed an administrative civil liability pursuant to Water Code Sections 13323 and 13268 in the amount of **sixteen thousand eight hundred dollars (\$16,800)** for failure to submit the 2009 report by the July 1, 2010 deadline as required by the General Order and the MRP, and failure to submit a WMP by the 1 July 2010 deadline as required by the General Order.

The Executive Officer proposes that the amount of the assessed administrative liability (\$16,800) may be reduced provided the Discharger submits one or more of the following: 1) a complete 2009 Annual Report; 2) a complete Waste Management Plan; and/or 3) a complete MWISP. The amount of the assessed civil liability shall be reduced by \$2,000 for each report described above that is received by **20 June 2011** and which the Executive Officer finds complete. The total adjustment to the liability amount will not exceed \$6,000.

If a panel of the Central Valley Water Board holds a hearing, it may choose to recommend to the Central Valley Water Board the imposition of administrative civil liability in the amount proposed, in a higher or lower amount, or it may decline to seek civil liability, or it may recommend referral of the matter to the Attorney General for enforcement. If this matter proceeds to hearing, the Prosecution Team reserves the right to seek an increase in the civil liability amount to cover the costs of enforcement incurred subsequent to the issuance of this administrative civil liability complaint through hearing.

There are no statutes of limitations that apply to administrative proceedings. The statutes of limitations that refer to "actions" and "special proceedings" and are contained in the California Code of Civil Procedure apply to judicial proceedings, not an administrative proceeding. See *City of Oakland v. Public Employees' Retirement System* (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 29, 48; 3 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (4th ed. 1996) Actions, §405(2), p. 510.)

Notwithstanding the issuance of this Complaint, the Regional Board retains the authority to assess additional penalties for violations of the requirements of the Discharger's waste discharge requirements for which penalties have not yet been assessed or for violations that may subsequently occur.

Issuance of this Complaint is an enforcement action and is therefore exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.) pursuant to title 14, California Code of Regulations sections 15308 and 15321 subsection (a) (2).

Payment of the assessed liability amount does not absolve the Discharger from complying with the General Order or the MRP, the terms of which remain in effect. Additional civil liability may be assessed in the future if the Discharger fails to comply with the General Order, the MRP, and/or future orders issued by the Regional Board.

Date

5 May 11

for

T. L. Moya

Pamela Creedon
Executive Officer
Central Valley Water Board Prosecution Team

**WAIVER OF 90-DAY HEARING REQUIREMENT FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT**

By signing this waiver, I affirm and acknowledge the following:

1. I am duly authorized to represent Leno Bettencourt (hereinafter "Discharger") in connection with Administrative Civil Liability Complaint R5-2011-0551 (hereinafter the "Complaint");
2. I am informed that California Water Code section 13323, subdivision (b), states that, "a hearing before the regional board shall be conducted within 90 days after the party has been served" with the Complaint;
3. ***(Check one of the boxes below if the Discharger will waive its right to a hearing and either [Box 1] accept the proposed liability amount of sixteen thousand eight hundred dollars (\$16,800) in full or [Box 2] accept an adjusted amount of proposed liability subject to timely submission of the required reports)*** I hereby waive any right the Discharger may have to a hearing before the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) within ninety (90) days of service of the Complaint

[Box 1] I certify that the Discharger will be liable for **sixteen thousand eight hundred dollars (\$16,800) in full** and will submit this signed waiver and full payment by check, which will contain a reference to "ACL Complaint R5-2011-0551" and will be made payable to the "State Water Resources Control Board Cleanup and Abatement Account" by **6 June 2011**

[Box 2] I certify that the Discharger will be liable for the adjusted amount of proposed liability if the Discharger submits one or more of the following documents by **20 June 2011**:

- a complete 2009 Annual Report; and/or
- a complete Waste Management Plan.

The amount of the assessed civil liability shall be reduced by two thousand dollars (\$2,000) for each report described above that is received by **20 June 2011** and which the Executive Officer finds complete.

In addition to the reports, the Discharger shall also remit payment of the adjusted liability amount, by check, which will contain a reference to "ACL Complaint R5-2011-0551" and will be made payable to the "State Water Resources Control Board Cleanup and Abatement Account". Payment must be received by the Central Valley Water Board along with the reports described above by **20 June 2011** or this matter will be placed on the Central Valley Water Board's agenda for consideration at the **19/20 July 2011** Hearing Panel.

I understand that payment of the **liability amount** either in full or in the adjusted amount is not a substitute for compliance with applicable laws and that continuing violations of the type alleged in the Complaint may subject the Discharger to further enforcement, including additional civil liability.

-or-

4. ***(Check here if the Discharger will waive the 90-day hearing requirement, but wishes to engage in settlement negotiations. The Central Valley Water Board must receive information from the Discharger indicating a controversy regarding the assessed penalty at the time this waiver is submitted, or the waiver may not be accepted.)*** I hereby waive any right the Discharger may have to a hearing before the Regional Water Board within 90 days after service of the complaint but reserve the ability to request a hearing in the future. I certify that the Discharger will promptly engage the Central Valley Water Board staff in discussions to resolve the outstanding violation(s). By checking this box, the Discharger is *not* waiving its right to a hearing on this matter. By checking this box, the Discharger requests that the Central Valley Water Board delay the hearing so that the Discharger and Central Valley Water Board staff can discuss settlement. It remains within the discretion of the Central Valley Water Board to agree to delay the hearing. A hearing on the matter may be held before the Central Valley Water Board if these discussions do not resolve the liability proposed in the Complaint. The Discharger agrees that this hearing may be held after the 90-day period referenced in California Water Code section 13323 has elapsed.
5. ***(Check here if the Discharger will waive the 90-day hearing requirement in order to extend the hearing date and/or hearing deadlines. The Central Valley Water Board must receive information from the Discharger indicating a controversy regarding the assessed penalty at the time this waiver is submitted, or the waiver may not be accepted. Attach a separate sheet with the amount of additional time requested and the rationale.)*** I hereby waive any right the Discharger may have to a hearing before the Regional Water

Leno Bettencourt

Bettencourt & Sons Dairy

Stanislaus County

Board within 90 days after service of the complaint but reserve the ability to request a hearing in the future. By checking this box, the Discharger requests that the Central Valley Water Board delay the hearing and/or hearing deadlines so that the Discharger may have additional time to prepare for the hearing. It remains within the discretion of the Central Valley Water Board to approve the extension.

6. If a hearing on this matter is held, the Hearing Panel will consider whether it should recommend to the Central Valley Water Board the issuance of an administrative civil liability order assessing the proposed liability, or a higher or lower amount, or rejecting the proposed liability, or it may recommend referral of the matter to the Attorney General for enforcement.

(Print Name and Title)

(Signature)

(Date)

EXHIBIT A

Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies
Order R5-2007-0035

and

EXHIBIT B

Monitoring and Reporting Program R5-2007-0035

can be viewed at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/
r5-2007-0035.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2007-0035.pdf)

EXHIBIT C

Notice of Violation Issued 2 September 2010
For Failure to Submit 2009 Annual Report



California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region

Katherine Hart, Chair



Arnold
Schwarzenegger
Governor


Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

2 September 2010

Bettencourt and Sons Dairy
Lino Bettencourt
5731 Downie Road
Denair, CA 95316



Certified Mail No.
7007 0710 0004 3777 8192

POTENTIAL ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO SUBMIT ANNUAL REPORT, BETTENCOURT AND SONS DAIRY, 5731 DOWNIE RD, DENAIR, WDID 5B50NC00064, STANISLAUS COUNTY

The dairy facility identified above is covered under Order No. R5-2007-0035, Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies (General Order). The General Order required that a 2009 Annual Report be submitted for regulated facilities by 1 July 2010, including an Annual Dairy Facility Assessment with facility modifications implemented to date and a status on facility retrofitting completion as proposed in the Nutrient Management Plan submittal that was due 1 July 2009. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) staff have not received these items.

The General Order-required reports, including those due on 1 July 2010, are requested pursuant to California Water Code (CWC) §13267. CWC §13268 provides that failure to submit the required reports can subject you to administrative civil liability (monetary penalties) at a rate of up to \$1,000 for each day each report is late or substantially incomplete, if imposed by the Central Valley Water Board, or at a rate up to \$5,000 for each day a report is late or substantially incomplete, if imposed by the superior court. It is important that you promptly provide the Central Valley Water Board with the reports required by the General Order that were due by 1 July 2010, to minimize your potential liability.

Please contact Charlene Herbst at (916) 464-4724 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Charlene Herbst
Senior Engineering Geologist
Confined Animal Facility Regulatory Unit

Dairy at:
 5731 Downie
 Denair

2 SEPTEMBER 2010
 NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS

7007 0710 0004 3777 8192

Bettencourt and Sons Dairy
 Lino Bettencourt
 5731 Downie Road
 Denair, CA 95316

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

1. Article Addressed to:

Bettencourt and Sons Dairy
 Lino Bettencourt
 5731 Downie Road
 Denair, CA 95316

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature
 Agent
 Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)
 Lino Bettencourt

C. Date of Delivery
 9/3/10

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: No

3. Service Type
 Certified Mail Express Mail
 Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise
 Insured Mail C.O.D.

4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) Yes

EXHIBIT D

Notice of Violation Issued 2 September 2010
For Failure to Submit Waste Management Plan



California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region

Katherine Hart, Chair



Arnold
Schwarzenegger
Governor

Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

11020 Sun Center Drive #200 Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

2 September 2010

Certified Mail No.
7007 0710 0004 3777 8192

Bettencourt and Sons Dairy
Lino Bettencourt
5731 Downie Road
Denair, CA 95316

APPROVED
author <u>JML 8/24/10</u>
senior <u>[Signature]</u>

POTENTIAL ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO SUBMIT WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, BETTENCOURT AND SONS DAIRY, 5731 DOWNIE RD, DENAIR, WDID 5B50NC00064, STANISLAUS COUNTY

The dairy facility identified above is covered under Order No. R5-2007-0035, Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies (General Order). The General Order required that a Waste Management Plan (WMP) be submitted for regulated facilities by 1 July 2010, including the following: 1) Retrofitting plan, with schedule, needed to improve storage capacity, flood protection, or design of the production area; 2) Production area and land application area maps (facility information); 3) Wastewater storage capacity evaluation; 4) Flood protection evaluation; 5) Production area design/construction evaluation; and 6) Documentation that there are no cross connections. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) staff have not received these items.

The General Order-required reports, including those due on 1 July 2010, are requested pursuant to California Water Code (CWC) §13267. CWC §13268 provides that failure to submit the required reports can subject you to administrative civil liability (monetary penalties) at a rate of up to \$1,000 for each day each report is late or substantially incomplete, if imposed by the Central Valley Water Board, or at a rate up to \$5,000 for each day a report is late or substantially incomplete, if imposed by the superior court. It is important that you promptly provide the Central Valley Water Board with the reports required by the General Order that were due by 1 July 2010, to minimize your potential liability.

Please contact Charlene Herbst at (916) 464-4724 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Charlene Herbst
Senior Engineering Geologist
Confined Animal Facility Regulatory Unit

EXHIBIT E

Letter Issued 4 February 2010

Groundwater Monitoring Directive Issued Pursuant to CWC Section 13267



Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region

Katherine Hart, Chair

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>



Arnold
Schwarzenegger
Governor

4 February 2010

CERTIFIED MAIL NO.
7007 0710 0004 3787 0957

Lino Bettencourt
Lino Bettencourt and Sons Dairy
5731 Downie Rd
Denair, CA 95316

GROUNDWATER MONITORING DIRECTIVE, ISSUED PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA WATER CODE SECTION 13267, LINO BETTENCOURT AND SONS DAIRY, 5731 DOWNIE RD, DENAIR, STANISLAUS COUNTY

You are legally obligated to respond to this Order. Please read this Order carefully.

Your dairy is regulated by the Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies, Order R5-2007-0035 (General Order), which was issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board or Board) on 3 May 2007. Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2007-0035 (MRP) accompanies the General Order and contains requirements for implementing groundwater monitoring at your dairy. Under the MRP, the Executive Officer has the authority to order the installation of monitoring wells based on the threat that individual dairies pose to water quality.

You have been identified as the owner and/or operator of a dairy where installation of monitoring wells is appropriate because either:

- Nitrate-nitrogen has been detected at a concentration of 10 milligrams per liter (mg/L) or more in one domestic or agricultural water supply well in the vicinity of the dairy, and/or
- Based on the factors listed in the MRP, Attachment A, Table 5 (Groundwater Monitoring Factors for Ranking Priority), it is appropriate for the Executive Officer to order the installation of additional monitoring wells to address the threat to water quality at the facility.

Attachment A (Additional Groundwater Monitoring, Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan and Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report for Milk Cow Dairies) is enclosed for your convenience.

The Executive Officer finds that:

1. You are the owner and/or operator of a dairy regulated under the General Order. A completed Table 5, which is a tool contained in the MRP that is used by the Board to

California Environmental Protection Agency

assess the threat that a dairy poses to groundwater, is attached to this Order, along with the ranking priority scores. This table indicates a total score of 195 points for your facility. This score identifies your facility as a priority site, which means that your facility will be directed to install monitoring wells.

2. The MRP, and this subsequent directive, are issued pursuant to California Water Code section 13267, which states, in relevant part:

(a) A regional board ... may investigate the quality of any waters of the state within its region.

(b)(1) In conducting an investigation specified in subdivision (a), the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region ... shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports.

3. The Board adopted the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (4th Ed., Revised October 2007), which designates beneficial uses of water. All groundwater within the vicinity of the site is designated as having a beneficial use of municipal and domestic water supply (MUN) and agricultural supply (AGR).
4. Dairy waste constituents (primarily nitrogen and salts), when released to groundwater, are a significant threat to the beneficial uses of MUN and AGR.
5. The Board has evaluated your facility and has concluded that it has discharged, or is suspected of having discharged, dairy waste constituents that could affect the quality of groundwater designated MUN or AGR. An investigation to assess whether the Dairy has impacted groundwater quality is reasonable and appropriate. The cost of the technical reports is justified by the fact that these reports will allow the Central Valley Water Board to assess whether current regulatory measures are protective of groundwater beneath dairy facilities.
6. Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Reports are technical reports that present groundwater data collected in accordance with the MRP. These reports must include an evaluation of data to assess the impact of the dairy on groundwater quality.
7. Monitoring and Reporting Program R5-2007-0035 states, in relevant part, the following:

A: Additional Groundwater Monitoring

1. When ordered by the Executive Officer, the Discharger shall install sufficient monitoring wells to:
 - a. Characterize groundwater flow direction and gradient beneath the site;
 - b. Characterize natural background (unaffected by your dairy or other discharges) groundwater quality upgradient of the facility; and

c. Characterize groundwater quality downgradient of the corrals, downgradient of the wastewater retention pond(s), and downgradient of the land application areas.

3. Prior to installation of wells, the Discharger shall submit to the Executive Officer a Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan (MWISP) (see *MRP Attachment A, Subsection B: Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan*) and schedule prepared by, or under the direct supervision of, and certified by, a California registered civil engineer or a California registered geologist with experience in hydrogeology. Installation of monitoring wells shall not begin until the Executive Officer notifies the Discharger in writing that the MWISP is acceptable. At a minimum, the MWISP must contain the information requested in Attachment A of the MRP.
7. Within 45 days after completion of any monitoring well, the Discharger shall submit to the Executive Officer a Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report (MWICR) (see *MRP Attachment A, Subsection C: Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report*) prepared by, or under the direct supervision of, and certified by, a California registered civil engineer or a California registered geologist with experience in hydrogeology.
8. Following installation of the groundwater monitoring wells, groundwater data must be collected and semi-annual groundwater monitoring reports submitted in accordance with the MRP.

It is hereby Ordered that, pursuant to CWC section 13267,

1. By **30 April 2010**, you must submit an acceptable MWISP that contains the minimum information required by Attachment A of the MRP to allow the collection of data that will identify whether your dairy is impacting groundwater quality. Installation of the monitoring wells shall not begin until the Executive Officer notifies you in writing that the MWISP is acceptable.
2. By **135 calendar days after notification that your MWISP is acceptable**, you must have installed the accepted monitoring well system and submitted an acceptable MWICR. The MWICR must contain, at a minimum, the information required by Attachment A of the MRP.
3. Each well within the monitoring well system must be sampled semi-annually (twice per year) for field measurements of electrical conductivity and pH, and laboratory analysis must be conducted for nitrate and ammonium. Depth to groundwater is to be measured in each monitoring well prior to purging the well for each sampling event. During the first semi-annual event, and every five years thereafter, groundwater samples from each well shall also be analyzed in the laboratory for calcium, magnesium, sodium, bicarbonate, carbonate, sulfate, chloride, and potassium.¹ Groundwater monitoring reports are to be submitted within 60 days of groundwater sample collection. The

¹ Sampling for Potassium was not included in the original MRP. However, because discharges of this constituent, which is typically found in dairy waste, may affect the designated beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater, it is appropriate to include sampling for this constituent.

groundwater monitoring reports are to contain a detailed description of how the data were collected, copies of laboratory reports, a tabulated summary of the data, and an evaluation of whether the dairy has impacted groundwater.

4. All technical reports are to be signed and stamped by a California Professional Engineer (Registered as a Civil Engineer) or Professional Geologist experienced in performing groundwater assessments. All laboratory analyses are to be performed by an analytical laboratory certified by the State of California for the analyses performed.

The failure to furnish any of the required reports, or the submittal of substantially incomplete reports or false information, is a misdemeanor, and may result in additional enforcement actions being taken against you, including issuance of an Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Complaint pursuant to CWC section 13268. Liability may be imposed pursuant to CWC section 13268 in an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day in which the violation occurs.

Any person aggrieved by this action of the Central Valley Water Board may petition the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to review the action in accordance with CWC section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 2050 and following. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., 30 days after the date of this Order, except that if the thirtieth day following the date of this Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday (including mandatory furlough days), the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions may be found on the Internet at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality

or will be provided upon request.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Charlene Herbst of this office at (916) 464-4724 or at cherbst@waterboards.ca.gov.



for Pamela C. Creedon
Executive Officer

Enclosure: Attachment A: Additional Groundwater Monitoring, Monitoring Well Installation And Sampling Plan And Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report For Existing Milk Cow Dairies

cc: Mr. John Menke, State Water Resources Control Board, Sacramento

5731 Downie Rd.
 Denver

TABLE 5. GROUNDWATER MONITORING FACTORS FOR RANKING PRIORITY¹

FACTOR	SITE CONDITION	POINTS	SCORE
Highest nitrate concentration (nitrate-nitrogen in mg/l) in any existing domestic well, agricultural supply well, or subsurface (tile) drainage system at the dairy or associated land application area.*	< 10	0	20
	10 - 20	10	
	>20	20	
Location of production area or land application area relative to a Department of Pesticide Groundwater Protection Area ² (GWPA).	Outside GWPA	0	20
	In GWPA	20	
Distance (feet) of production area or land application area from an artificial recharge area ³ as identified in the California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118 or by the Executive Officer.	> 1,500	0	0
	601 to 1,500	10	
	0 to 600	20	
Nitrate concentration (nitrate-nitrogen in mg/l) in domestic well on property adjacent to the dairy production area or land application area (detected two or more times).	< 10 or unknown	0	0
	10 or greater	20	
Distance (feet) from dairy production area or land application area and the nearest off-property domestic well.*	> 600	0	20
	301 to 600	10	
	0 to 300	20	
Distance (feet) from dairy production area or land application area and the nearest off-property municipal well.*	> 1,500	0	0
	601 to 1,500	10	
	0 to 600	20	
Number of crops grown per year per field.*	1	5	15
	2	10	
	3	15	
Nutrient Management Plan completed by 1 July 2009*	Yes	0	100
	No	100	
Whole Farm Nitrogen Balance. ⁴	<1.65	0	20
	1.65 to 3	10	
	>3	20	

Total Score: 195

*This information will be provided by the Discharger. All other information will be obtained by the Executive Officer.

1 Information on each factor may not be available for each facility. Total scores will be the ratio of the points accumulated to the total points possible for each facility. Dairies with higher total scores will be directed to install monitoring wells first.

2 The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) defines a Groundwater Protection Area (GWPA) as an area of land that is vulnerable to the movement of pesticides to groundwater according to either leaching or runoff processes. These areas include areas where the depth to groundwater is 70 feet or less. The DPR GWPA's can be seen on DPR's website at <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/gwp/gwpamaps.htm>.

3 An artificial recharge area is defined as an area where the addition of water to an aquifer is by human activity, such as pulling surface water into dug or constructed spreading basins or injecting water through wells.

4 The Whole Farm Nitrogen Balance is to be determined as the ratio of (total nitrogen in storage - total nitrogen exported + nitrogen imported + irrigation nitrogen + atmospheric nitrogen)/(total nitrogen removed by crops) as reported in the Preliminary Dairy Facility Assessment in the Existing Conditions Report (Attachment A).

EXHIBIT F

Notice of Violation Issued 29 September 2010
For Failure to Submit Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan



Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region

Katherine Hart, Chair

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>



Arnold
Schwarzenegger
Governor

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

29 September 2010

CERTIFIED MAIL NO.
7009 1410 0002 1421 8192

Lino Bettencourt
5731 Downie Road
Denair, CA 95316

FAILURE TO SUBMIT MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION AND SAMPLING PLAN, ISSUED PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA WATER CODE SECTION 13267, BETTENCOURT & SONS DAIRY, 5731 DOWNIE ROAD, DENAIR, STANISLAUS COUNTY

Your dairy is regulated by the Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies, Order R5-2007-0035 (General Order), which was issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board or Board) on 3 May 2007. Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2007-0035 (MRP) accompanies the General Order and contains requirements for implementing groundwater monitoring at your dairy. Under the MRP, the Executive Officer has the authority to order the installation of monitoring wells based on the threat that individual dairies pose to water quality.

In a letter dated 4 February 2010, the Executive Officer directed operator(s) and owner(s) of your dairy to submit to the Board an acceptable Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan (MWISP) by 30 April 2010. To date the Board has not received the required MWISP.

The Executive Officer's 4 February 2010 letter was issued pursuant to California Water code (CWC) section 13267, which authorizes the Board to require the submittal of technical reports. The Board may impose administrative civil liability (monetary penalties) of up to \$1,000 for each day the MWISP is late under CWC section 13268. Because you have not submitted the MWISP for your dairy, you face potential monetary penalties that are growing every day that the MWISP is not submitted to the Board.

Therefore, by **25 October 2010**, you must submit a MWISP in accordance with Attachment A of the MRP. The submittal date stated above is for administrative purposes only, and does not change any due dates required by the General Order.

California Environmental Protection Agency



If you have questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (916) 464-4724 or at cherbst@waterboards.ca.gov.



Charlene Herbst
Chief, confined Animal Facilities Regulatory Unit

cc: Mr. John Menke, State Water Resources Control Board, Sacramento

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Lino Bettencourt
 5731 Downie Road
 Denver, CA 95316

2. Article Number

(Transfer from service label)

7009 1410 0002 1421 8192

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X *Lino G. Bettencourt* Agent Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

Lino G. Bettencourt

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yesif YES, enter delivery address below: No

3. Service Type

 Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D.

4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)

 Yes

Administrative Civil Liability

Fact Sheet

The California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) have the authority to impose administrative civil liabilities for a variety of violations under California Water Code section 13323. This document generally describes the process that the Regional Water Boards follow in imposing administrative civil liabilities.

The first step is the issuance of an administrative civil liability complaint (complaint) by the authorized Regional Water Board's Executive Officer or Assistant Executive Officer. The complaint describes the violations that alleged to have been committed, the Water Code provisions authorizing the imposition of liability, and the evidence that supports the allegations. **Any person who receives a complaint must respond timely as directed, or risk the Regional Water Board imposing the administrative civil liability by default.** The complaint is accompanied by a letter of transmittal, a Waiver Form and a Hearing Procedure. Each document contains important information and deadlines. You should read each document carefully. A person issued a complaint is allowed to represent him or herself. However, legal advice may be desirable to assist in responding to the complaint.

Parties

The parties to a complaint proceeding are the Regional Water Board Prosecution Team and the person/s named in the complaint, referred to as the "Discharger." The Prosecution Team is comprised of Regional Water Board staff and management. Other interested persons may become involved and may become "designated parties." Only designated parties are allowed to submit evidence and participate fully in the proceeding. Other interested persons may play a more limited role in the proceeding and are allowed to submit non-evidentiary policy statements. If the matter proceeds to hearing, the hearing will be held before the full membership of the Regional Water Board (composed of up to nine board members appointed by the Governor) or before a panel of three board members. The board members who will hear the evidence and rule on the matter act as judges. They are assisted by an Advisory Team, which provides advice on technical and legal issues. Both the Prosecution Team and the Advisory Team have their own attorney. Neither the Prosecution Team nor the Discharger or his/her representatives are permitted to communicate with the board members or the Advisory Team about the complaint without the presence or knowledge of the other. This is explained in more detail in the Hearing Procedure.

Complaint Resolution options

Once issued, a complaint can lead to (1) withdrawal of the complaint; (2) withdrawal and reissuance; (3) payment and waiver; (4) settlement; (5) hearing. Each of these options is described below.

Withdrawal: may result if the Discharger provides information to the Prosecution Team that clearly demonstrates that a fundamental error exists in the information set forth in the complaint.

Withdrawal and reissuance: may result if the Prosecution Team becomes aware of information contained in the complaint that can be corrected.

Payment and waiver: may result when the Discharger elects to pay the amount of the complaint rather than to contest it. The Discharger makes a payment for the full amount and the matter is ended, subject to public comment.

Settlement: results when the parties negotiate a resolution of the complaint. A settlement can include such things as a payment schedule, or a partial payment and suspension of the remainder pending implementation by the Discharger of identified activities, such as making improvements beyond those already required that will reduce the likelihood of a further violation or the implementation or funding of a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) or a Compliance Project. Qualifying criteria for Compliance Projects and SEPs are contained in the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board) Enforcement Policy, which is available at the State Water Board's website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/plans_policies/. Settlements are generally subject to public notice and comment, and are conditioned upon approval by the Regional Water Board or its authorized staff management. Settlements are typically memorialized by the adoption of an uncontested Administrative Civil Liability Order.

Hearing: if the matter proceeds to hearing, the parties will be allowed time to present evidence and testimony in support of their respective positions. The hearing must be held within 90 days of the issuance of the complaint, unless the Discharger waives that requirement by signing and submitting the Waiver Form included in this package. The hearing will be conducted under rules set forth in the Hearing Procedure. The Prosecution Team has the burden of proving the allegations and must present competent evidence to the Regional Water Board regarding the allegations. Following the Prosecution Team's presentation, the Discharger and other parties are given an opportunity to present evidence, testimony and argument challenging the allegations. The parties may cross-examine each others' witnesses. Interested persons may provide non-evidentiary policy statements, but may generally not submit evidence or testimony. At the end of the presentations by the parties, the board members will deliberate to decide the outcome. The Regional Water Board may issue an order

requiring payment of the full amount recommended in the complaint, it may issue an order requiring payment of a reduced amount, it may order the payment of a higher amount, decide not to impose an assessment or it may refer the matter to the Attorney General's Office.

Factors that must be considered by the Regional Water Board

Except for Mandatory Minimum Penalties under Water Code section 13385 (h) and (i), the Regional Water Board is required to consider several factors specified in the Water Code, including nature, circumstance, extent, and gravity of the violation or violations, whether the discharge is susceptible to cleanup or abatement, the degree of toxicity of the discharge, and, with respect to the violator, the ability to pay, the effect on ability to continue in business, any voluntary cleanup efforts undertaken, any prior history of violations, the degree of culpability, economic benefit or savings, if any resulting from the violations, and other matters as justice may require (Cal. Water Code §§ 13327, 13385(e) & 13399). During the period provided to submit evidence (set forth in the Hearing Procedure) and at the hearing, the Discharger may submit information that it believes supports its position regarding the complaint. If the Discharger intends to present arguments about its ability to pay it must provide reliable documentation to establish that ability or inability. The kinds of information that may be used for this purpose include:

For an individual:

1. Last three years of signed federal income tax returns (IRS Form 1040) including schedules;
2. Members of household, including relationship, age, employment and income;
3. Current living expenses;
4. Bank account statements;
5. Investment statements;
6. Retirement account statements;
7. Life insurance policies;
8. Vehicle ownership documentation;
9. Real property ownership documentation;
10. Credit card and line of credit statements;
11. Mortgage loan statements;
12. Other debt documentation.

For a business:

1. Copies of last three years of company IRS tax returns, signed and dated,
2. Copies of last three years of company financial audits

3. Copies of last three years of IRS tax returns of business principals, signed and dated.
4. Any documentation that explains special circumstances regarding past, current, or future financial conditions.

For larger firms:

1. Federal income tax returns for the last three years, specifically:
 - IRS Form 1120 for C Corporations
 - IRS Form 1120 S for S Corporations
 - IRS Form 1065 for partnerships
2. A completed and signed IRS Form 8821. This allows IRS to provide the Regional Water Board with a summary of the firm's tax returns that will be compared to the submitted income tax returns. This prevents the submission of fraudulent tax returns;
3. The following information can be substituted if income tax returns cannot be made available:
 - Audited Financial Statements for last three years;
 - A list of major accounts receivable with names and amounts;
 - A list of major accounts payable with names and amounts;
 - A list of equipment acquisition cost and year purchased;
 - Ownership in other companies and percent of ownership for the last three years;
 - Income from other companies and amounts for the last three years.

For a municipality, county, or district:

1. Type of entity:
 - City/Town/Village;
 - County;
 - Municipality with enterprise fund;
 - Independent or publicly owned utility;
2. The following 1990 and 2000 US Census data:
 - Population;
 - Number of persons age 18 and above;
 - Number of persons age 65 and above;
 - Number of Individual below 125% of poverty level;
 - Median home value;
 - Median household income.
3. Current or most recent estimates of:
 - Population;
 - Median home value;
 - Median household income;
 - Market value of taxable property;

- Property tax collection rate.
- 4. Unreserved general fund ending balance;
- 5. Total principal and interest payments for all governmental funds;
- 6. Total revenues for all governmental funds;
- 7. Direct net debt;
- 8. Overall net debt;
- 9. General obligation debt rating;
- 10. General obligation debt level.
- 11. Next year's budgeted/anticipated general fund expenditures plus net transfers out.

This list is provided for information only. The Discharger remains responsible for providing all relevant and reliable information regarding its financial situation, which may include items in the above lists, but could include other documents not listed. Please note that all evidence regarding this case, including financial information, will be made public.

Petitions

If the Regional Water Board issues an order requiring payment, the Discharger may challenge that order by filing a petition for review with the State Water Board pursuant to Water Code section 13320. More information on the petition process is available at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/index.shtml

An order of the State Water Board resolving the petition for review of the Regional Water Board's Administrative Civil Liability Order can be challenged by filing a petition for writ of mandate in the superior court pursuant to Water Code section 13330.

Once an Administrative Civil Liability Order becomes final, the Regional Water Board or State Water Board may seek a judgment of the superior court under Water Code section 13328, if necessary, in order to collect payment of the administrative civil liability amount.

Hearing Panel of the
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

HEARING PROCEDURE
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT
R5-2011-0551

ISSUED TO
LENO BETTENCOURT
BETTENCOURT & SONS DAIRY
STANISLAUS COUNTY

SCHEDULED FOR 19/20 JULY 2011

PLEASE READ THIS HEARING PROCEDURE CAREFULLY. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE DEADLINES AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED HEREIN MAY RESULT IN THE EXCLUSION OF YOUR DOCUMENTS AND/OR TESTIMONY.

Background

The Executive Officer has issued an Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Complaint pursuant to California Water Code (CWC) section 13323 to Leno Bettencourt alleging violations of CWC section 13267 (b) by failure to submit required reports.

The Complaint proposes that an administrative civil liability in the amount of \$16,800 be imposed. A hearing is currently scheduled to be conducted before a Hearing Panel of the Central Valley Water Board on **July 19/20**. Pursuant to Water Code section 13228.14, a Hearing Panel consisting of three or more members of the Central Valley Water Board will convene a hearing to hear evidence and argument and to propose a recommendation to the Central Valley Water Board about resolution of the ACL Complaint. The recommendation of the Hearing Panel will be presented to the board at a subsequent meeting. You will be notified of the date of the meeting. At the meeting, the board may adopt, modify, or reject, the recommendation of the Hearing Panel.

Purpose of the Hearing

The purpose of the hearing is to consider relevant evidence and testimony regarding the ACL Complaint. The Hearing Panel will consider whether it should recommend to the Central Valley Water Board the issuance of an administrative civil liability order assessing the proposed liability, or a higher or lower amount, or rejecting the proposed liability. The public hearing will commence at 9:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as practical, or as announced in the Hearing Panel meeting agenda. The meeting will be held at

11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200, Rancho Cordova, California.

An agenda for the meeting will be issued at least ten days before the meeting and posted on the Central Valley Water Board's web page at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_info/meetings.

Hearing Procedures

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with this Hearing Procedure. This Hearing Procedure has been proposed by the Prosecution Team and is subject to further revision by the Hearing Panel's Advisory Team. These Hearing Panel Procedures will become final by 6 June 2011 unless the Hearing Panel's Advisory Team makes further revisions. A copy of the general procedures governing adjudicatory hearings before the Central Valley Water Board may be found at California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 648 et seq., and is available at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov> or upon request. In accordance with Section 648, subdivision (d), any procedure not provided by this Hearing Panel Procedure is deemed waived. Except as provided in Section 648, subdivision (b) and herein, Chapter 5 of the Administrative Procedures Act (commencing with Gov't Code § 11500) does not apply to this hearing.

ANY OBJECTIONS TO THE HEARING PROCEDURE MUST BE RECEIVED BY THE HEARING PANEL'S ADVISORY TEAM NO LATER THAN 19 MAY 2011, OR THEY WILL BE WAIVED. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE DEADLINES AND REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED HEREIN MAY RESULT IN THE EXCLUSION OF DOCUMENTS AND/OR TESTIMONY.

The Discharger shall contact the Prosecution Team to try to resolve objections regarding due dates, the hearing date and hearing time limits BEFORE submitting objections to the Advisory Team.

Hearing Participants

Participants in this proceeding are designated as either "parties" or "interested persons." Designated parties to the hearing may present evidence and cross-examine witnesses and are subject to cross-examination. Interested persons may present non-evidentiary policy statements, but may not cross-examine witnesses and are not subject to cross-examination. Interested persons generally may not present evidence (e.g., photographs, eye-witness testimony, monitoring data). Both designated parties and interested persons may be asked to respond to clarifying questions from members of the Hearing Panel, staff or others, at the discretion of the Hearing Panel.

The following participants are hereby designated as parties in this proceeding:

1. Central Valley Water Board Prosecution Team
2. Leno Bettencourt

Requesting Designated Party Status

Persons who wish to participate in the hearing as a designated party must request party status by submitting a request in writing (with copies to the existing designated parties) so that it is received no later than 5 p.m. on 19 May 2011, by the Advisory Team attorney (contact information listed below). The request shall include an explanation of the basis for status as a designated party (i.e., how the issues to be addressed at the hearing and the potential actions by the Central Valley Water Board affect the person, and the need to present evidence or cross-examine witnesses), the information required of designated parties as provided below, and a statement explaining why the party or parties designated above do not adequately represent the person's interest. Any opposition to the request must be received by the Advisory Team, the person requesting party status, and all other parties by 5 p.m. on 24 May 2011. The parties will be notified by 5 p.m. on 26 May 2011 whether the request has been granted or denied.

Primary Contacts

Advisory Team:

Kenneth Landau, Assistant Executive Officer
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 464-4726
klandau@waterboards.ca.gov

Alex Mayer, Staff Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board, Office of Chief Counsel
Physical Address: 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, CA 95812
Phone: (916) 341-5051; fax (916) 341-5199
amayer@waterboards.ca.gov

Prosecution Team:

Pamela Creedon, Executive Officer
Rick Moss, Assistant Executive Officer
Robert Busby, Supervising Engineering Geologist
Charlene Herbst, Senior Engineering Geologist
Daniel Davis, Engineering Geologist
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 464-4724; fax: (916) 464-4800
cherbst@waterboards.ca.gov

Ellen Howard Staff Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board, Office of Enforcement
Physical Address: 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, CA 95812
Phone: (916) 341-5677; fax: (916) 341-5896
ehoward@waterboards.ca.gov

Discharger:

Leno Bettencourt
5731 Downie Road
Denair, CA 95316

Separation of Functions

To help ensure the fairness and impartiality of this proceeding, the functions of those who will act in a prosecutorial role by presenting evidence for consideration by the Hearing Panel (Prosecution Team) have been separated from those who will provide advice to the Hearing Panel (Advisory Team). Members of the Advisory Team are: Ken Landau and Alex Mayer. Members of the Prosecution Team are: Pamela Creedon, Clay Rodgers, Doug Patteson, Charlene Herbst, Daniel Davis, and Ellen Howard. Any members of the Advisory Team who normally supervise any members of the Prosecution Team are not acting as their supervisors in this proceeding, and vice versa. Pamela Creedon regularly advises the Central Valley Water Board in other, unrelated matters, but is not advising the Central Valley Water Board in this proceeding. Other members of the Prosecution Team act or have acted as advisors to the Central Valley Water Board in other, unrelated matters, but they are not advising the Hearing Panel in this proceeding. Members of the Prosecution Team have not had any ex parte communications with the members of the Hearing Panel or the Advisory Team regarding this proceeding.

Ex Parte Communications

The designated parties and interested persons are forbidden from engaging in ex parte communications regarding this matter with members of the Advisory Team or members of the Central Valley Water Board. An ex parte contact is any written or verbal communication pertaining to the investigation, preparation or prosecution of the ACL Complaint between a member of a designated party or interested person on the one hand, and a Central Valley Water Board or an Advisory Team member on the other hand, unless the communication is copied to all other designated parties (if written) or made in a manner open to all other designated parties (if verbal). Communications regarding non-controversial procedural matters are not ex parte contacts and are not restricted. Communications among one or more designated parties and interested persons themselves are not ex parte contacts.

The following communications to the Advisory Team must be copied to all designated parties: Objections to these Hearing Procedures; requests for modifications to these Hearing Procedures; requests for designated party status, or objections thereto; and all written evidence, legal argument or policy statements from designated parties. This is not an all-inclusive list of ex parte communications.

Hearing Time Limits

To ensure that all participants have an opportunity to participate in the hearing, the following time limits shall apply: each designated party shall have a combined **20** minutes to present evidence (including evidence presented by witnesses called by the designated party), cross-examine witnesses (if warranted), and provide a closing statement; and each

interested person shall have **3** minutes to present a non-evidentiary policy statement. Participants with similar interests or comments are requested to make joint presentations, and participants are requested to avoid redundant comments. **Participants who would like additional time must submit their request to the Advisory Team so that it is received by 5:00 p.m. on 20 June 2011.** Additional time may be provided at the discretion of the Advisory Team (prior to the hearing) or the Hearing Panel Chair (at the hearing) upon a showing that additional time is necessary. Such showing shall explain what testimony, comments or legal argument require extra time, and why the Discharger could not adequately provide the testimony, comments or legal argument in writing before the hearing.

A timer will be used, but will not run during questions by the members of the Hearing Panel or the responses to such questions, or during discussions of procedural issues.

Submission of Evidence and Policy Statements

Case in Chief: The Prosecution Team, the Discharger and each other designated party must submit the following information in writing in advance of the hearing:

1. All evidence (other than witness testimony to be presented orally at the hearing) that the Designated Party would like the Hearing Panel to consider. Evidence and exhibits already in the public files of the Central Valley Board may be submitted by reference as long as the exhibits and their location are clearly identified in accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 648.3. Hearing Panel members will generally not receive copies of materials incorporated by reference, and the referenced materials are generally not posted on the Board's website.
2. All legal and technical arguments or analysis.
3. The name of each witness, if any, whom the designated party intends to call at the hearing, the subject of each witness' proposed testimony, and the estimated time required by each witness to present direct testimony. (This information is not required for rebuttal witnesses or rebuttal testimony.)
4. The qualifications of each expert witness, if any. (This information is not required for rebuttal witnesses.)

The Prosecution Team's information must include the legal and factual basis for its claims against each Discharger; a list or attached copy of all evidence on which the Prosecution Team relies, which must include, at a minimum, all documents cited in the complaint or Staff Report; and the witness information required under items 3-4 for all witnesses, including staff. The Prosecution Team shall provide an electronic copy to Ken Landau and Alex Mayer of all documents cited in the complaint or Staff Report no later than the due date under Important Deadlines, below.

The Prosecution Team shall submit one hard copy and one electronic copy to Ken Landau and one electronic copy to Alex Mayer. Each other designated party shall submit 3 hard copies and one electronic copy to Ken Landau and one electronic copy to Alex Mayer. Ken Landau and Alex Mayer must receive all submissions no later than 5:00 p.m. on the applicable due date under Important Deadlines, below.

Rebuttal: Any designated party that would like to submit evidence, legal analysis or policy statements to rebut the information previously submitted by other designated parties shall submit 3 hard copies of their rebuttal information to Ken Landau and one electronic copy of the information to Alex Mayer so that they are received by 5 p.m. on the due date under Important Deadlines, below. "Rebuttal" means evidence, analysis or comments offered to disprove or contradict other designated parties' submissions. Rebuttal shall be limited to the scope of the materials previously submitted by the other designated parties. Rebuttal information that is not responsive to information previously submitted by other designated parties may be excluded.

Closing of Hearing: Designated Parties should be sure to submit all evidence or rebuttal evidence they want the Hearing Panel to consider by the dates set forth in the Important Deadlines, below. Once the Hearing Panel adjourns the hearing, the evidentiary record on which that recommendation is based will be closed. The Central Valley Water Board will not ordinarily allow new evidence to be presented or considered at the future Board meeting.

Copies: Hearing Panel members will receive copies of all materials submitted in hard copy or electronic format. The Hearing Panel's copies will be printed in black and white from the designated parties' electronic copies. Designated parties who are concerned about print quality of all or any part of their written materials should submit a high-resolution pdf or provide an extra three paper copies for the Hearing Panel members. For items with voluminous submissions, Hearing Panel members may receive copies electronically only. Electronic copies are also posted on the Board's website.

Parties without access to computer equipment are strongly encouraged to have their materials scanned at a copy and mailing center. However, the Hearing Panel will not reject materials solely for failure to provide electronic copies.

By 8 July 2011 the Prosecution Team shall prepare a summary agenda sheet ("buff sheet") for this item to be included in the Hearing Panel's agenda package and posted on the internet. The buff sheet shall clearly state that it was prepared by the Prosecution Team. The Prosecution Team shall provide a copy of the buff sheet to all parties by mail or email.

Interested persons who would like to submit written non-evidentiary policy statements are encouraged to submit them to the Advisory Team as early as possible, but they must be received by 8 July 2011. Interested persons do not need to submit written comments in order to speak at the hearing.

In accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 648.4, the Central Valley Water Board endeavors to avoid surprise testimony or evidence. Absent a showing of good cause and lack of prejudice to the parties, the Hearing Panel may exclude evidence and testimony that is not submitted in accordance with this Hearing Procedure. Excluded evidence and testimony will not be considered by the Hearing Panel and will not be included in the administrative record for this proceeding. Power Point and other visual presentations may be used at the hearing, but their content may not exceed the scope of

other submitted written material. Designated parties must provide the Advisory Team with a printed copy of such materials at or before the hearing, for inclusion in the administrative record. Additionally, any witness who has submitted written testimony for the hearing shall appear at the hearing and affirm that the written testimony is true and correct, and shall be available for cross-examination.

Evidentiary Documents and File

The Complaint and related evidentiary documents are on file and may be inspected or copied at the Central Valley Water Board office at 11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200, Rancho Cordova, California. This file shall be considered part of the official administrative record for this hearing. Other submittals received for this proceeding will be added to this file and will become a part of the administrative record absent a contrary ruling by the Hearing Panel Chair. Many of these documents are also posted on-line at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/tentative_orders/index.shtml Although the web page is updated regularly, to assure access to the latest information, you may contact Charlene Herbst (contact information above).

Questions

Questions concerning this proceeding may be addressed to the Advisory Team attorney (contact information above).

IMPORTANT DEADLINES

(Note: the Central Valley Water Board is required to provide a hearing within 90 days of issuance of the Complaint (CWC § 13323). The Advisory Team will generally adhere to this schedule unless the discharger submits a waiver and it is accepted.)

All required submissions must be received by 5:00 p.m. on the due date.

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 5 May 2011 | Prosecution Team issues ACL Complaint to Discharger and Advisory Team, sends proposed Hearing Procedure to Discharger and Advisory Team, and publishes Public Notice |
| 19 May 2011 | Objections due on proposed Hearing Procedure |
| 19 May 2011 | Deadline for submission of request for designated party status. |
| 24 May 2011 | Deadline for opposition to request for designated party status. |
| 24 May 2011 | Prosecution Team's deadline for submission of all information required under "Evidence and Policy Statements," above. |
| 26 May 2011 | Advisory Team issues decision on requests for designated party status, if any. |
| 6 June 2011 | Discharger's deadline for submitting signed form to waive right to hearing within 90 days. |
| 13 June 2011 | Remaining Designated Parties' (including the Discharger's) deadline for submission of all information required under "Evidence and Policy Statements," above. |
| 13 June 2011 | Prosecution Team submits an electronic copy to Ken Landau and Alex Mayer of all documents cited in the complaint or Staff Report, unless previously submitted. |
| 20 June 2011 | Requests for additional hearing time (see Hearing Time Limits, above). |
| 27 June 2011 | All Designated Parties shall submit any rebuttal evidence, written rebuttal to legal argument and/or written rebuttal to policy statements; and all evidentiary objections to other Designated Parties' submittals. |
| 8 July 2011 | Interested persons' comments are due. |
| 8 July 2011 | Prosecution Team's deadline to submit Buff Sheet. |

- 14 July 2011 If *new* rebuttal evidence or argument is submitted, deadline for designated parties to submit any requests for additional time at the hearing to respond to the rebuttal.
- 19/20 July 2011 Hearing

Attachment A
Penalty Calculation for Civil Liability

Attachment A
ACL Complaint No. R5 –2011- 0551
Specific Factors Considered – Civil Liability
Bettencourt & Sons Dairy (Complaint)

Each factor of the Enforcement Policy and its corresponding score for each violation are presented below:

1. **Violation No. 1 (Failure to submit 2009 Annual Report):** In accordance with Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies, Order R5-2007-0035, an Annual Report must be submitted for regulated facilities by 1 July 2010. To date, Leno Bettencourt (Discharger) has not submitted this report for the Bettencourt & Sons Dairy.

Calculation of Penalty for Failure to Submit 2009 Annual Report

Step1. Potential for Harm for Discharge Violations

This step is not applicable because the violation is a not a discharge violation.

Step 2. Assessment for Discharge Violations

This step is not applicable because the violation is a not a discharge violation.

Step 3. Per Day Assessment for Non-Discharge Violations

The per day factor is 0.30.

This factor is determined by a matrix analysis using the potential for harm and the deviation from requirements. The potential for harm was determined to be minor due to the following: The failure to submit the 2009 Annual Report did not increase the amount of pollution discharged or threatened to discharge into Waters of the State. The deviation from requirements was determined to be major, as the requirement to submit technical reports has been rendered ineffective. The failure to submit the required technical reports undermines the Regional Board's efforts to prevent water quality degradation and implement the regulatory protection measures detailed in the 2007 General Order.

Initial Liability

A failure to submit annual reports is punishable under CWC 13268(a)(1) by civil liability in an amount which shall not exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day in which the violation occurs. The discharger failed to submit an annual report for 2009 on July 1, 2010 as required by the General Order and the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), which is now 308 days late.

However, the alternative approach for calculating liability for multiday violations in the Enforcement Policy is applicable. The failure to submit required technical reports does not cause a daily detrimental impact to the environment or the regulatory program and it does not result in an economic benefit that can be measured on a daily basis. It is the extended time period of non-compliance that causes the detrimental impact to both the environment and the regulatory program. Furthermore, the Discharger only receives an economic benefit by not submitting the required technical reports, and not a per-day benefit during the entire period of violation.

Applying the per-day factor to the adjusted number of days of violation rounded to the nearest full day equals 16 days of violation. A calculation of initial liability totals \$4,800 (0.3 per day factor X 16 adjusted days of violation X \$1000 per day penalty).

Step 4. Adjustment Factors

a) *Culpability: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the neutral score of 1, which neither increases nor decreases the fine.

The Discharger is fully responsible for failure to submit annual reports alleged in this Complaint. The requirement to submit a 2009 Annual Report and associated documents were detailed in the General Order. Further, the Discharger was issued a Notice of Violation on 2 September 2010, which requested that the report be submitted as soon as possible to minimize liability. Since that time, the Discharger has failed to submit the 2009 Annual Report or any of the associated documents, and is therefore highly culpable for failure to comply with the program.

b) *Cleanup and Cooperation: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the neutral score of 1, which neither increases nor decreases the fine. Despite the fact that the Discharger received multiple notices regarding the requirements set forth in the General Order, including notice through the General Order and an NOV, the Discharger continues to fail to comply. The violation of CWC section 13268(a), alleged herein, is a non-discharge violation, and thus cleanup is not applicable.

c) *History of Violations: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the score of 1 which neither increases nor decreases the fine. The Regional Board has no documentation of violations for the Discharger with respect to the failure to submit technical and/or monitoring reports as required by an order issued pursuant to CWC section 13267(b).

Step 5. Determination of Total Base Liability Amount

The Total Base Liability is determined by applying the adjustment factors from Step 4 to the Initial Liability Amount determined in Step 3.

a) *Total Base Liability Amount: \$4,800* (Initial Liability (\$4,800) x Adjustments (1)(1)(1).

Steps 6 through 10 Are Applied to the Combined Total Base Liability Amount for All Violations and Will be Discussed After the Total Base Liability Amounts Have Been Determined for the Remaining Violations.

2. **Violation No. 2 (Failure to submit a Waste Management Plan):** In accordance with the General Order and Order R5-2009-0029, a Waste Management Plan for regulated facilities must be submitted by 1 July 2010. To date, the Discharger has not submitted this Plan for the Dairy.

Calculation of Penalty for Failure to Submit a Waste Management Plan

Step 1. Potential for Harm for Discharge Violations

This step is not applicable because the violation is a not a discharge violation.

Step 2. Assessment for Discharge Violations

This step is not applicable because the violation is a not a discharge violation.

Step 3. Per Day Assessment for Non-Discharge Violations

The per day factor is 0.30.

This factor is determined by a matrix analysis using the potential for harm and the deviation from requirements. The potential for harm was determined to be minor due to the following: The failure to develop and submit a Waste Management Plan does not itself threaten water quality. The deviation from requirements was determined to be major, as the requirement to develop a Waste Management Plan for the operational portions of the Dairy facility has been rendered ineffective. The failure to submit the required Waste Management Plan undermines the Regional Board's efforts to prevent water quality degradation and implement the regulatory protection measures detailed in the General Order.

Initial Liability

A failure to submit a Waste Management Plan is punishable under CWC 13268(b)(1) by civil liability in an amount which shall not exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day in which the violation occurs. The Discharger failed to submit a Waste Management Plan by the July 1, 2010 deadline as required by the General Order which is now 308 days late.

The alternative approach for calculating liability for multiday violations in the Enforcement Policy is applicable. The failure to submit a Waste Management Plan addressing the management of waste does not cause a daily detrimental impact to the environment or the regulatory program and it does not result in an economic benefit that can be measured on a daily basis. It is the extended time period of non-compliance that causes the detrimental impact to both the environment and the

regulatory program. The Discharger receives a single economic benefit in cost saved in not developing the report, and not a per-day benefit during the entire period of violation.

Applying the per day factor to the adjusted number of days of violation rounded to the nearest full day equals 16 days of violation. This yields an initial liability of \$4,800 (0.3 per day factor X 16 adjusted days of violation X \$1000 per day penalty).

Step 4. Adjustment Factors

a) *Culpability: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the neutral score of 1, which neither increases nor decreases the fine.

The Discharger is fully responsible for failure to submit a Waste Management Plan alleged in this Complaint. The requirement to develop and submit a Waste Management Plan was detailed in the General Order. Further, the amended Order gave dischargers and extra calendar year to develop and submit the Plan. The Discharger was issued a Notice of Violation on 2 September 2010, which requested that the Plan be submitted as soon as possible to minimize liability. Since that time, the Discharger has failed to show any progress toward developing a Plan, and is therefore highly culpable for failure to comply with the program.

b) *Cleanup and Cooperation: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the neutral score of 1, which neither increases nor decreases the fine. Despite the fact that the Discharger received multiple notices regarding the requirements set forth in the General Order, the Discharger continues to fail to comply. The violation of CWC section 13268, alleged herein, is a non-discharge violation, and thus cleanup is not applicable.

c) *History of Violations: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the score of 1 which neither increases nor decreases the fine. The Regional Board has no documentation of violations for the Discharger with respect to the failure to submit technical and/or monitoring reports as required by an order issued pursuant to CWC section 13267(b).

Step 5. Determination of Total Base Liability Amount

The Total Base Liability is determined by applying the adjustment factors from Step 4 to the Initial Liability Amount determined in Step 3.

a) *Total Base Liability Amount: \$4,800* (Initial Liability (\$4,800) x Adjustments (1)(1)(1).

Steps 6 through 10 Are Applied to the Combined Total Base Liability Amount for All Violations and Will be Discussed After the Total Base Liability Amounts Have Been Determined for the Remaining Violations.

3. **Violation No. 3 (Failure to comply with requirements of 13267 Directive):** On 4 February 2010 the Discharger was issued a Groundwater Monitoring Directive, issued pursuant to California Water Code Section 13267 (13267 Directive). This Directive was issued because the facility was identified as a dairy where installation of monitoring wells was appropriate based on the factors listed in the MRP. Under the 13267 Directive, the Discharger was directed to submit an acceptable Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan (MWISP) by 30 April 2010. To date, the Discharger has not submitted an MWISP for the Dairy.

Calculation of Penalty for Failure to Submit MWISP

Step 1. Potential for Harm for Discharge Violations

This step is not applicable because the violation is a not a discharge violation.

Step 2. Assessment for Discharge Violations

This step is not applicable because the violation is a not a discharge violation.

Step 3. Per Day Assessment for Non-Discharge Violations

The per day factor is 0.30.

This factor is determined by a matrix analysis using the potential for harm and the deviation from requirements. The potential for harm was determined to be minor due to the following: The failure to develop and submit an MWISP is not in itself a threat to water quality. The deviation from requirements was determined to be major, as the requirement to develop an MWISP for the Dairy has been rendered ineffective. The failure to submit the required MWISP undermines the Regional Board's efforts to prevent water quality degradation and implement the regulatory protection measures detailed in the General Order.

Initial Liability

A failure to submit an MWISP is punishable under CWC 13268(b)(1) by civil liability in an amount which shall not exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day in which the violation occurs. The Discharger failed to submit an MWISP by the 30 April 2010 deadline as required by the 4 February 2010 13267 Directive, which is now 370 days late.

The alternative approach for calculating liability for multiday violations in the Enforcement Policy is applicable. The failure to submit an MWISP does not cause a daily detrimental impact to the environment or the regulatory program and it does not result in an economic benefit that can be measured on a daily basis. It is the extended time period of non-compliance that causes the detrimental impact to both the environment and the regulatory program. The Discharger receives a single economic benefit in cost saved in not developing the report, and not a per-day benefit during the entire period of violation.

Applying the per day factor to the adjusted number of days of violation rounded to the nearest full day equals 18 days of violation. This yields an initial liability of \$5,400 (0.3 per day factor X 18 adjusted days of violation X \$1000 per day penalty).

Step 4. Adjustment Factors

a) *Culpability: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the neutral score of 1, which neither increases nor decreases the fine.

The Discharger is fully responsible for failure to submit the MWISP as alleged in this Complaint. The requirement to develop and submit the MWISP was detailed in the 13267 Directive issued to the Discharger on 29 January 2010. Since that time, the Discharger has failed to show any progress toward developing an MWISP, and is therefore highly culpable for failure to comply with the program.

b) *Cleanup and Cooperation: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the neutral score of 1, which neither increases nor decreases the fine. Despite the fact that the Discharger received multiple notices regarding the requirements set forth in the General Order, including notice through the MRP, the 13267 Directive, and an NOV, the Discharger continues to fail to comply. The violation of CWC section 13268(a), alleged herein, is a non-discharge violation, and thus cleanup is not applicable.

c) *History of Violations: 1*

Discussion: The Discharger was given the score of 1 which neither increases nor decreases the fine. The Regional Board has no documentation of violations for the Discharger with respect to the failure to submit technical and/or monitoring reports as required by an order issued pursuant to CWC section 13267(b).

Step 5. Determination of Total Base Liability Amount

The Total Base Liability is determined by applying the adjustment factors from Step 4 to the Initial Liability Amount determined in Step 3.

a. *Total Base Liability Amount: \$5,400* (Initial Liability (\$5,400) x Adjustments (1)(1)(1)).

Steps 6 through 10 Are Applied to the Combined Total Base Liability Amount for All Violations and Will be Discussed After the Total Base Liability Amounts Have Been Determined for the Remaining Violations.

COMBINED TOTAL BASE LIABILITY AND FACTORS APPLIED TO ALL VIOLATIONS

The Combined Total Base Liability Amount for the three Violations is \$15,000 (\$4,800 + \$4,800 + \$5,400).

The following factors apply to the combined Total Base Liability Amounts for all of the violations discussed above.

Step 6. Ability to Pay and Continue in Business

a) *Adjusted Combined Total Base Liability Amount: \$15,000*

Discussion: The Discharger has the ability to pay the total base liability amount based on 1) the Discharger owns the Dairy, a significant asset, 2) the Discharger operates a dairy, an ongoing business that generates profits.

Based on the reasons discussed above, an ability to pay factor of 1 has been applied to the Combined Total Base Liability Amount.

Step 7. Other Factors as Justice May Require

a) *Adjusted Combined Total Base Liability Amount: \$15,000 + \$1,800 (Staff Costs) = \$16,800.*

b) *Discussion:* The State and Regional Water Board has incurred \$1,800 in staff costs associated with the investigation and enforcement of the violations alleged herein. This represents approximately 12 hours of staff time devoted to investigating and drafting the complaint at \$150 an hour. In accordance with the Enforcement Policy, this amount is added to the Combined Total Base Liability Amount. A further adjustment of the combined total based liability amount may be made if the Discharger submits a complete 2009 Annual report, a complete Waste Management Plan, and/or a complete MWISP by 20 June 2011. The amount of the combined total based liability amount may be reduced by \$2000 for each completed report that is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board by 20 June 2011. This reduction in the combined total base liability amount by \$2000 for each completed report accounts for enforcement efficiencies gained by the Discharger submitting the completed report or reports.

Step 8. Economic Benefit

a) *Estimated Economic Benefit: \$10,000*

Discussion: The Discharger has received an economic benefit from the costs saved in not drafting and preparing the 2009 Annual Report, the Waste Management Plan, and the MWISP. This is based on the current consulting costs of producing an Annual Report and an MWISP (\$2,500 each) and employing a certified engineer to conduct a site inspection and produce a Waste Management Plan (\$5,000). The adjusted total base liability amount of \$16,800 is more than at least 10% higher than the economic benefit amount (\$10,000) as required by the enforcement policy.

Step 9. Maximum and Minimum Liability Amounts

a) *Minimum Liability Amount: \$ 11,000*

Discussion: The Enforcement Policy requires that the minimum liability amount imposed not be below the economic benefit plus ten percent. As discussed above, the Regional Water Board Prosecution Team's estimate of the Discharger's economic benefit obtained from the violations cited in this Complaint is \$10,000.

b) *Maximum Liability Amount: \$986,000*

Discussion: The maximum administrative liability amount is the maximum amount allowed by Water Code Section 13367(b)(1): one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day in which the violation occurs. Without the benefit of the alternative approach for calculating liability for multiday violations under the Enforcement Policy, the Discharger could face penalties for the total number of days in violation (986 total days X \$1,000 per day).

The proposed liability falls within these maximum and minimum liability amounts.

Step 10. Final Liability Amount

Based on the foregoing analysis, and consistent with the Enforcement Policy, the final liability amount proposed for the failure to submit the 2009 Annual Report, the Waste Management Plan, and the MWISP is **\$16,800**. Attachment B is a spreadsheet that demonstrates the use of the penalty calculation methodology.

Attachment B
Penalty Calculation for Civil Liability Spreadsheet

Password for Workbook Protection: enforcement

- Instructions**
1. Select Potential Harm for Discharge Violations
 2. Select Characteristics of the Discharge
 3. Select Susceptibility to Cleanup or Abatement
 4. Select Deviation from Standard
 5. Click "Determine Harm & per Gallon/Day..."
 6. Enter Values into the yellow highlighted fields.

Select item
Select item
Select item
Select item
Select item
Potential Harm for Discharge Violations
Characteristics of the Discharge
Susceptibility of Cleanup or Abatement
Deviation from Requirement

Select item
Select item
Select item
Select item
Select item
Potential Harm for Discharge Violations
Characteristics of the Discharge
Susceptibility of Cleanup or Abatement
Deviation from Requirement

Select item
Select item
Select item
Select item

Discharger Name/ID: **Belencourt & Sons Dairy/SB50NC00064**

ATTACHMENT B

		Violation 1		Violation 2	
Discharge Violations					
Step 1	Potential Harm Factor (Generated from Button)				
Step 2	Per Gallon Factor (Generated from Button)				
	Gallons				
	Statutory / Adjusted Max per Gallon (\$)				
	Total				
	Per Day Factor (Generated from Button)	0	0	0	0
	Days				
	Statutory Max per Day				
	Total				
Step 3	Per Day Factor	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
	Days	16	16	16	18
	Statutory Max per Day				
	Total	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Non-Discharge Violations					
	Initial Amount of the ACL				
Step 4	Culpability	1	1	1	1
	Cleanup and Cooperation	1	1	1	1
	History of Violations	1	1	1	1
Step 5	Total Base Liability Amount				
Step 6	Ability to Pay & to Continue in Business	1	1	1	1
Step 7	Other Factors as Justice May Require	1	1	1	1
	Staff Costs*				
	Economic Benefit				
Step 8	Minimum Liability Amount	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
Step 9	Maximum Liability Amount	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000
	Minimum Liability Amount	\$ 986,000	\$ 986,000	\$ 986,000	\$ 986,000
Step 10	Final Liability Amount				
		\$ 16,800.00	\$ 16,800.00	\$ 16,800.00	\$ 16,800.00

Penalty Day Range Generator

Start Date of Violation=	7/2/10	Maximum Days Fined (Steps 2 & 3) =	308	Days
End Date of Violation=	5/5/11	Minimum Days Fined (Steps 2 & 3) =	16	Days

