

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - ENFORCEMENT MATTER
DOCKET NO.: 2008-1184-PST-E **TCEQ ID:** RN101804441 **CASE NO.:** 36239
RESPONDENT NAME: Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo

ORDER TYPE:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1660 AGREED ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/> FINDINGS AGREED ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/> FINDINGS ORDER FOLLOWING SOAH HEARING
<input type="checkbox"/> FINDINGS DEFAULT ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/> SHUTDOWN ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/> IMMINENT AND SUBSTANTIAL ENDANGERMENT ORDER
<input type="checkbox"/> AMENDED ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGENCY ORDER	
CASE TYPE:		
<input type="checkbox"/> AIR	<input type="checkbox"/> MULTI-MEDIA (check all that apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> INDUSTRIAL AND HAZARDOUS WASTE
<input type="checkbox"/> PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PETROLEUM STORAGE TANKS	<input type="checkbox"/> OCCUPATIONAL CERTIFICATION
<input type="checkbox"/> WATER QUALITY	<input type="checkbox"/> SEWAGE SLUDGE	<input type="checkbox"/> UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL
<input type="checkbox"/> MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE	<input type="checkbox"/> RADIOACTIVE WASTE	<input type="checkbox"/> DRY CLEANER REGISTRATION
<p>SITE WHERE VIOLATION(S) OCCURRED: King Food Citgo, 24551 Loop 494, Kingwood, Montgomery County</p> <p>TYPE OF OPERATION: Convenience store with retail sales of gasoline</p> <p>SMALL BUSINESS: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>OTHER SIGNIFICANT MATTERS: There are no complaints. There is no record of additional pending enforcement actions regarding this facility location.</p> <p>INTERESTED PARTIES: No one other than the ED and the Respondent has expressed an interest in this matter.</p> <p>COMMENTS RECEIVED: The <i>Texas Register</i> comment period expired on December 29, 2008. No comments were received.</p> <p>CONTACTS AND MAILING LIST: TCEQ Attorney/SEP Coordinator: None TCEQ Enforcement Coordinator: Mr. Wallace Myers, Enforcement Division, Enforcement Team 6, MC 128, (512) 239-6580; Mr. Bryan Sinclair, Enforcement Division, MC 219, (512) 239-2171 Respondent: Mr. Pasha Sajjad, Owner, King Food Citgo, 24551 Loop 494, Kingwood, Texas 77339 Respondent's Attorney: Not represented by counsel on this enforcement matter</p>		

VIOLATION SUMMARY CHART:

VIOLATION INFORMATION	PENALTY CONSIDERATIONS	CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN/REQUIRED
<p>Type of Investigation: <input type="checkbox"/> Complaint <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Routine <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement Follow-up <input type="checkbox"/> Records Review</p> <p>Date(s) of Complaints Relating to this Case: None</p> <p>Date of Investigation Relating to this Case: June 2, 2008</p> <p>Date of NOE Relating to this Case: June 18, 2008 (NOE)</p> <p>Background Facts: This was a routine investigation.</p> <p>WASTE</p> <p>Failure to monitor underground storage tanks (USTs) for releases at a frequency of at least once every month (not to exceed 35 days between each monitoring) [30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 334.50(b)(1)(A) and TEX. WATER CODE § 26.3475(c)(1)].</p>	<p>Total Assessed: \$2,350</p> <p>Total Deferred: \$470 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expedited Settlement <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Inability to Pay</p> <p>SEP Conditional Offset: \$0</p> <p>Total Paid (Due) to General Revenue: \$164 (remaining \$1,716 due in 11 monthly payments of \$156 each)</p> <p>Site Compliance History Classification <input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p> <p>Person Compliance History Classification <input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p> <p>Major Source: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Applicable Penalty Policy: September 2002</p>	<p>Corrective Actions Taken:</p> <p>The Executive Director recognizes that the Respondent implemented a release detection method for all USTs at the Facility on July 17, 2008.</p>

Additional ID No(s): PST ID No. 18106



Policy Revision 2 (September 2002)

Penalty Calculation Worksheet (PCW)

PCW Revision June 12, 2008

DATES	Assigned	23-Jun-2008	Screening	26-Jun-2008	EPA Due	
	PCW	24-Sep-2008				

RESPONDENT/FACILITY INFORMATION	
Respondent	Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo
Reg. Ent. Ref. No.	RN101804441
Facility/Site Region	12-Houston
Major/Minor Source	Minor

CASE INFORMATION			
Enf./Case ID No.	36239	No. of Violations	1
Docket No.	2008-1184-PST-E	Order Type	1660
Media Program(s)	Petroleum Storage Tank	Government/Non-Profit	No
Multi-Media		Enf. Coordinator	Wallace Myers
		EC's Team	Enforcement Team 6
Admin. Penalty \$ Limit Minimum	\$0	Maximum	\$10,000

Penalty Calculation Section

TOTAL BASE PENALTY (Sum of violation base penalties)	Subtotal 1	\$2,500
---	-------------------	---------

ADJUSTMENTS (+/-) TO SUBTOTAL 1		
Subtotals 2-7 are obtained by multiplying the Total Base Penalty (Subtotal 1) by the indicated percentage.		
Compliance History	4.0% Enhancement	Subtotals 2, 3, & 7
		\$100

Notes Enhancement for two NOV's without same or similar violations.

Culpability	No	0.0% Enhancement	Subtotal 4	\$0
--------------------	----	------------------	-------------------	-----

Notes The Respondent does not meet the culpability criteria.

Good Faith Effort to Comply Total Adjustments	Subtotal 5	\$250
--	-------------------	-------

Economic Benefit	0.0% Enhancement*	Subtotal 6	\$0
-------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-----

Total EB Amounts \$9
 Approx. Cost of Compliance \$1,500
 *Capped at the Total EB \$ Amount

SUM OF SUBTOTALS 1-7	Final Subtotal	\$2,350
-----------------------------	-----------------------	---------

OTHER FACTORS AS JUSTICE MAY REQUIRE	0.0%	Adjustment	\$0
---	------	-------------------	-----

Reduces or enhances the Final Subtotal by the indicated percentage.

Notes

Final Penalty Amount	\$2,350
-----------------------------	---------

STATUTORY LIMIT ADJUSTMENT	Final Assessed Penalty	\$2,350
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

DEFERRAL	20.0% Reduction	Adjustment	-\$470
-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	--------

Reduces the Final Assessed Penalty by the indicated percentage. (Enter number only; e.g. 20 for 20% reduction.)

Notes Deferral offered for expedited settlement.

PAYABLE PENALTY	\$1,880
------------------------	---------

Screening Date 26-Jun-2008

Docket No. 2008-1184-PST-E

PCW

Respondent Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo

Policy Revision 2 (September 2002)

Case ID No. 36239

PCW Revision June 12, 2008

Reg. Ent. Reference No. RN101804441

Media [Statute] Petroleum Storage Tank

Enf. Coordinator Wallace Myers

Compliance History Worksheet

>> **Compliance History Site Enhancement (Subtotal 2)**

Component	Number of...	Enter Number Here	Adjust.
NOVs	Written NOVs with same or similar violations as those in the current enforcement action <i>(number of NOVs meeting criteria)</i>	0	0%
	Other written NOVs	2	4%
Orders	Any agreed final enforcement orders containing a denial of liability <i>(number of orders meeting criteria)</i>	0	0%
	Any adjudicated final enforcement orders, agreed final enforcement orders without a denial of liability, or default orders of this state or the federal government, or any final prohibitory emergency orders issued by the commission	0	0%
Judgments and Consent Decrees	Any non-adjudicated final court judgments or consent decrees containing a denial of liability of this state or the federal government <i>(number of judgements or consent decrees meeting criteria)</i>	0	0%
	Any adjudicated final court judgments and default judgments, or non-adjudicated final court judgments or consent decrees without a denial of liability, of this state or the federal government	0	0%
Convictions	Any criminal convictions of this state or the federal government <i>(number of counts)</i>	0	0%
Emissions	Chronic excessive emissions events <i>(number of events)</i>	0	0%
Audits	Letters notifying the executive director of an intended audit conducted under the Texas Environmental, Health, and Safety Audit Privilege Act, 74th Legislature, 1995 <i>(number of audits for which notices were submitted)</i>	0	0%
	Disclosures of violations under the Texas Environmental, Health, and Safety Audit Privilege Act, 74th Legislature, 1995 <i>(number of audits for which violations were disclosed)</i>	0	0%
<i>Please Enter Yes or No</i>			
Other	Environmental management systems in place for one year or more	No	0%
	Voluntary on-site compliance assessments conducted by the executive director under a special assistance program	No	0%
	Participation in a voluntary pollution reduction program	No	0%
	Early compliance with, or offer of a product that meets future state or federal government environmental requirements	No	0%

Adjustment Percentage (Subtotal 2) 4%

>> **Repeat Violator (Subtotal 3)**

No

Adjustment Percentage (Subtotal 3) 0%

>> **Compliance History Person Classification (Subtotal 7)**

Average Performer

Adjustment Percentage (Subtotal 7) 0%

>> **Compliance History Summary**

Compliance History Notes

Enhancement for two NOVs without same or similar violations.

Total Adjustment Percentage (Subtotals 2, 3, & 7) 4%

Screening Date	26-Jun-2008	Docket No.	2008-1184-PST-E	PCW
Respondent	Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo			<i>Policy Revision 2 (September 2002)</i>
Case ID No.	36239			<i>PCW Revision June 12, 2008</i>
Reg. Ent. Reference No.	RN101804441			
Media [Statute]	Petroleum Storage Tank			
Enf. Coordinator	Wallace Myers			

Violation Number	1
Rule Cite(s)	30 Tex. Admin. Code § 334.50(b)(1)(A) and Tex. Water Code § 26.3475(c)(1)
Violation Description	Failed to monitor USTs for releases at a frequency of at least once every month (not to exceed 35 days between each monitoring).
Base Penalty	\$10,000

>> Environmental, Property and Human Health Matrix

OR	Harm			Percent	
	Release	Major	Moderate		Minor
	Actual				
	Potential	x			25%

>> Programmatic Matrix

	Falsification	Major	Moderate	Minor	Percent
					0%

Matrix Notes
Human health or the environment will or could be exposed to pollutants which would exceed levels that are protective of human health or environmental receptors as a result of the violation.

Adjustment \$7,500

\$2,500

Violation Events

Number of Violation Events: 1 24 Number of violation days

mark only one with an x

daily	
monthly	x
quarterly	
semiannual	
annual	
single event	

Violation Base Penalty \$2,500

One monthly event is recommended based on documentation of the violation during the June 2, 2008 investigation to the June 26, 2008 screening date.

Good Faith Efforts to Comply 10.0% Reduction \$250

	Before NOV	NOV to EDPRP/Settlement Offer
Extraordinary		
Ordinary		x
N/A		(mark with x)

Notes
The Respondent came into compliance on July 17, 2008.

Violation Subtotal \$2,250

Economic Benefit (EB) for this violation **Statutory Limit Test**

Estimated EB Amount: \$9 Violation Final Penalty Total: \$2,350

This violation Final Assessed Penalty (adjusted for limits) \$2,350

Economic Benefit Worksheet

Respondent Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo
Case ID No. 36239
Reg. Ent. Reference No. RN101804441
Media Petroleum Storage Tank
Violation No. 1

Percent Interest	Years of Depreciation
5.0	15

Item Description	Item Cost	Date Required	Final Date	Yrs	Interest Saved	Onetime Costs	EB Amount
<small>No commas or \$</small>							

Delayed Costs

Equipment				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Buildings				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (as needed)				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Engineering/construction				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Land				0.00	\$0	n/a	\$0
Record Keeping System				0.00	\$0	n/a	\$0
Training/Sampling				0.00	\$0	n/a	\$0
Remediation/Disposal				0.00	\$0	n/a	\$0
Permit Costs				0.00	\$0	n/a	\$0
Other (as needed)	\$1,500	2-Jun-2008	17-Jul-2008	0.12	\$9	n/a	\$9

Notes for DELAYED costs Estimated cost to provide release detection for the USTs at the Facility. The date required is the date of the investigation and the final date is the date of compliance.

Avoided Costs

ANNUALIZE [1] avoided costs before entering item (except for one-time avoided costs)

Disposal				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Inspection/Reporting/Sampling				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies/equipment				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Financial Assurance [2]				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
ONE-TIME avoided costs [3]				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (as needed)				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes for AVOIDED costs

Approx. Cost of Compliance \$1,500

TOTAL \$9

Compliance History

Customer/Respondent/Owner-Operator:	CN600978951 SAJJAD, PASHA	Classification: AVERAGE	Rating: 1.40
Regulated Entity:	RN101804441 KING FOOD CITGO	Classification: AVERAGE	Site Rating: 1.40
ID Number(s):	PETROLEUM STORAGE TANK REGISTRATION	REGISTRATION	18106
Location:	24551 LOOP 494, KINGWOOD, TX, 77339		Rating Date: 9/1/2007 Repeat Violator: NO
TCEQ Region:	REGION 12 - HOUSTON		
Date Compliance History Prepared:	July 17, 2008		
Agency Decision Requiring Compliance History:	Enforcement		
Compliance Period:	July 17, 2003 to July 17, 2008		

TCEQ Staff Member to Contact for Additional Information Regarding this Compliance History

Name: Wallace Myers Phone: 512-239-6580

Site Compliance History Components

1. Has the site been in existence and/or operation for the full five year compliance period? Yes
2. Has there been a (known) change in ownership of the site during the compliance period? No
3. If Yes, who is the current owner? N/A
4. If Yes, who was/were the prior owner(s)? N/A
5. When did the change(s) in ownership occur? N/A

Components (Multimedia) for the Site :

- A. Final Enforcement Orders, court judgements, and consent decrees of the state of Texas and the federal government.

N/A
- B. Any criminal convictions of the state of Texas and the federal government.

N/A
- C. Chronic excessive emissions events.

N/A
- D. The approval dates of investigations. (CCEDS Inv. Track. No.)

1	10/20/2003	(278964)
2	09/23/2004	(289895)
3	12/09/2006	(532155)
4	06/08/2007	(563322)
5	06/18/2008	(681710)
- E. Written notices of violations (NOV). (CCEDS Inv. Track. No.)

Date:	10/20/2003	(278964)			
Self Report?	NO		Classification:	Moderate	
Citation:	30 TAC Chapter 37, SubChapter I 37.815(a) 30 TAC Chapter 37, SubChapter I 37.815(b)				
Description:	Failure to provide acceptable financial assurance.				
Date:	12/09/2006	(532155)			
Self Report?	NO		Classification:	Moderate	
Citation:	30 TAC Chapter 115, SubChapter C 115.242(3)				
Description:	30 Tex. Admin. Code Section 115.242 (3) - Failure to maintain the Stage II vapor recovery system in proper operating condition, as specified by the manufacturer and/or any applicable CARB Executive Order(s), and free of defects that would impair the effectiveness of the system. **** During the investigation TXP 102.1				
Self Report?	NO		Classification:	Minor	
Citation:	30 TAC Chapter 115, SubChapter C 115.246(1)				
Description:	30 Tex. Admin Code Section 115.246 (1)- Failure to maintain a copy of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Executive Order(s) for the Stage II vapor recovery system and any related components installed at the facility. **** During the investigation this facility did not have the correct CARB executive order on-si				
- F. Environmental audits.

N/A

G. Type of environmental management systems (EMSs).

N/A

H. Voluntary on-site compliance assessment dates.

N/A

I. Participation in a voluntary pollution reduction program.

N/A

J. Early compliance.

N/A

Sites Outside of Texas

N/A

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



**IN THE MATTER OF AN
ENFORCEMENT ACTION
CONCERNING
PASHA SAJJAD DBA KING FOOD
CITGO
RN101804441**

§
§
§
§
§
§

**BEFORE THE
TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

**AGREED ORDER
DOCKET NO. 2008-1184-PST-E**

I. JURISDICTION AND STIPULATIONS

At its _____ agenda, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality ("the Commission" or "TCEQ") considered this agreement of the parties, resolving an enforcement action regarding Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo ("the Respondent") under the authority of TEX. WATER CODE chs. 7 and 26. The Executive Director of the TCEQ, through the Enforcement Division, and the Respondent appear before the Commission and together stipulate that:

1. The Respondent owns and operates a convenience store with retail sales of gasoline at 24551 Loop 494 in Kingwood, Montgomery County, Texas (the "Facility").
2. The Respondent's three underground storage tanks ("USTs") are not exempt or excluded from regulation under the Texas Water Code or the rules of the Commission.
3. The Commission and the Respondent agree that the Commission has jurisdiction to enter this Agreed Order, and that the Respondent is subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.
4. The Respondent received notice of the violations alleged in Section II ("Allegations") on or about June 23, 2008.
5. The occurrence of any violation is in dispute and the entry of this Agreed Order shall not constitute an admission by the Respondent of any violation alleged in Section II ("Allegations"), nor of any statute or rule.
6. An administrative penalty in the amount of Two Thousand Three Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$2,350) is assessed by the Commission in settlement of the violations alleged in Section II ("Allegations"). The Respondent has paid One Hundred Sixty-Four Dollars (\$164) of the

administrative penalty and Four Hundred Seventy Dollars (\$470) is deferred contingent upon the Respondent's timely and satisfactory compliance with all the terms of this Agreed Order. If the Respondent fails to timely and satisfactorily comply with all requirements of this Agreed Order, including the payment schedule, the Executive Director may require the Respondent to pay all or part of the deferred penalty.

The remaining amount of One Thousand Seven Hundred Sixteen Dollars (\$1,716) of the administrative penalty shall be payable in 11 monthly payments of One Hundred Fifty-Six Dollars (\$156) each. The next 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 until paid in full. If the Respondent fails to timely and satisfactorily comply with the payment requirements of this Agreed Order, the Executive Director may, at the Executive Director's 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 failure of the Respondent to meet the payment schedule of this Agreed Order constitutes the failure by the Respondent to timely and satisfactorily comply with all the terms of this Agreed Order.

7. Any notice and procedures, which might otherwise be authorized or required in this action, are waived in the interest of a more timely resolution of the matter.
8. The Executive Director of the TCEQ and the Respondent have agreed on a settlement of the matters alleged in this enforcement action, subject to the approval of the Commission.
9. The Executive Director recognizes that the Respondent implemented a release detection method for all USTs at the Facility on July 17, 2008.
10. The Executive Director may, without further notice or hearing, refer this matter to the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Texas ("OAG") for further enforcement proceedings if the Executive Director determines that the Respondent has not complied with one or more of the terms or conditions in this Agreed Order.
11. 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.
12. 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.

II. ALLEGATIONS

As owner and operator of the Facility, the Respondent is alleged to have failed to monitor USTs for releases at a frequency of at least once every month (not to exceed 35 days between each monitoring), in violation of 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 334.50(b)(1)(A) and TEX. WATER CODE § 26.3475(c)(1), as documented during an investigation conducted on June 2, 2008.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data. The text also mentions that regular audits are necessary to identify any discrepancies or errors in the accounting process. Furthermore, it highlights the role of technology in streamlining financial operations and reducing the risk of human error.

In addition, the document outlines the various methods used for data collection and analysis. It describes how primary data is gathered through direct observation and interviews, while secondary data is obtained from existing sources. The text explains that statistical techniques are employed to analyze the collected data and draw meaningful conclusions. It also discusses the importance of data security and privacy, particularly when handling sensitive financial information. The document concludes by stating that a robust data management system is essential for the success of any organization.

The final section of the document provides a summary of the key findings and recommendations. It reiterates the need for consistent record-keeping and the use of reliable data sources. The text suggests that organizations should invest in modern accounting software and training for their staff to ensure the highest quality of financial reporting. It also recommends that regular communication and collaboration between different departments are crucial for maintaining accurate and up-to-date records. The document ends with a statement of confidence in the accuracy and reliability of the information presented.

III. DENIALS

The Respondent generally denies each allegation in Section II ("Allegations").

IV. ORDERING PROVISIONS

1. It is, therefore, ordered by the TCEQ that the Respondent pay an administrative penalty as set forth in Section I, Paragraph 6 above. The payment of this administrative penalty and the Respondent's compliance with all the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreed Order resolve only the allegations in Section II. The Commission shall not be constrained in any manner from requiring corrective action or penalties for violations which are not raised here. Administrative penalty payments shall be made payable to "TCEQ" and shall be sent with the notation "Re: Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo, Docket No. 2008-1184-PST-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. The provisions of this Agreed Order shall apply to and be binding upon the Respondent. The Respondent is ordered to give notice of the Agreed Order to personnel who maintain day-to-day control over the Facility operations referenced in this Agreed Order.
3. If the Respondent 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, the Respondent's failure to comply is not a violation of this Agreed Order. The Respondent shall have the burden of establishing to the Executive Director's satisfaction that such an event has occurred. The Respondent shall notify the Executive Director within seven days after the Respondent becomes aware of a delaying event and shall take all reasonable measures to mitigate and minimize any delay.
4. 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 the Respondent shall be made in writing to the Executive Director. Extensions are not effective until the Respondent receives written approval from the Executive Director. The determination of what constitutes good cause rests solely with the Executive Director.
5. This Agreed Order, issued by the Commission, shall not be admissible against the Respondent 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.
6. 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.

...the ... of ...

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

7. Under 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 70.10(b), the effective date is the date of hand-delivery of the Order to the Respondent, or three days after the date on which the Commission mails notice of the Order to the Respondent, whichever is earlier. The Chief Clerk shall provide a copy of this Agreed Order to each of the parties.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for consistent and reliable data collection processes to support effective decision-making.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the role of technology in data management and analysis. It discusses how modern software solutions can streamline data collection, storage, and reporting, thereby improving efficiency and accuracy.

4. The fourth part of the document addresses the challenges associated with data management, such as data quality, security, and privacy. It provides strategies to mitigate these risks and ensure that data is used responsibly and ethically.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes by summarizing the key findings and recommendations. It stresses the importance of ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure that data management practices remain effective and aligned with the organization's goals.

6. The sixth part of the document provides a detailed overview of the data management framework, including the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders. It also outlines the key performance indicators (KPIs) used to measure the success of the framework.

7. The seventh part of the document discusses the impact of data management on organizational performance. It highlights how effective data management can lead to improved decision-making, increased operational efficiency, and enhanced customer satisfaction.

8. The eighth part of the document provides a detailed analysis of the data management process, including the identification of key data sources and the development of data collection and analysis protocols. It also discusses the importance of data governance and the role of data stewards.

9. The ninth part of the document focuses on the implementation of data management practices. It provides a step-by-step guide to setting up a data management system, including the selection of software, the establishment of data collection and analysis procedures, and the training of staff.

10. The tenth part of the document discusses the future of data management and the role of emerging technologies. It highlights the potential of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and big data analytics to revolutionize data management and provide deeper insights into organizational performance.

SIGNATURE PAGE

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For the Commission

John Bralier
For the Executive Director

12/8/08
~~10-1-08~~ J
Date

I, the undersigned, have read and understand the attached Agreed Order. I am authorized to agree to the attached Agreed Order on behalf of the entity indicated below my signature, and I do agree to the terms and conditions specified therein. I further acknowledge that the TCEQ, in accepting payment for the penalty amount, is materially relying on such representation.

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

- A negative impact on compliance history;
- Greater scrutiny of any permit applications submitted;
- 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;
- Automatic referral to the Attorney General's Office of any future enforcement actions; and
- TCEQ seeking other relief as authorized by law.

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

Sajjad Pasha
Signature

10-1-08
Date

Sajjad Pasha
Name (Printed or typed)
Authorized Representative of
Pasha Sajjad dba King Food Citgo

owner
Title

Instructions: Send the original, signed Agreed Order with penalty payment to the Financial Administration Division, Revenues Section at the address in Section IV, Paragraph 1 of this Agreed Order.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
CHICAGO, ILL.

REPORT OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
FOR THE YEAR 1911

CHICAGO, ILL.:
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS,
1912

PRINTED AND BOUND BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS