

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

REVISED ACL COMPLAINT NO. R5-2005-0525

ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT  
IN THE MATTER OF

VIRGINIA L. DRAKE, TRUSTEE, DRAKE REVOCABLE TRUST,  
JAMES E. SIMMONS, DARWIN H. AND NINA R. SIMMONS, TRUSTEES,  
SIMMONS FAMILY TRUST, AND  
CITY OF CHICO

HUMBOLDT ROAD BURN DUMP AREA 8  
ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER 018-390-014  
BUTTE COUNTY

This Revised Administrative Civil Liability Complaint (hereafter Complaint) is issued to Virginia L. Drake, Trustee, Drake Revocable Trust, (hereafter "Drake"), James E. Simmons, Darwin H. and Nina R. Simmons, Trustees, Simmons Family Trust, (Darwin H. and Nina R. Simmons, Trustees, Simmons Family Trust are hereafter referred to as "Simmons"), and the City of Chico (hereafter "City") (hereafter jointly Discharger) based on findings of failure to comply with California Water Code (CWC) Section 13304 and Section 13267. This Complaint is issued pursuant to CWC Sections 13350 and 13268(a) and (b), which authorize the imposition of Administrative Civil Liability.

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

1. The Humboldt Road Burn Dump (HRBD) is a contiguous collection of 15 parcels containing, in whole or in part, waste from the disposal of municipal and/or commercial operations that contains waste as defined in California Water Code (CWC) section 13050 and hazardous materials as defined in Health and Safety Code section 25260(d). Studies of the HRBD conducted under contract to the City characterized the waste, delineated the extent, and confirmed the need for further remediation on several properties. Studies show that the HRBD had waste containing lead exceeding hazardous waste levels in some locations and significant other hazardous and non-hazardous waste constituents that pose a threat to human health and the environment, including waters of the state.
2. The Executive Officer issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 88-700 (hereafter "1988 CAO") and Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R5-2003-0707 (hereafter "2003 CAO") requiring cleanup of the HRBD. The 1988 CAO only addressed Area 8, whereas the 2003 CAO addresses all 15 HRBD parcels. Most of the parcels that make up the HRBD have been cleaned up in compliance with the 2003 CAO, with the exception of two parcels referred to as Area 7 and Area 8. This Complaint addresses Area 8.

**Assessors Parcel Number 018-390-014**

3. Currently, Assessors Parcel Number (APN) 018-390-014 is 10.18 acres of essentially unimproved land near the intersection of Stilson Canyon and Humboldt Road, in Chico, California. In the past, the property was part of a larger unimproved property; specifically, APN 018-390-014 was part of the Simmons Ranch, APN 011-050-128. APN 018-390-014 is also referred to as Area 8 of the HRBD.
4. APN 018-390-014 is currently owned by Virginia L. Drake, the Drake Revocable Trust, Darwin H. Simmons, Nina R. Simmons, James E. Simmons, and the Simmons Family Trust. It was formerly also owned by John D. Drake. On 21 February 2001, John D. Drake deeded his ½ interest in the land to himself and Virginia L. Drake as trustees of the Drake Revocable Trust created on 23 January 2001. John D. Drake died on 22 November 2001. Virginia L. Drake, through the Drake Revocable Trust established with her deceased husband, John D. Drake, owns an undivided ½ interest, Darwin H. Simmons and Nina R. Simmons, through the Simmons Family Trust, own an undivided ¼ interest, and James E. Simmons owns an undivided ¼ interest in APN 018-390-014.
5. On 3 March 2003, Drake filed civil action in Butte County Superior Court (Case #129127) against Simmons to partition APN 018-390-014 and other land Drake owns with the Simmons. Court action on the case is pending.

**Previous Enforcement**

Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 88-700

6. In 1982, the City decided to construct a two-lane extension from the intersection of Humboldt and Bruce Roads, northerly to State Highway 32 (the Bruce Road Extension Project). The City prepared an initial study, determined that the project would not have a significant environmental impact, and subsequently prepared a Negative Declaration. On 30 June 1982, the City approved the Negative Declaration and, on 13 April 1983, filed a Notice of Determination for the project.
7. On 20 July 1987, the City awarded the construction contract for the Bruce Road Extension Project to Baldwin Contracting Company, Inc. (hereafter "Baldwin"). The contract specifies that disposal of surplus construction material is the responsibility of the contractor. Baldwin excavated 31,700 cubic yards of material from the roadbed and, after obtaining permission from adjacent property owners, disposed of the surplus material on four HRBD properties (currently known as APN 018-390-014, 002-180-084, 002-180-086, and 011-030-136).
8. On 13 August 1987, James E. Simmons granted Baldwin permission to dispose of surplus material from the Bruce Road Extension Project on the Simmons Ranch described in Finding 3. A stock pond levee was constructed on the land. On 16 September 1987, in response to complaints from citizens, Water Board staff collected soil samples from the stock pond levee. Analyses of the samples showed the presence of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons at concentrations ranging from 2.3 µg/Kg to 84.9 µg/Kg, copper at concentrations ranging from 560 mg/Kg to 1,400 mg/Kg, total chromium at concentrations ranging from 75 mg/Kg to 110 mg/Kg, lead at concentrations ranging from 2,000 mg/Kg to 3,400 mg/Kg, and other metals.

These constituents constitute waste as defined in CWC section 13050. The volume of waste in the stock pond levee is approximately 7,500 cubic yards.

9. On 27 January 1988, the Executive Officer issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 88-700, pursuant to California Water Code section 13304, requiring the City, John D. Drake, and James E. Simmons remove the Area 8 waste. In an effort to identify all the HRBD waste material and evaluate the threats to human health and the environment, including water quality, Water Board staff deferred enforcement of the 1988 CAO until investigation of other HRBD properties could be completed.
10. Between 1989 and 1991, studies conducted under contract to John D. Drake further characterized the stock pond levee waste to support a Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) special waste application (variance) to dispose of the waste at the City's HRBD, APN 018-500-015. On 3 April 1992, DTSC staff granted approval to classify and manage the stock pond levee waste as a special waste, excluding approximately 300 cubic yards of waste that DTSC determined was hazardous. Although DTSC granted a variance for a majority of the stock pond levee waste, the waste was not removed.
11. Studies conducted under contract to the City further characterized the HRBD waste, delineated the extent, and confirmed the need for further remediation on several properties. Historic aerial photographs of the area were reviewed. Area 8 is visible in photographs taken in 1990.
12. On 2 June 1994, James E. Simmons agreed to reimburse John D. Drake for clean up or response costs associated with the stock pond levee waste. James E. Simmons reimbursed John D. Drake for \$89,946 in response costs and, on 1 August 1995, further agreed to reimburse John D. Drake ongoing response costs including remediation of the waste.
13. In October 1997, the City applied to the California Environmental Protection Agency Site Designation Committee, pursuant to HSC section 25260, et seq., requesting the Water Board be designated as Administering Agency for thirteen HRBD properties, including APN 018-500-014. An Administering Agency designated pursuant to HSC section 25260 et seq., is solely responsible, to the exclusion of other state and local agencies, to oversee site investigation and cleanup at a site and to ensure compliance with all applicable state and local laws. On 11 December 1997, the Site Designation Committee adopted Resolution No. 97-16 designating the Water Board as administering agency and City of Chico as the responsible party. Responsible party, as defined in HSC section 25260(h), means "any persons, except for an independent contractor, who agrees to carry out a site investigation and remedial action at a hazardous materials release site for one of the following reasons: (1) the person is liable under a state or local law, ordinance, or regulation for the site investigation or remedial action; or (2) the site investigation or remedial action is required by a state or local law, ordinance, or regulation because of a hazardous materials release."

Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R5-2003-0707

14. On 3 June 2003, the Executive Officer issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R5-2003-0707, pursuant to California Water Code section 13304, to the reasonably identifiable parties responsible for the waste at the HRBD. The Order defines HRBD by the following parcels and

their respective owners: APN 002-180-095 and 011-030-137 (City of Chico); APN 011-030-136, 011-030-138, 011-030-139 (Thomas and Mary Fogarty Revocable Trust); APN 011-030-015 (George Scott Revocable Trust); APN 011-030-016 (Edmond and Julie Johnson); APN 002-180-089 (Donald and Yvonne Mulkey Family Trust); APN 002-180-084 (Fred and Helen Bartig Family Trust et al.; APN 002-180-086 (Marilyn Adams Revocable Trust et al.); APN 018-390-014 (Simmons Family Trust)(Area 8); APN 018-390-018 (Drake Revocable Trust et al.)(Area 7); APN 002-180-087 and 002-180-088 (Chico Development Corporation); and APN 002-180-083 (Pleasant Valley Assembly of God). As described in Finding 9, James E. Simmons is named in the 1988 CAO, but in error, is not named in the 2003 CAO. Baldwin is also not named in the 1988 CAO or 2003 CAO.

15. The 2003 CAO requires the City, Thomas and Mary Fogarty Revocable Trust, George Scott Revocable Trust, Edmond and Julie Johnson, Donald and Yvonne Mulkey Family Trust, Fred and Helen Bartig Family Trust et al., Marilyn Adams Revocable Trust et al., Simmons Family Trust, Drake Revocable Trust et al., Chico Development Corporation, Pleasant Valley Assembly of God, County of Butte, and North Valley Disposal Service to investigate, clean up, and abate the effects of the waste resulting from activities at the HRBD beginning 1 June 2004. The 2003 CAO does not specify a single responsible party to cleanup the fifteen parcels, but requests each individual named in the CAO to submit written notification describing if they wish to maintain the City as lead responsible party and allow access to their respective properties for the purposes of investigation and cleanup or whether they intend to cleanup their own parcels. As described in Findings 2 through 15, the Discharger owns or caused waste to be deposited on the land and has knowledge of the waste discharge. Based on the available administrative record for this matter, the Executive Officer considers Virginia L. Drake, Trustee, Drake Revocable Trust, James E. Simmons, Darwin H. and Nina R. Simmons, Trustees, Simmons Family Trust, and the City of Chico to be responsible for Area 8 and not the other parties named in the 1988 or 2003 CAOs.
16. On 13 February 2004, Drake submitted to Water Board staff a notice of intent to submit a separate Remedial Action Plan to comply with the 2003 CAO without indication of outside assistance or participation. On 15 March 2004, Drake submitted a status report committing to cleanup the Area 8 waste. Subsequently, Drake notified Water Board and City staffs of the Drake's intent to remove the Area 8 waste by summer 2004, if possible.
17. On 8 July 2004, Drake and other private parties submitted a Final Remedial Action Plan (RAP) for Humboldt Road Private Properties Operational Unit, which includes Area 8 and seven other parcels. The approved remedial alternative for Area 8 is excavation and off-site disposal. The RAP proposes a time schedule to submit initial engineering design plans documents by 11 June 2004. On 13 July 2004, Water Board staff sent a letter to Drake, with copies to Simmons and the City, approved the RAP and requested Drake submit a Remedial Design and Implementation Plan (RDIP) on or before 13 August 2004. On 28 July 2004, the Drake notified Water Board staff that if Drake's discussions with the City were unsuccessful, Drake intended to immediately develop and submit an RDIP and initiate permitting to allow remediation work to begin in spring 2005.
18. On 1 September 2004, Baldwin notified the City they were will to pay \$75,000 toward removal of the Area 8 waste. On 10 September 2004, the City notified Baldwin and Drake that the City

would be willing to pay up to \$150,000 to cleanup the Area 8 waste and Drake notified the Simmons of her intent to manage and obtain all necessary permits to cleanup the Area 8 waste during summer 2005. Drake proposed to allocate cleanup costs based on the percentage of property ownership described in Finding 4 and committed to keep the total overall cleanup costs to a minimum. Subsequently, the Simmons indicated in writing they would pay Drake their fair share of the cleanup costs.

19. On 10 March 2005, Drake submitted an incomplete Remedial Design and Implementation Plan (RDIP) containing three cleanup alternatives for the Area 8 waste and Area 7 waste (for Area 7 waste, see revised ACLC No. R5-2005-0524). Drake selected Alternative 3 (truck the 8,000 cubic yards of waste to a Class 1 landfill approximately 300 miles from the site), which is the cleanup alternative with the highest estimated total cost, \$1,400,000. Both Alternative 1 and 2 consisted of disposal of the waste in disposal sites at the HRBD with an estimated cost of \$200,000.
20. On 11 April 2005, the Simmons parties notified Drake that they agreed with the plan to cleanup the waste at the lower estimated total cost, \$200,000 (either Alternative 1 or 2). Drake did not object to the Simmons cleaning up Area 8 waste at the Simmons' expense. The Discharger did not clean up Area 8 in Summer 2005 when the HRBD disposal sites (either Alternative 1 or 2) were available to accept the waste.
21. On 15 April 2005, the Assistant Executive Officer, pursuant to delegation from the Executive Officer, issued an Order pursuant to CWC section 13267 to the City, Drake, and Simmons, requiring by 20 April 2005, submittal of a technical report and time schedule describing each regulatory agency permit or authorization necessary for work to begin on Area 8, the date they intend to apply for each permit or authorization and the date they anticipated receiving the permit or authorization (15 April 2005 13267 Order). The City submitted a report denying responsibility for Area 8 waste and indicating they had no control or access to the property. Simmons responded that Drake was obtaining permits. Drake and the other parties failed to submit the technical report.
22. On 19 April 2005, the Assistant Executive Officer, pursuant to delegation from the Executive Officer, issued an Order pursuant to CWC section 13267 to the City, Drake, and Simmons requiring submittal of a technical report by 1 May 2005 to complete the RDIP (19 April 2005 13267 Order). The 13267 Order required the Discharger to submit a technical report describing the selected off-site disposal alternative and the revised transportation plan for the selected alternative. The City of Chico submitted a report denying responsibility for Area 8 waste and indicating they had no control or access to the property. Simmons responded they preferred waste disposal at the HRBD consolidation cells (either Alternative 1 or 2), however Simmons failed to submit a revised transportation plan. Drake, who preferred Alternative 3, conditionally approved Simmons's preferred disposal site. However, Drake failed to submit a complete technical report on the behalf of the Discharger. The technical report was not submitted.
23. The Chico Redevelopment Agency took responsibility for cleanup of six HRBD parcels. The Chico Redevelopment Agency's HRBD consolidation cell was not filled to design capacity with waste from the Agency's parcels. The consolidation cell had been designed with sufficient capacity for the Area 8 waste (the cell also had capacity for Area 7 waste also owned by Drake

and Simmons), which would implement Alternative 1 and the Chico Redevelopment Agency had offered Drake the opportunity to place the waste from Area 7 and 8 into the cell. Drake, however, had failed to secure regulatory permits and agreements necessary for cleanup of Area 7 and 8 and had indicated their intent not to select HRBD as a disposal site (i.e., Alternatives 1 or 2). Between 1 and 3 August 2005, approximately 14,000 cubic yards of clean fill was imported and placed in the Chico Redevelopment Agency consolidation cell to reach design grade.

24. In September 2005, the Executive Officer issued the original Complaint to Drake for failures to obtain regulatory permits necessary for cleanup of Area 8 waste in Summer 2005, remove waste from Area 8 in Summer 2005, submit monthly status reports, submit a regulatory permitting technical report, and submit an off-site disposal alternative/revised transportation plan technical report. The original Complaint proposed that Drake pay \$125,000 in administrative civil liability.
25. The original Complaint named Drake but not Simmons and the City because Drake had made clear to Water Board staff that Drake had assumed responsibility to cleanup the parcel, was authorized by the Simmons as part owners of the parcel, was in control of the cleanup activities as indicated by contact with permitting agencies, and had the financial ability, in part through an agreement with the Simmons and offers from the City and Baldwin, to cleanup the Area 8 waste.
26. At the 28 November 2005 public hearing, the Water Board considered a Draft Administrative Civil Liability Order for HRBD Area 8 and received testimony from staff, Drake, Simmons, the City, and other designated parties. The Water Board declined to adopt the Order as proposed continued the hearing to and for further consideration by the Executive Officer.
27. Although the City of Chico denies responsibility for Area 8 waste, Drake and Simmons have indicated to Water Board staff that they are cooperating to obtain necessary permits for cleanup of HRBD Area 8 in Summer 2006
28. Virginia L. Drake, the Drake Revocable Trust, Darwin H. Simmons, Nina R. Simmons, James E. Simmons, the Simmons Family Trust, and the City of Chico are jointly and severally responsible for cleanup of Area 8. To date, none of these parties have fully complied with the 1988 CAO, the 2003 CAO, or the 15 or 19 April 2005 13267 Orders.

### **Discharger Violations**

#### Failure to Obtain Regulatory Permits

29. The 2003 CAO includes Required Action 17, which requires the Discharger to obtain all local and state permits and access agreements to fulfill the requirements of the 2003 CAO prior to beginning work in Summer 2005. On 28 July 2004, the Drake notified Water Board staff of her intent to secure regulatory permits necessary to cleanup the Area 8 waste.
30. On 21 December 2004, the Drake submitted an incomplete application for Authority to Construct with Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD). Drake did not complete the application. Subsequently, the Drake notified BCAQMD staff to halt the project. Simmons and the City also failed to complete an application to the BCAQMD.

31. On 28 March 2005, Water Board staff sent a certified letter to Drake, Simmons, and the City providing comments on the proposed RDIP and providing a notice of intent to pursue enforcement actions. The letter set forth a list of five required regulatory permits, reminded the parties of the compliance date for cleanup to begin in accordance with Drake's construction schedule, and requested the Discharger submit copies of each complete permit application by 1 May 2005.
32. On 15 April 2005, the Water Board Assistant Executive Officer required the Discharger to submit pursuant to CWC section 13267 a technical report and time schedule, by 20 April 2005, describing each regulatory agency permit or authorization necessary for work to begin on Area 8, APN 018-390-014, the date they intend to apply for each permit or authorization, and the date they anticipated receiving the permit or authorization.
33. In response, the Drake indicated that consultants were obtained to initiate two regulatory permits; however, Drake subsequently notified the consultants to halt the project. Neither Drake nor Simmons, nor the City submitted the technical report and time schedule by 20 April 2005 (see Finding 28) and copies of each complete permit application by 1 May 2005.

Failure to Implement Cleanup

34. The 2003 CAO includes Required Action 7, which requires the Discharger to submit, by 1 April 2004, 100 percent design plans and specifications for implementation of the Remedial Action Plan (RAP). Following the Water Board Executive Officer's approval of the Discharger's RAP, on 13 July 2004, Water Board staff sent a letter addressed to Drake and copied to Simmons and the City requesting Drake submit design plans and specifications (RDIP) on or before 13 August 2004 for implementing the Area 8 cleanup.
35. On 28 March 2005, to complete the RDIP, Water Board staff sent a letter to Drake, Simmons, and the City requesting them to submit a revised Confirmation Sampling Plan and Transportation Plan. Drake submitted the revised Confirmation Sampling Plan but failed to submit the revised Transportation Plan by 1 May 2005. Simmons and the City also failed to submit the revised Transportation Plan. Therefore, the Discharger failed to complete the RDIP.
36. The 2003 CAO includes Required Action 3, which requires the Discharger to begin cleanup no later than 1 June 2004. The 28 March 2005 letter provided the Discharger final notice of Water Board staff's intent to recommend that the Water Board Executive Officer pursue additional enforcement action if final cleanup of Area 8 waste is not completed by 15 August 2005. The Discharger failed to cleanup the Area 7 waste as of the date of this Complaint.
37. On 19 April 2005, the Water Board Executive Officer required the Discharger to submit pursuant to CWC section 13267 a technical report, by 1 May 2005, describing the selected off-site disposal alternative for the Area 8 waste and the revised transportation plan developed pursuant to the selected alternative. The City of Chico submitted a report denying responsibility for Area 8 waste and indicating they had no control or access to the property. The Discharger failed to submit the technical report on the behalf of the Simmons's or the Discharger. The Discharger failed to submit the technical report.

Failure to Comply with other Required Actions

38. The 2003 CAO includes Required Action 9, which requires the Discharger to submit, on the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month, a status report to describe progress in complying with the 2003 CAO, explain any problems with compliance or delays in the schedule, and provide and plan for returning the cleanup to compliance with the 2003 CAO. The Discharger submitted a limited number of monthly status reports from 15 March 2004 through 15 March 2005. The Discharger has failed to submit monthly status reports since 15 April 2005.

**REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS**

39. The 2003 CAO states:  
*“If the Dischargers violate this Order, the dischargers may be liable civilly in a monetary amount provided by the California Water Code.”*
40. On 28 July 2004, in violation of the 2003 CAO, the Discharger failed to apply for the necessary permits to remove the Area 8 waste. Although the Discharger notified Water Board staff of its intent to secure regulatory permits necessary to cleanup the Area 8 waste, on APN 018-390-014 the Discharger failed to submit complete timely applications to appropriate regulatory agencies so cleanup work could begin in accordance with the time schedule described in the RDIP.
41. On 31 May 2005, in violation of the 1988 CAO and 2003 CAO, the Discharger failed to remove waste from Area 8, APN 018-390-014.
42. CWC Section 13304(a) states:  
*“Any person who has discharged or discharges waste into the waters of this state in violation of any waste discharge requirement or other order or prohibition issued by a regional board or the state board, or who has caused or permitted, causes or permits, or threatens to cause or permit any waste to be discharge where it is, or probably will be, discharged into the waters of the state and creates, or threatens to create, a condition of pollution or nuisance, shall upon order of the regional board, clean up such waste or abate the effects of the waste, or, in the case of threatened pollution or nuisance, take other necessary remedial action, including, but not limited to, overseeing cleanup and abatement efforts. A cleanup and abatement order issued by the state board or a regional board may require the provision of, or payment for, uninterrupted replacement water service, which may include wellhead treatment, to each affected public water supplier or private well owner. Upon failure of any person to comply with the cleanup or abatement order, the Attorney General, at the request of the board, shall petition the superior court for that county for the issuance of an injunction requiring the person to comply with the order. In the suit, the court shall have jurisdiction to grant a prohibitory or mandatory injunction, either preliminary or permanent, as the facts may warrant.”*

43. CWC Section 13304(c)(1) states:

*“If the waste is cleaned up or the effect of the waste are abated, or, in the case of threatened pollution or nuisance, other necessary remedial action is taken by any governmental agency, the person or persons who discharged the waste, discharges the waste, or threatened to cause or permit the discharge of the waste within the meaning of subdivision (a), are liable to that government agency to the extent of the reasonable costs actually incurred in cleaning up the waste, abating the effects of the waste, supervising cleanup or abatement activities, or taking other remedial actions. The amount of the costs is recoverable in a civil action by, and paid to, the governmental agency and the state board to the extent of the latter’s contribution to the cleanup costs from the State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account or other available funds.”*

44. CWC Section 13350 states, in part:

*“(a) Any person who (1) violates any ... cleanup and abatement order hereafter issued, reissued, or amended by a regional board ... shall be liable civilly, and remedies may be proposed, in accordance with subdivision (d) or (e).*

*(e) The state board or a regional board may impose civil liability administratively pursuant to Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 13323) of Chapter 5 either on a daily basis or on a per gallon basis, but not both.*

*(1) The civil liability on a daily basis may not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for each day the violation occurs.*

*(B) When there is no discharge, but an order issued by the regional board is violated, except as provided in subdivision (f), the civil liability shall not be less than one hundred dollars (\$100) for each day in which the discharge occurs.*

*(f) A regional board may not administratively impose civil liability in accordance with paragraph (1) of subdivision (e) in an amount less than the minimum amount specified, unless the regional board makes express findings setting forth the reasons for its action based upon the specific factors required to be considered pursuant to Section 13327.”*

46. Since 28 July 2004, the Discharger failed to obtain the regulatory permits necessary for cleanup of Area 8 waste from APN 018-390-014 to begin and; therefore, as of 10 February 2006, the Discharger has been in violation of the 2003 CAO for 562 days. Since 15 August 2005, the Discharger failed to remove waste from Area 8 and; therefore, as of 10 February 2006, the Discharger has been in violation of the 2003 CAO for 179 days. The maximum liability that can be imposed by the Regional Board under CWC Section 13350 is \$5,000 for each day and the minimum liability than can be imposed is \$100 for each day. Therefore, the maximum administrative civil liability is \$3,705,000 ((562 + 179) days times \$5,000 per day) and the minimum administrative civil liability is \$74,100 ((562 + 179) days times \$100 per day).

45. Since 15 April 2005, in violation of the 2003 CAO, the Discharger failed to submit status reports on the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month.

46. Since 20 April 2005, in violation of CWC section 13267 and the 2003 CAO, the Discharger has failed to submit a regulatory permitting technical report for the Area 8 waste.
47. Since 1 May 2005, in violation of CWC section 13267 and the 2003 CAO, the Discharger has failed to submit an off-site disposal alternative/revised transportation plan technical report for the Area 8 waste.
48. CWC Section 13268 states:

*“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).*

*(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 of a violation of subdivision (a) in an amount which shall not exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day in which the violation occurs.”*

49. Since 15 April 2005, the Discharger failed to submit monthly status reports and; therefore, as of 10 February 2006, the Discharger has been in violation of CWC Section 13267 for 301 days. Since 20 April 2005, the Discharger failed to submit a regulatory permitting technical report for the Area 8 waste and; therefore, as of 10 February 2006, the Discharger has been in violation of CWC Section 13267 for 296 days. Since 1 May 2005, the Discharger has failed to submit an off-site disposal alternative/revised transportation plan technical report for the Area 8 waste and; therefore, as of 10 February 2006, the Discharger has been in violation of CWC Section 13267 for 285 days. The maximum liability that can be imposed by the Regional Board under CWC Section 13268 is \$1,000 for each day. Therefore, the maximum administrative civil liability is \$882,000 ((301 + 296 + 285) days times \$1,000 per day).
50. The maximum administrative civil liability allowed pursuant to CWC Section 13350 and 13267 is \$4,587,000 (\$3,705,000 + \$882,000). The minimum administrative civil liability allowed pursuant to CWC Section 13350 is \$74,100. CWC Section 13267 does not provide for a minimum liability.
51. CWC Section 13327 states:
- “In determining the amount of civil liability, the regional board ... shall take into consideration the 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 violation, and other matters as justice may require.”*

52. Issuance of this Complaint is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et. seq.), in accordance with Section 15321 (a)(2), Title 14, of the California Code of Regulations.

**VIRGINIA L. DRAKE, TRUSTEE, DRAKE REVOCABLE TRUST, JAMES E. SIMMONS, DARWIN H. AND NINA R. SIMMONS, TRUSTEES, SIMMONS FAMILY TRUST, AND CITY OF CHICO ARE HEREBY GIVEN NOTICE THAT:**

1. The Executive Officer of the Water Board proposes that the Discharger be assessed Administrative Civil Liability in the amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000). The amount of the liability proposed is greater than the minimum allowed liability required under Section 13350 (e)(1)(B), and takes into account the factors set forth in CWC Section 13327 cited in Finding No. 51, and including consideration of the economic benefit or savings resulting from the violations.
2. A hearing shall be held on 16 and/or 17 March 2006 unless the Discharger agrees to waive the hearing and pay the proposed civil liability in full.
3. If a hearing is held, the Water Board will consider whether to affirm, reject or modify the proposed Administrative Civil Liability, or whether to refer the matter to the Attorney General for recovery of judicial civil liability.
4. In lieu of a hearing, the Discharger may waive the right to a hearing. If you wish to waive the right to a hearing, sign the enclosed waiver and return it with the full amount of civil liability (in a check made payable to the *State Water Resources Control Board Cleanup and Abatement Account*), to the Water Board's office at 415 Knollcrest Drive, Suite 100, Redding, CA 96002, **by 10 March 2006.**

---

KENNETH D. LANDAU, Acting Executive Officer

10 February 2006

---

(Date)

**WAIVER OF HEARING FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT**

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

1. I am duly authorized to represent Virginia L. Drake, Trustee, Drake Revocable Trust (hereinafter “Discharger”) in connection with Revised Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 (hereinafter the “Complaint”);
2. I am informed of the right provided by Water Code section 13323, subdivision (b), to a hearing within ninety (90) days of issuance of the Complaint;
3. I hereby waive the Discharger’s right to a hearing before the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, within ninety (90) days of the date of issuance of the Complaint; and
4. I agree to remit payment for the civil liability imposed in the amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000) by check, which contains a reference to “Revised ACL Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 ” and is made payable to the “*State Water Resources Control Board Cleanup and Abatement Account.*” I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties do not waive their right to a hearing and that the parties are jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000).
5. I understand the payment of the above amount constitutes a settlement of the Complaint that will not become final until after a public comment period.
6. I understand that payment of the above 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.
7. I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties named in this Complaint do not waive their right to a hearing and, in that event, a hearing before the Central Valley Water Board will be held within 90 days of the date of this revised Complaint.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

**WAIVER OF HEARING FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT**

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

1. I am duly authorized to represent James E. Simmons (hereinafter “Discharger”) in connection with Revised Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 (hereinafter the “Complaint”);
2. I am informed of the right provided by Water Code section 13323, subdivision (b), to a hearing within ninety (90) days of issuance of the Complaint;
3. I hereby waive the Discharger’s right to a hearing before the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, within ninety (90) days of the date of issuance of the Complaint; and
4. I agree to remit payment for the civil liability imposed in the amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000) by check, which contains a reference to “Revised ACL Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 ” and is made payable to the “*State Water Resources Control Board Cleanup and Abatement Account.*” I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties do not waive their right to a hearing and that the parties are jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000).
5. I understand the payment of the above amount constitutes a settlement of the Complaint that will not become final until after a public comment period.
6. I understand that payment of the above 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.
7. I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties named in this Complaint do not waive their right to a hearing and, in that event, a hearing before the Central Valley Water Board will be held within 90 days of the date of this revised Complaint.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

**WAIVER OF HEARING FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT**

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

1. I am duly authorized to represent Darwin H. and Nina R. Simmons, Trustees, Simmons Family Trust (hereinafter “Discharger”) in connection with Revised Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 (hereinafter the “Complaint”);
2. I am informed of the right provided by Water Code section 13323, subdivision (b), to a hearing within ninety (90) days of issuance of the Complaint;
3. I hereby waive the Discharger’s right to a hearing before the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, within ninety (90) days of the date of issuance of the Complaint; and
4. I agree to remit payment for the civil liability imposed in the amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000) by check, which contains a reference to “Revised ACL Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 ” and is made payable to the “*State Water Resources Control Board Cleanup and Abatement Account.*” I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties do not waive their right to a hearing and that the parties are jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000).
5. I understand the payment of the above amount constitutes a settlement of the Complaint that will not become final until after a public comment period.
6. I understand that payment of the above 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.
7. I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties named in this Complaint do not waive their right to a hearing and, in that event, a hearing before the Central Valley Water Board will be held within 90 days of the date of this revised Complaint.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

**WAIVER OF HEARING FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT**

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

1. I am duly authorized to represent the City of Chico (hereinafter “Discharger”) in connection with Revised Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 (hereinafter the “Complaint”);
2. I am informed of the right provided by Water Code section 13323, subdivision (b), to a hearing within ninety (90) days of issuance of the Complaint;
3. I hereby waive the Discharger’s right to a hearing before the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, within ninety (90) days of the date of issuance of the Complaint; and
4. I agree to remit payment for the civil liability imposed in the amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000) by check, which contains a reference to “Revised ACL Complaint No. R5-2005-0525 ” and is made payable to the “*State Water Resources Control Board Cleanup and Abatement Account.*” I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties do not waive their right to a hearing and that the parties are jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of one hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000).
5. I understand the payment of the above amount constitutes a settlement of the Complaint that will not become final until after a public comment period.
6. I understand that payment of the above 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.
7. I understand that this Waiver will not be effective if all parties named in this Complaint do not waive their right to a hearing and, in that event, a hearing before the Central Valley Water Board will be held within 90 days of the date of this revised Complaint.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)