## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - ENFORCEMENT MATTER

Page 1 of 3

DOCKET NO.: 2003-0413-MWD-E TCEQ ID NOS.: 11260-001 AND RN102080777 CASE NO.: 2625

RESPONDENT NAME: DERDEYN/FORD, INC.

ORDER TYPE:			
1660 AGREED ORDER	X_FINDINGS AGREED ORDER	_AMENDED ORDER	_IMMINENT AND SUBSTANTIAL
_SHUTDOWN ORDER	FINDINGS DEFAULT ORDER	_EMERGENCY ORDER	ENDANGERMENT ORDER
CASE TYPE:	·		
AGRICULTURE	AIR	INDUSTRIAL AND HAZARDOUS WASTE	MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE
OCCUPATIONAL CERTIFICATION	PETROLEUM STORAGE TANKS	PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY	RADIOACTIVE WASTE
MULTI-MEDIA (check all that apply)	SEWAGE SLUDGE	UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL	USED OIL
USED OIL FILTER	X_WATER QUALITY		
TYPE OF OPERATION: Waste wate SMALL BUSINESS: X Yes	No	is no record of additional pending enforcement :	actions regarding this facility location.
INTERESTED PARTIES: No one of	ner than the ED and the Respondent has exp	ressed an interest in this matter.	
COMMENTS RECEIVED: The Texa	s Register comment period expired on Septe	ember 11, 2006. No comments were received.	
TCEQ Enforcement Coordin TCEQ Regional Contact: Ma	nator: Ms. Elvia Maske, Enforcement Divis: : Robert Shirley, Tyler Regional Office, Mo eyn, President, Derdeyn/Ford, Inc., 509 Teja	CR-5, (903) 535-5168	ion, MC 175, (512) 239-1873

## RESPONDENT'S NAME: DERDEYN/FORD, INC. DOCKET NO.: 2003-0413-MWD-E

#### VIOLATION SUMMARY CHART:

VIOLATION INFORMATION	PENALTY CONSIDERATIONS	CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN/REQUIRED
Type of Investigation: ComplaintX Routine Enforcement Follow-upX Records Review	Total Assessed: \$41,933	Ordering Provision(s)
Type of Investigation: ComplaintX Routine		Ordering Provision(s)  The Respondent shall:  1) Immediately commence operating the Facility under the direct supervision of a properly certified operator.  2) Within 30 days:  a) Submit a written certification statement demonstrating compliance with Ordering Provision 2.a above.  b) Begin to properly operate and maintain the Facility and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control at all times. This shall include, but not be limited to, repairing or replacing the air diffuser system in the aeration chamber and the surface skimmer to operate properly.  c) Begin reporting in writing, effluent violations which deviated from the permitted effluent limitation by more than 40%, as required by TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Monitoring and Reporting Requirements No. 7.  3) Within 45 days, submit a written certification statement demonstrating compliance with Ordering Provision No. 2.b.ii and iii.
1) Failed to have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 milligram per liter (mg/l) at Outfall 001 for the month of April 2003, (the value recorded was 0.0 mg/l), has failed to comply with the permitted discharge limitations as shown in the Effluent Limit Violation Table attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (Attachment A), and has failed to properly operate and maintain the Facility and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times [30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305.125(5), Tex. Water Code § 26.121(a), and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Final Effluent Limitation and Monitoring Requirements Nos. 1 and 2, and Operational Requirements (1) and (4)].		4) Within 60 days, submit written certification of compliance with the effluent limits of TPDES Permit No. 11260-001.

# RESPONDENT'S NAME: DERDEYN/FORD, INC. DOCKET NO.: 2003-0413-MWD-E

#### VIOLATION SUMMARY CHART:

VIOLATION SUMMARI CHARI:		
VIOLATION INFORMATION	PENALTY CONSIDERATIONS	CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN/REQUIRED
2) Failed to report monthly effluent monitoring results, failed to submit Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) as required for the months of September, 2001 and March, 2003, and also failed to submit monthly DMRs by the 20th day of each month to the TCEQ for the months from July, 2001 to February, 2003 [30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE §§ 319.1 and 305.125(1), and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Monitoring and Reporting Requirements No. 1].		
3) Failed to report effluent violations which deviated from the permitted effluent limitation by more than 40% for the months of April, May, and October 2002, and February, March, April, and August 2003, to the TCEQ [30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE § 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Monitoring and Reporting Requirements No. 7].		
4) Failed to ensure that the Facility was operated by a licensed wastewater operator. Specifically, the operator's class "D" license expired in December, 2002 [30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE §§ 30.350(i), 30.331(b), and 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Other Requirements No. 1].		
5) Failed to comply with the permitted discharge limitations at Outfall 001 of flow in conduit or through treatment plant of 0.002 million gallons per day (MGD) for August, 2003 [TEX. WATER CODE § 26.121(a) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Final Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements No. 1.].		

10/17/06 H:\ENFORCE\AOloko\MWD\Derdeyn Ford dba Tejas Village\Litigation Agreed Order\2003-0413-mwd-e-qcprev4-Derdeyn.wb3 Page 1 of 12 Penalty Calculation Worksheet (PCW) DATES PCW 6-Mar-2006 Screening 28-Jan-2003 Priority Due 28-May-2003 EPA Due RESPONDENT INFORMATION Respondent Derdeyn/Ford, Inc. Respondent/Site ID No(s). TPDES Permit No. 11260-001; RN102080777 Facility/Site Region 5 - Tyler Major/Minor Source Minor CASE INFORMATION Enf./Case ID No(s). CCEDS Enf. ID No. 2625 Docket No. 2003-0413-MWD-E No. Violations 5 Case Priority 3 Order Type Findings Enf. Coordinator Elvia Maske EC's Team Enforcement Team 5 Media Program(s) Water Quality Admin. Penalty \$ Limit Minimum \$0 Maximum \$10,000 **Penalty Calculation Section** TOTAL BASE PENALTY (Sum of violation base penalties) Subtotal 1 \$37,000 ADJUSTMENTS (+/-) TO SUBTOTAL 1 Subtotals 2-7 are obtained by multiplying the Total Base Penalty (Subtotal 1) by the indicated percentage. Compliance History 80% Enhancement Subtotals 2, 3 & 7 \$29,600 An enhancement is recommended because there are 11 self-reported effluent violations and five NOVs for same or similar violations for this site within the Notes past five years. Culpability Subtotal 4 0% Enhancement < | Select Yes/No Respondent does not meet the culpability criteria. Notes Good Faith Effort to Comply 0% Reduction Subtotal 5 Before NOV NOV to EDPRP/Settlement Offer Extraordinary Ordinary (mark with small x) None of the above The Respondent is not yet in compliance. Notes **Economic Benefit** 0% Enhancement\* Subtotal 6 \$13,358 Total EB Amounts \*Capped at the Total EB \$ Amount \$33,000 Approx. Cost of Compliance SUM OF SUBTOTALS 1-7 Final Subtotal \$66,600 OTHER FACTORS AS JUSTICE MAY REQUIRE 37% Reduction Adjustment -\$24,667 (enter number only; e.g. -30 for -30%) Reduces or enhances the Final Subtotal by the indicated percentage Recommend reduction in penalty so that the reporting violations are Notes proportional to the effluent violation.

Deferral

STATUTORY LIMIT ADJUSTMENT

Reduces the Final Assessed Penalty by the indicated percentage

Notes

DEFERRAL

PAYABLE PENALTY

**Final Penalty Amount** 

**Final Assessed Penalty** 

Reduction

(enter number only; e.g. 20 for 20% reduction

No deferral is recommended because this is a Findings Order.

\$41,933

\$41,933

\$41,933

Total Adjustment Percentage (Subtotals 2, 3 & 7)

80%

Case ID No. CCEDS Ent. ID No. 2825  Respondent/Site ID No. TPDES Permit No. 11280-001; RN102080777  Medial Startute! West Cuality Ent. Coordinator Evida Meake Violation Number  Primary Rule Cite  Primary Rule Cite Secondary Cite(s)  Violation Description  Fallure to have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 recorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003.  Fallure to have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 recorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003.  Fallure to comply with permitted discharge limitations as referenced on attached table at Outfall 001, as documented during a record review conducted on May 13, 2004. Fallure to property operate and marinatin the facility, and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Spocifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation it was occumented that only and other and interest system was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating system was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control, and it is a strength of the additional and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating as a control of pollutarion of the clarifier was not operating as a control of pollutarion of the clarifier was not operating as a control of pollutarion of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health of the environment. The TSS and D		Screening Date			ci iyumber,	2003-0413-MWD-E	Policy Rev	PCW vision 2 (09/02)
Respondent/Site ID No. TPDES Permit No. 17290-001; RN102080777  Media (Startute) Water Quality Enf. Coordinator Evels Mastes  Violation Number  Primary Rule Cite  Primary Rule Cite  Secondary Cite(s)  Violation Description  Felium to have a chlorine residual of all beast 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 mecorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to have a chlorine residual of all beast 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 mecorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to comply with permitted during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to comply with permitted disching initiations as referenced on attached table at Outfall 001, as documented during a record review conducted on Nay 13, 2004. Failure to property operate and maintain the facility, and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation it was documented that only and fit has drifted system was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating agreement of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation it was documented that only and fit has drifting agreement of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation it was documented that only and fit has a fitting and system was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating agreement. Property and Human Health Matrix.  Release Major Moderate Minor Percent  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of blochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutari exceeded the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were							-	, .
Media [Statute] Water Quality Enf. Coordinator Fivia Maske Violation Number Primary Rule Cite Secondary Cite(s)  Forest Permit 11260-001, Final Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements (1) and Tex. Water Code § 26.121(a)  Forest Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305.125(a)  Violation Description  Follitre to have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 recorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to comply with permitted discharge imitations as referenced on attached table at Outfall 001, as documented discharge in a record review conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of restment, collection, disposa, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation in twas documented that only half of the air diffuser system was operating and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating proping and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating and the surface shirmer on the claimer was not operating and the surface shirmer on the claimer of	Respon				; RN10208077	7		
Primary Rule Cite  Primary Rule Cite  Primary Rule Cite  Secondary Cite(s)  TPDES Permit 11260-001, Final Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements (1) and (2), Operational Requirements (4) and Tox. Water Code § 26,121(a)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305,128(s)  Violation Description  Failure to have a chiorine residual of at least 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 recordod) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to comply with permitted discharge limitations as referenced on attached table at Outfall 001, as documented during an investigation are recording conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of 2004. Failure to properly operation and the systems of 2003. Failure to the systems of 2004. Failure to 200		Western Without the tell in the first of the						
Primary Rule Cite  Primary Rule Cite  Secondary Cite(s)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (4) and Tax. Watter Code § 25.121(a)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305.125(a)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305.125(a)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305.125(a)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305.125(a)  Failure to have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 necorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to comply with permitted dischange limitations as referenced on attached table at Outfall 001, as documented during a record review conducted on May 13, 2004. Failure to property operate and relational reference of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2004. Failure to property operate and mineral metals and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2004. Failure to property operate and mineral metals and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2004. Failure to property operate and mineral metals and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2004. Failure to property operate and mineral metals and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2004. Failure to property operate and metals and control and the aerators were not in operation, aeration was occurring in the aerators basin, the aerators were not in operation, aeration was occurring in the aerator basin, the aerators were not in operation.  **Percent**  **Release**  **Major**  **Release**  **Major**  **Major**  **A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of blochemical oxygen demand delay average to determine health of the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the lattice of the value of the value of the value of blochemical oxygen demand delay average to determine health of th		Markette and refer to a find the first of the first	·	_				•
Tribulary Kitle Cite  Secondary Cite(s)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 7 ex. Water Code § 26.121(a)  TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Operational Requirements (1) and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 305.122(5)  Violation Description  Failure to have a chlorine residual of at beast 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 recorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. In the control of the control	1	iolation Number	1					
Violation Description  Failure to have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 recorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003. Failure to comply with permitted discharge limitations as referenced on a retached table at 0 uffall 001, as documented during a record review conducted on May 13, 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation it was documented the facility, and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation, it was documented that on a property. On April 7, 2003, during an investigation, it was documented that on a aeration was occurring in the aeration basin, the aerators were not in operation.  ** Environmental, Property and Human Health Matrix  ** Flastification Major Moderate Minor  ** Percent 10%  ** Programmatic Matrix  ** Flastification Major Moderate Minor  ** Percent 10%  ** Programmatic Matrix  ** Flastification Major Moderate Minor  ** Percent 10%  ** Programmatic Matrix  ** Flastification Major Moderate Minor  ** Percent 10%  ** Programmatic Matrix  ** Flastification Major Moderate Minor  ** Percent 10%  ** Programmatic Matrix  ** Flastification Major Moderate Minor  ** Percent 10%  ** Programmatic Matrix  ** Flastification Major Moderate Minor  ** A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of blochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of politutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceeded hely level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  ** Adjustment 5-9,000  ** Violation Events	. P	rimary Rule Cite						· ·
Feliure to have a chicrine residual of at least 1.0 mg/l for April 2003 (value of 0.0 recorded) as documented during a moverage from conducted on April 7, 2003. Feliure to comply we permitted deliverage record conducted on April 7, 2003. Feliure to comply the property operate and maintain the facility, and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation it was documented that only half of the air diffuser system was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating properly. On April 7, 2003, during an investigation, it was documented that no half of the air diffuser system was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating properly. On April 7, 2003, during an investigation, it was documented that no aeration was occurring in the aeration basin, the aerators were not in operation.  Base Penalty  S10,000  Environmental, Property and Human Health Matrix  Harm  Release Major Moderate Minor  Actual  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand dialy average to determine whether the discharged armount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the level protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded elvels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment  Adjustment  S2,000  Wiolation Events  Number of Violation Events  Adjustment  S2,000  S3,000  March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commonaurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation  Statutory Limit Test	S	Secondary Cite(s)	TPDES Permit	No. 11260-001			0 Tex. Admin.	
recorded) as documented during an investigation conducted on April 7, 2003.  Failure to comply with permitted discharge limitations as referenced on attached table at Outfall 001, as documented during a record review conducted on May 13, 2004. Failure to properly operate and maintain the facility, and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, on April 23, 2002, during an investigation it was documented that only half of the air diffuser system was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating properly. On April 7, 2003, during an investigation, it was documented that no aeration was occurring in the seration basin, the serators were not in operation.  **Base Penalty**  **Potential**  **Percent**  **Percent**  **Actual**  **Percent**  **Actual**  **Percent**  **Noderate**  **Major**  **Moderate**  **Minor**  **Percent**  **A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSs and D. O. stutuse were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSs and D. O. stutuse were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSs and D. O. stutuse were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSs and D. O. stutuse were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSs and D. O. stutuse were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSs and D. O. stutuse were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human single evaluate and the protective of human	Viol	ation Description						
Release Major Moderate Minor  Release Major Moderate Minor  Actual Potential Property and Human Health Matrix  Release Major Moderate Minor  Percent 10%  Programmatic Matrix  Falsification Major Moderate Minor  Release Major Moderate Minor  Percent  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D. O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment \$\frac{\$\\$\\$}{\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	recorded) as of Failure to complete to complete at Outfall of 2004. Failu treatment, colled 2002, during a system was opproperly. On	documented dubly with permitto 001, as documente to properly cection, disposal investigation erating and the April 7, 2003, decided and the permit of the pe	uring an invest ed discharge ented during a operate and m , and control, it was docum surface skim during an invest	igation conducted on Apimitations as referenced record review conductions are retained in the facility, and sat all times. Specifically ented that only half of the rer on the clarifier was stigation, it was docume	oril 7, 2003. If on attached ed on May 13, systems of y, on April 23, he air diffuser not operating ented that no	
Release Major Moderate Minor  Release Major Moderate Minor  Actual Potential Property and Human Health Matrix  Release Major Moderate Minor  Percent 10%  Programmatic Matrix  Falsification Major Moderate Minor  Release Major Moderate Minor  Percent  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D. O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment \$\frac{\$\\$\\$}{\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$\\$	•					<u> </u>	D 10 1/	
Release Major Moderate Minor  Actual X Potential X Percent 10%  Programmatic Matrix Falsification Major Moderate Minor  Release Major Moderate Minor Percent 10%  Percent 10%  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the fevel protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the subject of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the subject of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the subject of human health or the environment.  Adjustment \$9,000  Violation Events  Number of Violation Events 3  Mark only one; use smell x daily monthly quarterly semiannual single event    Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation Statutory Limit Test	65 (8 2 A S	Environmontal	Decoded and	Llumon Lloo	Ith Motrix		Base Penalty	\$10,000
Release Actual Potential X Potential Potential X Percent 10%  Programmatic Matrix Falsification Major Moderate Minor  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The riss and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment		Environmental,	rroperty and	and the second s	iui iviauix			•
Programmatic Matrix Falsification Major Moderate Minor  Percent  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustments9,000  Adjustments9,000  Base Penalty Subtotal \$1,000  Violation Events		Release	Major		Minor			
Programmatic Matrix Falsification Major Moderate Minor  Percent  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the levels that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceed delevels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment \$9,000  Base Penalty Subtotal \$1,000  Violation Events  Number of Violation Events 3  mark only one; use small x daily monthly quarterly semiannual x monthly quarterly semiannual annual single event  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation Statutory Limit Test	OR	4	IVIAJO	Moderate				•
Programmatic Matrix Falsification Major Moderate Minor  Percent  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment Sase Penalty Subtotal  Violation Events  Number of Violation Events  Number of Violation Events  **Three semiannual and annual single event**  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation Statutory Limit Test						Percent	10%	
Falsification Major Moderate Minor  Percent  A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment				JI		· ·		•
A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment	<b>»</b>	Programmatic N	//atrix					•
A simplified model was utilized to evaluate the value of biochemical oxygen demand daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment  Separative Subtotal  **In,000**		Falsification	Major	Moderate	Minor			•
daily average to determine whether the discharged amount of pollutant exceeded the level protective of human health or the environment. The amount discharged at the time of the violations was insignificant and does not exceed the level that was protective of human health or the environment. The TSS and D.O. values were also evaluated and were determined not to have exceeded levels that were protective of human health or the environment.  Adjustment	OR					Percent		•
Adjustment	Matrix Notes	daily average to de level protective of time of the viol protective of huma	etermine whether human health or ations was insigr an health or the e re determined no	the discharged the environme ificant and doe nvironment. The to have excess	d amount of pent. The amous not exceed he TSS and Deded levels the	ollutant exceeded the int discharged at the the level that was .O. values were also		
Violation Events  Number of Violation Events  Number of Violation Events  May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Base Penalty Subtotal  \$1,000  Violation Events  Violation Base Penalty \$3,000  \$3,000  \$3,000  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation  Statutory Limit Test			human he	alth or the env	ironment.			:
Violation Events  Number of Violation Events  Number of Violation Events  May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Base Penalty Subtotal  \$1,000  Violation Events  Violation Base Penalty \$3,000  \$3,000  \$3,000  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation  Statutory Limit Test		•				Adjustment	-\$9,000	
Violation Events  Number of Violation Events  3								\$1,000
mark only one; use small x  daily monthly quarterly semiannual single event  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation  Statutory Limit Test		Violation Events	S. S				·	•
monthly quarterly semiannual x Violation Base Penalty \$3,000  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation Statutory Limit Test	•	Number of Vi	olation Events	3	]			
monthly quarterly semiannual x Violation Base Penalty \$3,000  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation Statutory Limit Test			Politika i i	·	<del>-</del>			•
quarterly semiannual X Violation Base Penalty \$3,000  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation Statutory Limit Test	mark	only one; use small x			_			•
semiannual x Violation Base Penalty \$3,000  annual single event  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation Statutory Limit Test					4			•
annual single event  Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation  Statutory Limit Test	•				4	Violetian Pa	so Ponelt	¢2 000
Three semiannual events are recommended based on the violation months of April, May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation  Statutory Limit Test		,		_ ^	-	งเบเลนบก ฮล	ise relially	<b>৯</b> ৯,000
May, July, August, September, October, and November 2002, and January, February, March, April, and August 2003, to make the penalty commensurate with the situation.  Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation  Statutory Limit Test			L. N. e. a.					
	Events Notes	May, July, August,	September, Octo	ber, and Nove	mber 2002, ar	nd January, February,		,
Estimated EB Amount (\$) \$3,904 Violation Final Penalty total \$3,400		Economic Bene	fit (EB) for this	violation		Statutory Limit Test		
· ·		di kangakina didun didun dianta kalin kepandunan berada kelipat didun di		kurist ist er et en syltre krijskisk. Dan i krijskisk fi				•
			EB Amount (\$)	\$3,90		Violation Final Po	,	\$3,400

Page 5 of 12	10/17	/06 H:\ENFORC	EVAOloko\MWD\D	erdeyn Ford db	a Tejas Village	e\Litigation Agreed C	Order\2003-0413	-mwd-e-qcprev4-[	Derdeyn.wb
		Screening Date		at the second se		03-0413-MWD-E		PCW	
		Respondent	Derdeyn/Ford, Inc	э.				evision 2 (09/02)	
		Case ID No.	CCEDS Enf. ID N	lo. 2625	* -		PCW Re	vision 6/12/2003	
	Respon	ndent/Site ID No.	TPDES Permit No	o. 11260-001; R	RN102080777				
		Media [Statute]							
		Enf. Coordinator	Elvia Maske					·	-
		iolation Number	2						
		rimary Rule Cite	TPDES Permit 1	1260-001, Mon Ad	nitoring and Re Imin. Code § 3	porting Requiremen 19.1	ts (1), 30 Tex.		
	S	Secondary Cite(s)		30 Tex. A	Admin. Code §	305.125(1)			•
en e	Viol	ation Description	submitted Discha months of Sep review on June 1 to the TCEQ. Sp	rge Monitoring F tember 2001 an 3, 2003. Failure pecifically, DMR:	Reports (DMRs nd March 2003, e to submit DM s were submitt	esults. The Respors) for this facility as a as documented during by the 20th day ed late from July 20	required for the ring a record of each month 01 to February		
			2003, as docu	mented during	a record reviev	v conducted on June	e 12, 2003.		
						An in rail - 3 in a foot a subsequent and consistent constant and in the constant of the const	Base Penalty	\$10,000	
	, ` <b>»</b>	Environmental,	Property and H	luman Health	n Matrix			•	
I.		1		Harm				•	
		Release	Major	Moderate	Minor			•	
16	OR:	Actual						•	
		Potential				Percent		•	
			<u> </u>			•		•	
	<b>»</b>	Programmatic M	// Matrix					•	
		Falsification	Major	Moderate	Minor				
	OR	1 alsincation	x x	MOGCIERC		Percent	· 10%		
							1070	•	
Anna de la companya d	Matrix Notes	Fa	nilure to comply wit	th 100% of the r	ule requireme	nt.		-	
						Adjustment	-\$9,000		
		•				-	alty Subtotal	\$1,000	
. ,		Violation Events				Dase I CII	any Subtotai	\$1,000	
P.2		Number of Vi	************	21			l	•	
	•	Number of vic	Diation Events						
			e dan en		1 .	•		•	
	nıark	only one; use small x	daily					•	
,			monthly					-	
			quarterly				<b>5</b> "[		
			semiannual			Violation B	ase Penalty	\$21,000	
			annual						
			single event	Х					
			<del></del>				1		
societos es	Events Notes	Twenty one single e	events are recomm record reviews co				r		
					<del></del>	. ,			
	7,075	Economic Bener	fit (EB) for this	violation	Sta	atutory Limit Tes	t		
		Estimated E	B Amount (\$)	\$2,333	. V	/iolation Final F	Penalty total	\$23,800	
			This Viol	ation Final A	Assessed F	enalty (adjuste	d for limits)	\$23,800	

ID Number(s) CCI	deyn/Ford, Inc. EDS Enf. ID No.	. 2625		t		Percent	Years of
Media [Statute] Wat						Interest	Depreciation (
Violation Number	2					5.0	15
ltem Description №	Item Cost commas or \$	Date Required	Final Date	Yrs	Interest Saved	Onetime Costs	EB Amount
Delayed Costs							
. Equipment				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Buildings				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (As needed)				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Engineering/construction				0.0	.\$0	\$0	\$0
Land				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Record Keeping System				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Training/Sampling				0.0	\$0	n/a	.\$0
Remediation/Disposal				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Permit Costs				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Other (As Needed) Notes for DELAYED costs				0.0	. \$0	n/a	\$0
						·	
Avoided Costs	A	NNUALIZE [1] av	oided costs befo	ore enterin	ng item (excep	t for one-time avo	oided costs)
Disposal				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel				0.0	. \$0	\$0	\$0
Inspection/Reporting/Sampling	\$900	1-Jul-2001	19-Dec-2003	2.5	\$111	\$2,222	\$2,333
Supplies/equip				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Financial Assurance [2]				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				0.0	.\$0	· \$0	\$0
ONE-TIME avoided costs [3]				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (as needed)		o obtain, certify a	nd submit monthly	DMRs with	h representative B DMR was sub	e sample measure mitted.	ments for the
Other (as needed) Notes for AVOIDED costs	Estimated cost t	facility. F	-mai date is date i	viaicii zooc		200 (1)	

n.

ge 7 of 12	10/17	7/06 H:\ENFORCE	E\AOloko\MWD	NDerdeyn Ford dba	Tejas Village\	Litigation Agreed Ord	ler\2003-0413-mw	
Approximation of the control of the		Screening Date	28-Jan-03	Docket N	Number 2003	3-0413-MWD-E		PCW
i est transport		Respondent	Derdeyn/Ford, I	Inc.	•	•	Policy Revis	1
ŀ		Case ID No.	CCEDS Enf. ID	No. 2625			PCW Revisi	on 6/12/2003
***	Respo	ndent/Site ID No.	TPDES Permit	No. 11260-001; RN	1102080777			4
2		Media [Statute]	Water Quality					
1		Enf. Coordinator	Elvia Maske					
-	1	violation Number	3					
	P	rimary Rule Cite	TPDES Per	mit No. 11260-001,	Monitoring an	d Reporting Require	ments (7)	
		Secondary Cite(s) ation Description		30 Tex. Ad	min. Code § 3	05.125(1)		,
****	<i>y</i> 101	ation Description	Failure to rep		ns which devia n by more than	ted from the permitten 40%.	ed effluent	
		·				В	ase Penalty	\$10,000
	<b>»</b>	Environmental, F	roperty and	Human Health I	Matrix		- Volumental Autom	
		A STATE OF THE STA	and the second of a contract of the second o	Harm	MACABE METRODO POR PARA METAMENTO COLOR AND AND AND COLOR AND	anteres a sella finanzia i i della distributazioni di di a anno trassi e il i il di di distributa di distributa I		
		Release	Major	Moderate	Minor			
	OR.	Actual				•		. •
		Potential	5			Percent		
ľ		G (E				-	-	
1	)  }}	Programmatic M	atrix					
Ė		Falsification	Major	Moderate ·	Minor			
	''OR		x			Percent	10%	
f		<u> </u>			·			
	Matrix Notes	Fai	lure to comply	with 100% of the rul	e requirement			
	140,03							
				e		Adjustment	-\$9,000	
						Base Penal	ty Subtotal	\$1,000
		Violation Events					incomments.	
<u> </u>		Number of Vio	lation Events	7				
-		Transport of Tra	1111011 13 ( 01110	<u> </u>				
	mark	only one; use small x	daily	, T. A				
	man	orny dire, ade arrair x	monthly					
		ľ	quarterly					
***			semiannual			Violation Bas	e Penalty	\$7,000
			annual			violation bac	ic renarry	Ψ1,000
			single event					
		<b>J</b> ::	anigle eveni			•		
		Seven single ex	vente are recon	nmended based on	the failure to e	uhmit savan		
1	Events			e months of April, N			•	
	Notes			ust 2003, as docume				
		conducted on April	3, 2003 and red	cord reviews conduct 13, 2004.	cted on June 1	2, 2003 and May		
.				10, 200T.				- Percentage of the Control of the C
ļ.,								
		Economic Benefi	t (EB) for thi	s violation	Stat	utory Limit Test		
				-			***************************************	
***************************************		Estimated El	B Amount (\$)	\$1,996	Vie	olation Final Pe	nalty total	\$7,933
-								
1		· ·	This Vi	olation Final As	ssessed Pe	nalty (adjusted	for limits)	\$7,933

ID North Arthur Control	leyn/Ford, Inc.				Г		
A 모양하다는 이번 시간을 경기하면 불다는 이번 보다면 함께 그 모든 A TEST 등	DS Enf. ID No	. 2625				Percent	Years of
Media [Statute] Wate	er Quality					Interest	Depreciation
Violation Number	3 	an tu na serim un me <sup>‡</sup> um me et an etan	e, europresentañes per esperen ken	erina and einderena	era rakanja ta da da partu kungk	5.0	15
ltem Description №	Item Cost commas or \$	Date Required	Final Date	Yrs	Interest Saved	Onetime Costs	EB Amount
Delayed Costs							
Equipment				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$(
Buildings				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$(
Other (As needed)				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$(
Engineering/construction				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$(
Land				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$(
Record Keeping System				0.0	<b>\$0</b>	n/a	\$(
Training/Sampling				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$1
Remediation/Disposal				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$(
Permit Costs				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$
Other (As Needed)				0.0	\$o	n/a	\$0
		NNUALIZE [1] avo	oided costs befo	ore enteri	ng item (excep	for one-time avo	ided costs)
Avoided Costs	<u>ne di Dira, Barrati, Poff</u>					\$0	
Avoided Costs Disposal	<u>ne diineBaate 🗲</u>			0.0	\$0	- ΦU	\$0
dimensionalitation in the continue decay in the second contract of the contrac				0.0	\$0 \$0	. \$0	\$0 \$0
Disposal Personnel	\$400	31-Aug-2001	1-Jun-2006				\$(
Disposal Personnel		31-Aug-2001	1-Jun-2006	0.0	\$0	. \$0	
Disposal Personnel Personnel spection/Reporting/Sampling		31-Aug-2001	1-Jun-2006	0.0 4.8	\$0 \$95	. \$0 \$1,901	\$0 \$1,996
Disposal Personnel nspection/Reporting/Sampling Supplies/equip		31-Aug-2001	1-Jun-2006	0.0 4.8 0.0	\$0 \$95 . \$0	\$0 \$1,901 \$0	\$0 \$1,996 \$0
Disposal Personnel spection/Reporting/Sampling Supplies/equip Financial Assurance [2] ONE-TIME avoided costs [3] Other (as needed)		31-Aug-2001	1-Jun-2006	0.0 4.8 0.0 0.0	\$0 \$95 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$1,901 \$0 \$0	\$1,99 \$1,99 \$
Disposal Personnel nspection/Reporting/Sampling Supplies/equip Financial Assurance [2] ONE-TIME avoided costs [3]			1-Jun-2006 to submit DMR e	0.0 4.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	\$0 \$95 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$1,901 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	\$ \$1,99 \$ \$ \$

t ,

•

	Carconing Date				e\Litigation Agreed Or 003-0413-MWD-E	The second secon	PCW
48.00	Screening Date			t Mulliber 20	JU3-U4 13-WW D-E	Policy Rev	rision 2 (09/02)
	그리 지나가는 경험 때 중요요요요요 시간이다.	Derdeyn/Ford, Ir					sion 6/12/2003
	<ul> <li>A. Saleh E. Calle J. M. G. Wang, Phys. Lett. B</li> </ul>	CCEDS Enf. ID		DN400000777			
cespoi	ndent/Site ID No.		10. 11260-001; 1	RN102080777			
	Media [Statute]	•					To a control of the c
	Enf. Coordinator	Elvia Maske	1			•	
,	iolation Number	20 Toy Adr	nin Codo SS 30	250(i) and 20	221/b) and TDDES Da	rmit No	
	rimary Rule Cite	30 rex. Adr	11260-00	01, Other Requ		mit No.	4
	Secondary Cite(s)		30 Tex.	Admin. Code	§ 305.125(1)		-
Viol	ation Description				a licensed wastewate se expired in Decembe		indermonent desirelesses
er er er er er er er					В	ase Penalty	\$10,000
<b>&gt;</b> : :	Environmental,	Property and I	-luman Healt	h Matrix			· ·
549	on investigated		Harm				•
	Release	Major	Moderate	Minor			
OR :	Actual		<u> </u>		£	are constitution and a section of a	
	Potential				Percent		•
							•
<b>»</b>	Programmatic N	latrix			•		
	Falsification	Major	Moderate	Minor	,	- <del></del>	
⊃R ;		X			Percent	10%	•
otes	ngman road to	Solidarilo Willori	health.		otective of human	a market a collection and a street deal accomplished and a state of the street of the	
					Adjustment	-\$9,000 · ·	
						!	
	Violation Events	Second Company of Second Secon			Base Penal	ty Subtotal	\$1,000
	A SALAM TO ACCUMULATE ACCUMULATION OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	olation Events	1	]	Base Penal	ty Subtotal	\$1,000
	A SALAM TO ACCUMULATE ACCUMULATION OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	Second Company of Second Secon	1	]	Base Penal	ty Subtotal	\$1,000
mark	A SALAM TO ACCUMULATE ACCUMULATION OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	olation Events daily	1	]	Base Penal	ty Subtotal	\$1,000
mark	Number of Vi	olation Events daily monthly	1	]	Base Penal	ty Subtotal	\$1,000
mark	Number of Vi	daily monthly quarterly		]			
mark	Number of Vi	daily daily monthly quarterly semiannual	1 x	]	Base Penal		\$1,000
mark	Number of Vi	daily daily monthly quarterly semiannual annual		]			
mark	Number of Vi	daily daily monthly quarterly semiannual		]			
mark	Number of Vi	daily daily monthly quarterly semiannual annual					
<i>mark</i> ents	Number of Vic	daily monthly quarterly semiannual annual single event	x ended based or on April 9, 2003	3 until the settle			
ents	Number of Vic	daily monthly quarterly semiannual annual single event event is recomm pation conducted ber 15, 2003 to n	ended based or on April 9, 2003 nake the penalty	3 until the settle commensural	Violation Basen of the violation ement termination		
ents	Number of Vic	daily monthly quarterly semiannual annual single event event is recomm pation conducted ber 15, 2003 to n	ended based or on April 9, 2003 nake the penalty	3 until the settle commensural	violation Bases	se Penalty	
ıts	Number of Vic	daily monthly quarterly semiannual single event event is recomm gation conducted ber 15, 2003 to multi (EB) for this	ended based or on April 9, 2003 nake the penalty violation	3 until the settle commensural	violation Bases on of the violation ement termination e with the situation.	nalty total	\$1,000

Page 9

		Economic	Benefit Wor	kshee	tolk, biolik		
	Derdeyn/Ford, Inc.	•			· .		
en variate. Primer kan men men bilang dia	CCEDS Enf. ID No	. 2625	•			Percent Interest	Years of Depreciation
Media [Statute]	1					ta signaatiyaniyaat <sub>i</sub>	MILITER OF THE STATE OF THE
Violation Number	America programma especial personal con	1. 500() 2-40()() \$46()()	100 A 10			5.0	1:
Item Description	Item Cost No commas or \$	Date Required	Final Date	Yrs	Interest Saved	Onetime Costs	EB Amount
Delayed Costs							
Equipment				0.0	\$0 <sub>'</sub>	\$0	.\$
Buildings	·			0.0	\$0	\$0	. \$
Other (As needed)				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$
Engineering/construction	,			0.0	\$0	\$0	\$
Land				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$
Record Keeping System			·	0.0	\$0	n/a	. \$
Training/Sampling				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$
Remediation/Disposal		-		0.0	\$0	n/a	\$
Permit Costs				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$
Other (As Needed)	\$30,000	1-Jan-2003	1-Jun-2006	3.4	\$5,125	n/a	\$5,12
	**************************************	inv	censed wastewater estigation to the es	timated o	late of compliance		nammensense (v. 1. en e.
Avoided Costs Disposal		ANNUALIZE [1] a	voided costs bef	ore enter 0.0	ring item (except	for one-time avo	sided costs)
Personnel				0.0	. \$0	\$0	<u>Ψ</u>
Inspection/Reporting/Sampling				0.0	\$0 \$0	\$0	<u>\$</u>
Supplies/equip	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7			0.0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$
Financial Assurance [2]				0.0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$
ONE-TIME avoided costs [3]				0.0	\$0	. \$0	<u> </u>
Other (as needed)				0.0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$
Notes for AVOIDED costs				0.01	φ <b>0</b> [	- φυ[	Ψ
			<u> </u>				

vb3

	Screening Date Respondent	Derdeyn/Ford, In		one on or anno Waller	2003-0413-MW[		Policy Re	vision 2 (09/02)			
	经付款 医海绵切除 医乳体毒物病	CCEDS Enf. ID I	•				PCW Rev	ision 6/12/2003			
Respoi	ndent/Site ID No.			RN10208077	7						
	Media [Statute]				•						
	Enf. Coordinator						i				
	iolation Number	5				•					
	rimary Rule Cite	TPDES Permit 1	PDES Permit 11260-001, Final Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements (1) and Tex. Water Code § 26.121(a)								
S	Secondary Cite(s)										
	ation Description										
			treatment plant of 0.0098 (390	of 0.002 mil % exceeden	ge limitations at ( lion gallons per ( ce)) as documer May 13, 2004.	lay (MGD	) for 8/03				
	u					Ba	se Penalty	\$10,000			
<b>»</b>	Environmental, I	Property and F	luman Healt	n Matrix				•			
	**************************************	and the control of th	Harm	hindre Verlanis sientral das Novae-18 and Schales	n yan sagan kan yang Samahan Marahan Marahan Marahan Kanan Kanan Kanan Kanan Kanan Marahan Marahan Marahan Mar I						
	Release	Major	Moderate	Minor							
OR	Actual	x									
	Potential				Per	rcent	50%	. •			
<b>»</b>	Programmatic M	latriy .									
	Falsification	Major	Moderate	Minor							
OR	- Laisincation	iviajoi	Woderate	I I	Per	rcent		• .			
Matrix Notes	A simplified mo treatment plant den pollutant exceede amount discharge	ed the level prote	e to determine of the contraction of the contractio	whether the nealth or the	discharged amou environment. T	int of he		• •			
	level th	at was protective	of human healt	n or the envi	ronment.			•			
					Adjust	ment	-\$5,000 -				
TO LOUIS SOUTHWARE TO STREET FOR			meneral en moscome, amenerante e commençare en espera en espera.	masakata erapitatakanina	Bas	e Penalty	y Subtotal	\$5,000			
	Violation Events	The state of the s		ī				•			
	Number of Vio	olation Events	. 1								
	1	aria i . waa n T	<del></del>	1			•	•			
mark	only one; use small x	daily						•			
	,	monthly	X	,				. •			
		quarterly			Violati	on Pace	e Penalty	\$5,000			
		semiannual			violati	บม ๒๙๖६	- renaity	φο,υυυ			
		annual	-								
		single event									
Events Notes	One monthly event	is recommended ake the penalty c				3 to		•			
TO STATE	Economic Benef	it (EB) for this	violation		Statutory Limi	t Test					
Company of the second			and a survey of many in 1974, at her of the history of	وكمناه أدارك أراكاه أفائلك والمستدومة	and the state of t			أدرية أشرته الكائره للاشتهاد فالمسمع			

This Violation Final Assessed Penalty (adjusted for limits)

Respondent	Derdeyn/Ford, Inc.				\ \		
	CCEDS Enf. ID No	. 2625				Percent	Years of
Media [Statute]						Interest	Depreciation
Violation Number	5					5.0	15
Item Description	Item Cost No commas or \$	Date Required	Final Date	Yrs	Interest Saved	Onetime Costs	EB Amount
Delayed Costs							
Equipment		•		0.0	\$0	· \$0	\$0
Buildings				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (As needed)				0.0	\$0	\$0	
Engineering/construction				0.0	\$0	. \$0	\$0
Land				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Record Keeping System				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Training/Sampling	·		`	0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Remediation/Disposal				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Permit Costs				0.0	\$0	n/a	\$0
Other (As Needed)			-	0.0	\$0	n/a	\$C
		manus promoner and adaptive to the National	ic benefit has be	. ja - 2 - 61-9655			
Avoided Costs Disposal		ANNUALIZE [1] av	oided costs befo	0.0	ing item (excep \$0	t for one-time avo	oided costs) \$0
Personnel				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
spection/Reporting/Sampling				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies/equip				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Financial Assurance [2]				0.0	\$0	\$0	· \$0
ONE-TIME avoided costs [3]				0.0	\$0	. \$0	\$C
Other (as needed)				0.0	\$0	\$0	\$C
Notes for AVOIDED costs			•		T - 1		

## **COMPLIANCE HISTORY**

Customer/Respondent/Owner-Operator:	Derdeyn/Ford, Inc.	Classification: Average
Regulated Entity/ID Nos.:	RN102684339; CN601362742; TPDES Permit No. 11260-001; EPA ID No. TX0066338; PWS Facility ID No. 1580002	Site Rating: 0.7273
Location [physical address or description of location (street, highway, FM, etc.) including city or nearest city, and county]:	Tejas Village 509 Tejas Road Marion County	Repeat Violator: (y/n) n
TCEQ Region No.	5	
Date Compliance History Prepared:	June 13, 2003	
Agency Decision Requiring Compliance H	story (mark one):	
the issuance, renewal, amendme	nt, modification, denial, suspension, or revocation	ı of a permit
X enforcement		
the use of announced investigati	ons (Field Ops)	
participation in innovative prog	rams .	
Compliance Period: 6/13/98–6/13/03	•	
•	information regarding this compliance history:	
Name: Elvia Maske	Phone: 512/239-0789	
	Site Compliance History Components	
1. Has the site been in existence and/or open	ation for the full five year compliance period?	X Yes No Unk
2. Has there been a (known) change in own	ership of the site during the compliance period?	X Yes No Unk
3. If Yes, who is the current owner?	Derdeyn/Ford, Inc.	
4. If Yes, who was/were the prior owner(s)	Roy Curlee	
5. When did the change(s) in ownership occ	eur? Permit transferred July 19, 200	1.
Components (multimedia) for the Site:		
A. Final enforcement orders, court jud	gments, and consent decrees of the state of Texas	and the federal government
1. Effective Date: NA	Type of Action:	
Violation Citation 1: NA	Classification:	
Violation Description: NA		
B. Any criminal convictions of the state	e of Texas and the federal government.	
Conviction Date: NA		
Count 1: NA		·
C. Chronic excessive emissions events	: None	

_	emi i a	•	*			
D.	The dates of investigation	ons.			•	٠
	1. 6/11/01 2. 4/23/02					
	3. 1/3/03					
	4. 9/22/99		·			
	5. 6/2/03		·	•		
	6. 60 months of DMRs				•	
E.	Written notices of viola	tion (NOV)				
1.	Date:	December 17, 1999	Self-reported?	Yes	X No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 319.1-11	Classification:			MOD
	Violation Description:	failure to submit MER for 8/99				
2.	Date:	October 29, 1999	Self-reported?	Yes	X No	
	Violation Citation 1:	Permit Prov	Classification:	,		MOD
	Violation Description:	failure to have licensed wastew	ater operator			
3.	Date:	December 28, 1999	Self-reported?	Yes	X No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 319.1-11	Classification:		<u> </u>	MOD
	Violation Description:	failure to submit MER for 8/98				
1.	Date:	December 14, 1999	Self-reported?	Yes	X No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 319.1-11	Classification:	11	` <b>L</b> I	MOD
	Violation Description:	failure to submit MER for 7/98				
5.	Date:	February 2000	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1)	Classification:	71 100	1110	MOD
	Violation Description:	effluent violation	Classification.			иор
б.	Date:	March 2000	Calf romantad?	X Yes	No	``
).			Self-reported?	I I es		MOD
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1)	Classification:			MOD
,	Violation Description:	effluent violation	C 10 , 10	77 77	□ NT.	
7.	Date:	October 2000	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	MOD
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1)	Classification:			MOD
	Violation Description:	effluent violation				
3.	Date:	September 22, 2000	Self-reported?	Yes	X. No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 319.1-11	Classification:			MOD
	Violation Description:	failure to submit MER for 11/9				
).	Date:	November 2001	Self-reported?	X Yes	" No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001	Classification:		6	MOD
	Violation Description:	Effluent Violations				
0.	Date:	December 2001	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001	Classification:			MOD
	Violation Description:	Effluent Violations				•
1.	Date:	January 2002	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001	Classification:	22 100	L110	MOD
	Violation Description:	Effluent Violations				
2.	Date:	February 2002	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	· ·	1001um y 2002	John roportou:	[ZZ] 1 C3	L_1***	

	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and	Classification:	•	•	MOD
		TPDES Permit No. 11260-001		•		
	Violation Description:	Effluent Violations	a 10			
13.	Date:	April 2002	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001	Classification:			MOD
	Violation Description:	Effluent Violations				•
14.	Date:	May 2002	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001	Classification:			MOD
	Violation Description:	Effluent Violations		•	•	
15.	Date:	July 2002	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001	Classification:		<del>,</del>	MOD
	Violation Description:	Effluent Violations				
16.	Date:	August 2002	Self-reported?	X Yes	No	
	Violation Citation 1:	30 TAC 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001	Classification:	, <u> </u>		MOD
	Violation Description:	`Effluent Violations	-			
	-		•			
F.	Environmental audits.					
1.	Notice of Intent Date:	NA				
	Disclosure Date:	NA			,	
	Violation Citation 1:	NA	Classification:			•
•	Violation Description:					
	, iolation Description.					
G.	Type of environmental:	management systems (EMSs).				
o.	NA NA	managomoni oyutomb (214155).		,		
	112 1					
Η.	Voluntary on-site comp	liance assessment dates.				
11.	NA .	nunce assessment dates.			•	
	, ,					•
т	Dauticipatión in a volum	town no llastion no darotion are organ				
I.		tary pollution reduction program.				
	NA				:	
						•
J.	Early compliance.			•	•	
	NA	·	•			
	,					
Sites	Outside of Texas					•
	State: NA	4				
	Site Name: NA	A				
	Location: NA					
	Type of Action: NA			•		•
						÷
	Effective Date: NA	<b>.</b>		•		
		•				
		,				
		,			•	
						•

## TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



IN THE MATTER OF AN	§	BEFORE THE
ENFORCEMENT ACTION	§	
CONCERNING	§	
DERDEYN/FORD, INC.,	§	
TEXAS POLLUTANT	§	TEXAS COMMISSION ON
DISCHARGE ELIMINATION	§	
SYSTEM (TPDES) PERMIT NO.	§	
11260-001;	§	
RN102080777	§	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

### AGREED ORDER DOCKET NO. 2003-0413-MWD-E

At its \_\_\_\_\_\_ agenda, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality ("Commission" or "TCEQ") considered this agreement of the parties, resolving an enforcement action regarding Derdeyn/Ford, Inc. (Derdeyn/Ford) under the authority of TEX. WATER CODE chs. 7 and 26. The Executive Director of the TCEQ, represented by the Litigation Division, and Derdeyn/Ford presented this agreement to the Commission.

Derdeyn/Ford understands that it has certain procedural rights at certain points in the enforcement process, including, but not limited to, the right to formal notice of violations, notice of an evidentiary hearing, the right to an evidentiary hearing, and a right to appeal. By entering into this Agreed Order, Derdeyn/Ford agrees to waive all notice and procedural rights.

It is further understood and agreed that this Agreed Order represents the complete and fully-integrated agreement of the parties. The provisions of this Agreed Order are deemed severable and, if a court of competent jurisdiction or other appropriate authority deems any provision of this Agreed Order unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall be valid and enforceable. The duties and responsibilities imposed by this Agreed Order are binding upon Derdeyn/Ford.

The Commission makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Derdeyn/Ford owns and operates a 0.002 million gallon per day (MGD) waste water treatment plant located at 509 Tejas Road, Jefferson, Marion County, Texas (the Facility).

- 2. The Facility has discharged waste into or adjacent to any water in the state or has committed another act that has caused or will cause pollution of any water in the state under the Texas Water Code.
- 3. During investigations conducted on April 23, 2002, and April 7, 2003, and a record review conducted on May 13, 2004, a TCEQ Tyler Regional Office investigator and a TCEQ enforcement coordinator documented that Derdeyn/Ford failed:
  - a. To have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 milligram per liter (mg/l) at Outfall 001 for the month of April 2003, (the value recorded was 0.0 mg/l);
  - b. To Comply with the permitted discharge limitations as shown in the Effluent Limit Violation Table attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (Attachment A); and
  - c. To properly operate and maintain the Facility and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times. Specifically, only half of the air diffuser system in the aeration chamber was operating and the surface skimmer on the clarifier was not operating properly and no aeration was occurring in the aeration basin as the aerators were not in operation.
- 4. During record reviews conducted on June 12 and 13, 2003, a TCEQ enforcement coordinator documented that Derdeyn/Ford failed to report monthly effluent monitoring results. Derdeyn/Ford failed to submit Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) as required for the months of September, 2001 and March, 2003. Derdeyn/Ford also failed to submit monthly DMRs by the 20th day of each month to the TCEQ for the months from July, 2001 to February, 2003.
- 5. During an investigation conducted on April 9, 2003, and record reviews conducted on June 12, 2003, and May 13, 2004, a TCEQ Tyler Regional Office investigator and a TCEQ enforcement coordinator documented that Derdeyn/Ford failed to report effluent violations which deviated from the permitted effluent limitation by more than 40% for the months of April, May, and October 2002, and February, March, April, and August, 2003, to the TCEQ.
- 6. During an investigation conducted on April 9, 2003, a TCEQ Tyler Regional Office investigator documented that Derdeyn/Ford failed to ensure that the Facility was operated by a licensed wastewater operator. Specifically, the operator's class "D" license expired in December, 2002.

- 7. During a record review conducted on May 13, 2004, a TCEQ enforcement coordinator documented that Derdeyn/Ford failed to comply with the permitted discharge limitations at Outfall 001 of flow in conduit or through treatment plant of 0.002 million gallons per day (MGD) for August, 2003. The reported value was 0.0098, a 390% exceedance
- 8. Derdeyn/Ford received notice of the violations on or about June 18, 2002, and January 3, 2005.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. As evidenced by Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2, Derdeyn/Ford is subject to the jurisdiction of the TCEQ pursuant to Tex. WATER CODE § 7.002 and ch. 26 and the rules of the Commission.
- 2. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 3, Derdeyn/Ford has failed to have a chlorine residual of at least 1.0 milligram per liter (mg/l) at Outfall 001 for the month of April 2003, (the value recorded was 0.0 mg/l), has failed to comply with the permitted discharge limitations as shown in the Effluent Limit Violation Table attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (Attachment A), and has failed to properly operate and maintain the Facility and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control, at all times, in violation of 30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE § 305.125(5), Tex. WATER CODE § 26.121(a), and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Final Effluent Limitation and Monitoring Requirements Nos. 1 and 2, and Operational Requirements (1) and (4).
- 3. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 4, Derdeyn/Ford failed to report monthly effluent monitoring results, failed to submit Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) as required for the months of September, 2001 and March, 2003, and also failed to submit monthly DMRs by the 20th day of each month to the TCEQ for the months from July, 2001 to February, 2003, in violation of 30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE §§ 319.1 and 305.125(1), and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Monitoring and Reporting Requirements No. 1
- 4. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 5, Derdeyn/Ford failed to report effluent violations which deviated from the permitted effluent limitation by more than 40% for the months of April, May, and October 2002, and February, March, April, and August, 2003, to the TCEQ, in violation of 30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE § 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Monitoring and Reporting Requirements No. 7.
- 5. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 6, Derdeyn/Ford failed to ensure that the Facility was operated by a licensed wastewater operator. Specifically, the operator's class "D" license

- expired in December, 2002, in violation of 30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE §§ 30.350(i), 30.331(b), and 305.125(1) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Other Requirements No. 1.
- 6. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 7, Derdeyn/Ford failed to comply with the permitted discharge limitations at Outfall 001 of flow in conduit or through treatment plant of 0.002 million gallons per day (MGD) for August, 2003, in violation of Tex. WATER CODE § 26.121(a) and TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Final Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements No. 1. The reported value was 0.0098, a 390% exceedance
- 7. Pursuant to Tex. Water Code § 7.051, the Commission has the authority to assess an administrative penalty against Derdeyn/Ford for violations of the Texas Water Code and the Texas Health and Safety Code within the Commission's jurisdiction; for violations of rules adopted under such statutes; or for violations of orders or permits issued under such statutes.
- 8. An administrative penalty in the amount of forty-one thousand nine hundred thirty-three dollars (\$41,933.00) is justified by the facts recited in this Agreed Order, and considered in light of the factors set forth in Tex. Water Code § 7.053.

#### ORDERING PROVISIONS

NOW, THEREFORE, THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ORDERS that:

1. Derdeyn/Ford is assessed an administrative penalty in the amount of forty-one thousand nine hundred thirty-three dollars (\$41,933.00) as set forth in Conclusion of Law No. 8 for violations of TCEQ rules and state statutes. The Financial Assurance Section of the Commission's Financial Administration Division reviewed the financial documentation submitted by Derdeyn/Ford and determined that Derdeyn/Ford is unable to pay part of the administrative penalty. Therefore, thirty-eight thousand three hundred thirty-three dollars (\$38,333) of the penalty is deferred contingent upon Derdeyn/Ford's timely and satisfactory compliance with all the terms of this Agreed Order. The deferred amount will be waived upon full compliance with the terms of this Agreed Order. If Derdeyn/Ford fails to timely and satisfactorily comply with all requirements of this Agreed Order, including the payment schedule, the Executive Director may require Derdeyn/Ford to pay all or part of the deferred penalty.

Derdeyn/Ford has paid one hundred dollars (\$100.00) dollars of the undeferred administrative penalty. The remaining amount of three thousand five hundred dollars (\$3,500.00) shall be payable in thirty-five (35) monthly payments of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) dollars each.

The first monthly payment shall be paid within 30 days after the effective date of this Agreed Order. The subsequent payments shall each be paid not later than 30 days following the due date of the previous payment. If Derdeyn/Ford fails to timely and satisfactorily comply with the payment requirements of this Agreed Order, the Executive Director may, at his option, accelerate the maturity of the remaining installments, in which event the unpaid balance shall become immediately due and payable without demand or notice. In addition, the acceleration of any remaining balance constitutes the failure by Derdeyn/Ford to timely and satisfactorily comply with all the terms of this Agreed Order and the Executive Director may demand payment of any deferred penalty amount. Administrative penalty payments shall be made payable to "Texas Commission on Environmental Quality" and shall be sent with the notation "Re: Derdeyn/Ford, Inc.; Docket No. 2003-0413-MWD-E" to:

Financial Administration Division, Revenues Section Attention: Cashier's Office, MC 214 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality P.O. Box 13088 Austin, Texas 78711-3088

- 2. Derdeyn/Ford shall undertake the following technical requirements:
  - a. Immediately upon the effective date of this Agreed Order, Derdeyn/Ford shall commence operating the Facility under the direct supervision of a properly certified operator.
  - b. Within 30 days after the effective date of this Agreed Order, Derdeyn/Ford shall:
    - i. Submit a written certification statement demonstrating compliance with Ordering Provision 2.a above;
    - ii. Begin to properly operate and maintain the Facility and systems of treatment, collection, disposal, and control at all times. This shall include, but not be limited to, repairing or replacing the air diffuser system in the aeration chamber and the surface skimmer to operate properly; and
    - iii. Begin reporting in writing, effluent violations which deviated from the permitted effluent limitation by more than 40%, as required by TPDES Permit No. 11260-001, Monitoring and Reporting Requirements No. 7. These reports shall be submitted to:

> WQ MIS Team, Enforcement Section V Enforcement Division, MC 224 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality P.O. Box 13087 Austin, Texas 78711-3087

## with a copy to:

Water Section Manager Tyler Regional Office Texas Commission On Environmental Quality 2916 Teague Drive Tyler, Texas 75701-3734

- c. Within 45 days after the effective date of this Agreed Order, Derdeyn/Ford shall submit a written certification statement demonstrating compliance with Ordering Provision No. 2.b.ii and iii.
- d. Within 60 days after the effective date of this Agreed Order, Derdeyn/Ford shall submit written certification of compliance with the effluent limits of TPDES Permit No. 11260-001.
- e. Derdeyn/Ford shall submit all correspondence, reports, and documentation required by these Ordering Provisions to:

Order Compliance Team
Enforcement Division, MC 149A
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

and shall send a copy of the documentation to:

Mr. Noel Luper, Manager
Water Section
Tyler Regional Office
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
2916 Teague Drive
Tyler, Texas 75701-3756

- 3. The provisions of this Agreed Order shall apply to and be binding upon Derdeyn/Ford. Derdeyn/Ford is ordered to give notice of this Agreed Order to personnel who maintain day-to-day control over the Facility operations referenced in this Agreed Order.
- 4. If Derdeyn/Ford fails to comply with any of the Ordering Provisions in this Agreed Order within the prescribed schedules, and that failure is caused solely by an act of God, war, strike, riot, or other catastrophe, Derdeyn/Ford failure to comply is not a violation of this Agreed Order. Derdeyn/Ford has the burden of establishing to the Executive Director's satisfaction that such an event has occurred. Derdeyn/Ford shall notify the Executive Director within seven days after Derdeyn/Ford becomes aware of a delaying event and shall take all reasonable measures to mitigate and minimize any delay.
- 5. The Executive Director may grant an extension of any deadline in this Agreed Order or in any plan, report, or other document submitted pursuant to this Agreed Order, upon a written and substantiated showing of good cause. All requests for extensions by Derdeyn/Ford shall be made in writing to the Executive Director. Extensions are not effective until Derdeyn/Ford receives written approval from the Executive Director. The determination of what constitutes good cause rests solely with the Executive Director.
- 6. The Executive Director may refer this matter to the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Texas ("OAG") for further enforcement proceedings without notice to Derdeyn/Ford if the Executive Director determines that Derdeyn/Ford has not complied with one or more of the terms or conditions in this Agreed Order.
- 7. This Agreed Order shall terminate five years from its effective date or upon compliance with all the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreed Order, whichever is later.
- 8. This Agreed Order, issued by the Commission, shall not be admissible against Derdeyn/Ford in a civil proceeding, unless the proceeding is brought by the OAG to: (1) enforce the terms of this Agreed Order; or (2) pursue violations of a statute within the Commission's jurisdiction, or of a rule adopted or an order or permit issued by the Commission under such a statute.
- 9. This agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, which together shall constitute a single original instrument. Any executed signature page to this Agreement may be transmitted by facsimile transmission to the other parties, which shall constitute an original signature for all purposes.
- 10. The Chief Clerk shall provide a copy of this Agreed Order to each of the parties. Pursuant to 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 70.10(b) and TEX. GOV'T CODE § 2001.142, the effective date

is the date of hand-delivery of the Order to Derdeyn/Ford, or three days after the date on which the Commission mails notice of the Order to Derdeyn/Ford, whichever is earlier.

#### SIGNATURE PAGE

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

I, the undersigned, have read and understand the attached Agreed Order in the matter of Derdeyn/Ford, Inc. I represent that I am authorized to agree to the attached Agreed Order on behalf of Derdeyn/Ford, Inc., and do agree to the specified terms and conditions. I further acknowledge that the TCEQ, in accepting payment for the penalty amount, is materially relying on such representation.	For the Commission  For the Executive Director	Aldolo Date
	Derdeyn/Ford, Inc. I represent that I am author of Derdeyn/Ford, Inc., and do agree to the special	rized to agree to the attached Agreed Order on behalf fied terms and conditions. I further acknowledge that

I understand that by entering into this Agreed Order, Derdeyn/Ford, Inc. waives certain procedural rights, including, but not limited to, the right to formal notice of violations addressed by this Agreed Order, notice of an evidentiary hearing, the right to an evidentiary hearing, and the right to appeal. I agree to the terms of the Agreed Order in lieu of an evidentiary hearing. This Agreed Order constitutes full and final adjudication by the Commission of the violations set forth in this Agreed Order.

I also understand that my failure to comply with the Ordering Provisions, if any, in this order and/or my failure to timely pay the penalty amount, may result in:

- A negative impact on my compliance history;
- Greater scrutiny of any permit applications submitted by me;
- Referral of this case to the Attorney General's office for contempt, injunctive relief, additional penalties, and/or attorney fees, or to a collection agency;
- Increased penalties in any future enforcement actions against me;
- Automatic referral to the Attorney General's Office of any future enforcement actions against me; and

Date

TCEQ seeking other relief as authorized by law.

In addition, any falsification of any compliance documents may result in criminal prosecution.

Signature

Name (printed or typed)

Authorized Representative

Derdeyn/Ford, Inc.