

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

IN THE MATTER OF)
COPART INC)
COPART-THEODORE) CONSENT ORDER 20-XXX-CLD
THEODORE, T6S, R3W, S10,)
MOBILE COUNTY, ALABAMA)
NPDES REGISTRATION NO. ALR10BE96)

PREAMBLE

This Special Order by Consent is made and entered into by the Alabama Department of Environmental Management (hereinafter "Department" or "ADEM") and Copart Inc. (hereinafter "Operator") pursuant to the provisions of the Alabama Environmental Management Act, Ala. Code §§ 22-22A-1 to 22-22A-16, as amended, the Alabama Water Pollution Control Act (hereinafter "AWPCA"), Ala. Code §§ 22-22-1 to 22-22-14, as amended, and the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, and § 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, as amended.

STIPULATIONS

- 1. The Operator is a Texas foreign limited liability company, doing business in the State of Alabama, constructing the commercial development Copart-Theodore (hereinafter "Facility") located in T6S, R3W, S10, south of Old Pascagoula Road and west of Pecan Terrace Drive in Theodore, Mobile County, Alabama. Sediment and other pollutants in stormwater runoff from the Facility have the potential to discharge and/or have discharged to an unnamed tributary of Jackson Creek, a water of the State.
2. The Department is a duly constituted department of the State of Alabama pursuant to Ala. Code §§ 22-22A-1 to 22-22A-16, as amended.
3. Pursuant to Ala. Code § 22-22A-4(n), as amended, the Department is the State Agency responsible for the promulgation and enforcement of the water pollution control regulations in accordance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 to

1387, as amended. In addition, the Department is authorized to administer and enforce the provisions of the AWPCA, Ala. Code §§ 22-22-1 through 22-22-14, as amended.

4. The following references and acronyms are used in this Consent Order, and when used, shall have the meaning of the name or title referenced below.

BMPs	Best Management Practices
CBMPP	Construction Best Management Practices Plan
NTUs	Nephelometric Turbidity Units
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOV	Notice of Violation
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
QCP	ADEM-recognized Qualified Credentialed Professional
UT	Unnamed Tributary
WL	Warning Letter

5. Pursuant to ADEM Admin. Code rs. 335-6-12-.05(1) and 335-6-12-.11(1), the Operator is required to register for and obtain NPDES coverage prior to commencing and/or continuing regulated disturbance activities.

6. On October 23, 2018, the Operator submitted to the Department an NOI requesting NPDES coverage under NPDES General Permit ALR10000 (hereinafter "Permit") for regulated disturbance activities and discharges of treated stormwater from the Facility. The Department granted registration ALR10BE96 to the Operator on November 1, 2018.

7. Pursuant to Part III. A. of the Permit, the Permittee shall design, install, and maintain effective erosion control and sediment controls, appropriate for site conditions. Sediment control measures, erosion control measures, and other site management practices must be properly selected based on site-specific conditions, must meet or exceed the technical standards outlined in the Alabama Handbook For Erosion Control, Sediment Control, And Stormwater Management On Construction Sites And Urban Areas published by the Alabama Soil and Water Conservation Committee (hereinafter the "Alabama Handbook"), and the site-specific CBMPP prepared in accordance with Part III. E.

8. Pursuant to Part III. E. of the Permit, construction activity may not commence until a CBMPP has been prepared in a format acceptable to the Department and certified by a QCP as

adequate to meet the requirements of this Permit. The Permittee shall properly implement and regularly maintain the controls, practices, devices, and measures specified in the CBMPP.

9. During the inspection of the Facility on April 17, 2019, the Department observed and documented that, although NPDES construction activity had commenced and was continuing, the Operator had not properly implemented and maintained effective BMPs in violation of Parts III. A. and E. of the Permit.

10. On May 2, 2019, a WL was sent to the Operator by the Department as a result of the April 17, 2019, inspection. The WL identified to the Operator areas of concern noted during the inspection and requested that these items be addressed and required the Operator to submit to the Department, within ten (10) days of receipt of the WL, conformation detailing how and when corrective action was taken to effectively address the items noted. The Department received the required report on July 18, 2019.

11. Pursuant to Part I. C. 9. of the Permit, the Permittee is not authorized to discharge stormwater where the turbidity of such discharge will cause or contribute a substantial visible contrast with the natural appearance of the receiving water.

12. Pursuant to Part I. C. 10. of the Permit, the Permittee is not authorized to discharge stormwater where the turbidity of such discharge will cause or contribute an increase turbidity of the receiving water by more than fifty (50) NTU's above background.

13. The Department inspected the Facility on August 9, 2019, and observed and documented that, although NPDES construction activity had commenced and was continuing, the Operator had not properly implemented and maintained effective BMPs in violation of Parts III. A. and E. of the Permit.

14. During the inspection of the Facility on August 9, 2019, the Department observed and documented that the Operator had contributed to an increase of more than fifty (50) NTU's in turbidity and caused a substantial visible contrast in the natural appearance of the receiving water, in violation of Parts I. C. 9. and 10. of the Permit.

15. On August 14, 2019, a NOV was sent to the Operator by the Department as a result of the August 9, 2019, inspection. The NOV notified the Operator of deficiencies documented at

the Facility, and required the Operator to submit to the Department, within ten (10) days of receipt of the NOV, a report prepared by a QCP showing steps that were taken at the Facility to correct the noted violations within ten (10) days of receipt of the NOV. As of the date of this Consent Order, the required report has not been received by the Department.

16. The Operator consents to abide by the terms of the following Consent Order and to pay the civil penalty assessed herein.

CONTENTIONS

Pursuant to Ala. Code § 22-22A-5(18)(c), as amended, in determining the amount of any penalty, the Department must give consideration to the seriousness of the violations, including any irreparable harm to the environment and any threat to the health or safety of the public; the standard of care manifested by such person; the economic benefit which delayed compliance may confer upon such person; the nature, extent and degree of success of such person's efforts to minimize or mitigate the effects of such violations upon the environment; such person's history of previous violations; and the ability of such person to pay such penalty. Any civil penalty assessed pursuant to this authority shall not exceed \$25,000.00 for each violation, provided however, that the total penalty assessed in an Order issued by the Department shall not exceed \$250,000.00. Each day such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation. In arriving at this civil penalty, the Department has considered the following:

A. **SERIOUSNESS OF THE VIOLATIONS:** The Department considered the general nature of each violation, the magnitude and duration of each non-compliant discharge, their effects, if any, on impaired waters, and any available evidence of irreparable harm to the environment or threat to the public. The Department determined the base penalty to be \$8,000.

B. **THE STANDARD OF CARE:** In consideration of this factor, the Department noted that the standard of care taken by the Operator was not commensurate with the applicable regulatory requirements and increased the penalty by an additional \$10,000.

C. **ECONOMIC BENEFIT WHICH DELAYED COMPLIANCE MAY HAVE CONFERRED:** The Operator avoided certain costs associated with proper implementation and maintenance of BMPs. Based on the Department's estimates of these delayed costs and the timeframe of non-

compliance, the Department determined that the Operator derived a significant economic benefit from these violations and increased the penalty by an additional \$1,800.

D. EFFORTS TO MINIMIZE OR MITIGATE THE EFFECTS OF THE VIOLATIONS UPON THE ENVIRONMENT: The Department is unaware of any efforts by the Operator to minimize or mitigate the effects of the violations upon the environment.

E. HISTORY OF PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS: The Department is unaware of any historical violations before those addressed herein.

F. THE ABILITY TO PAY: The Department is unaware of any evidence regarding the Operator's inability to pay the civil penalty.

G. The Civil Penalty is summarized in the penalty synopsis.

H. It should be noted that this Special Order by Consent is a negotiated settlement and, therefore, the Department has compromised the amount of the penalty the Department believes is warranted in this matter in the spirit of cooperation and the desire to resolve this matter amicably, without incurring the unwarranted expense of litigation.

OPERATOR CONTENTIONS

A. SERIOUSNESS OF THE VIOLATIONS: On August 9, 2019, during the discharge noted by the Department, the Operator (CoPart) considered and weighed the effect of alternative courses of action based on the Facility conditions at the time of the discharge. The Operator selected the option, in its opinion, that would have the least impact on water quality based on the specific conditions at the time.

B. THE STANDARD OF CARE: The Operator claims that its action was commensurate with the applicable regulatory requirements, based on the specific conditions at the site, prior to the discharge occurring. Prior to August 9, 2019, the Facility had no prior documented discharges from the northeast detention pond from any of the rain events. The Operator designed the pond to hold in excess of a two (2) year twenty-four (24) hour precipitation event, as specified in the ALR10BE96 permit.

Prior to August 9, 2019, on-going pumping operations had occurred, but did not result in a discharge. Also, the Operator was continuously and regularly dewatering the pond to maintain

capacity by filling two water trucks kept at the Facility and spraying the water on site in an effort to not produce a discharge. This maintenance BMP had been effective prior to August 9, 2019 discharge documented by the Department. Numerous, and successive storms produced precipitation which saturated the Facility soils with water, and filled the northeast detention pond in excess of the design capacity. All of the BMPs at the Facility were being implemented and maintained as well as the Facility conditions allowed. On August 9, 2019, the northeast detention pond reached critical capacity, and the water level was within seven (7) inches of overtopping the dam on the east side. Further, the southeast detention pond construction was not complete enough to allow pumping to that area. Additionally, a strong storm event was predicted at the Facility on August 9, 2019. In order to prevent a catastrophic failure of the northeast detention pond dam, the Operator, in its opinion, chose the best location available to dewater the pond. The location the Operator selected was a man-made ditch in an area that was stabilized with rip-rap and thick vegetation. The dewatering only occurred long enough to provide extra capacity in order to attempt to prevent runoff for the predicted rain event on August 9, 2019. In the Operator's opinion, this was the least severe option available for the site conditions.

C. ECONOMIC BENEFIT WHICH DELAYED COMPLIANCE MAY HAVE CONFERRED: The Operator claims that no cost was avoided in association with proper implementation and maintenance of BMPs. On numerous occasions previous to August 9, 2019, the Operator's superintendent met on-site with the Facility QCP and implemented all appropriate BMPs that were recommended by the QCP. There was no economic benefit realized by the Operator.

D. EFFORTS TO MINIMIZE OR MITIGATE THE EFFECTS OF THE VIOLATIONS UPON THE ENVIRONMENT: The Operator alleges its compliance effort was serious and diligent. The Operator alleges it took all available efforts to minimize and mitigate the effects of the discharge allowed by the Facility conditions and to protect the environment to the maximum extent practicable. Several times the Operator prepared the slopes around the perimeter for hydroseeding. Each time a rain event occurred the slopes were repaired. Further, the silt fences were repaired during routine maintenance pursuant to the permit. The Operator hired several sub-contractors in an effort to fully implement the perimeter BMPs as soon as possible. The

Operator alleges it implemented BMPs over and beyond those originally designed for the Facility due to the frequent and persistent rain events. On August 8, 2019, the Operator implemented and maintained the following BMPs in addition to those specified in the CBMPP for the Facility.

1. Installation and maintenance of a minimum of two (2) rows of Class-A Silt Fence around east, south and west, which is in addition to the single row as originally specified for the Facility.
2. In some areas there are four (4) rows and one area with five (5) rows of Class-A silt fence, with wire tie backs to reinforce them, and these are being fully maintained after rain events as soon as conditions allow.
3. Complete diversion swales around the facility to prevent over 90% of the on-site runoff from leaving the Facility.
4. Construction of very large detention areas, with the newest of which is located in the southeast portion of the Facility and was expanded to substantially increase its capacity following the ADEM inspection.
5. Stabilization of the entire Facility by application of concrete to the soils to a depth of one (1) ft. below grade, i.e. paving the entire Facility to prevent erosion as soon as conditions allow.
6. Pumping to dewater the ponds into water trucks to apply water to the surface at the Facility during dry periods to add capacity for detention areas.
7. Installation and maintenance of the Facility construction entrances, which are over twice the length of the specified construction entrance on the plans.

Additional BMP's were planned prior to the August 08, 2019, ADEM inspection, though not fully implemented:

- A. Preparation by re-grading all perimeter slopes for grassing using hydroseeding,
- B. Hydroseeding all outside slopes including application of additional soil amendments to

reduce turbidity of runoff and to enhance the growth rate for the perimeter grass on the outside slopes, to ensure complete vegetative cover as soon as possible,

- C. Installation of straw wattles, application of heavy mulch and removal of sediment accumulation from upland areas south of the perimeter silt fence, per our previous Facility inspections and recommendations.

The Operator (Copart), alleges, it is committed to maintaining Facility compliance with the ADEM permit requirements.

ORDER

Therefore, the Operator, along with the Department, desires to resolve and settle the compliance issues cited above. The Department has carefully considered the facts available to the Department and has considered the six penalty factors enumerated in Ala. Code § 22-22A-5(18)(c), as amended, as well as the need for timely and effective enforcement.

The Department believes that the following conditions are appropriate to address the violations alleged herein. Therefore, the Department and the Operator (hereinafter collectively "Parties") agree to enter into this Consent Order with the following terms and conditions:

A. That the Operator shall pay to the Department a civil penalty in the amount of \$15,000 in settlement of the violations alleged herein within forty-five (45) days from the issuance of this Consent Order. Failure to pay the civil penalty within forty-five (45) days from the date of issuance of this Consent Order may result in the Department's filing a civil action in the Circuit Court of Montgomery County to recover the civil penalty.

B. That all penalties due pursuant to this Consent Order shall be made payable to the Alabama Department of Environmental Management by certified or cashier's check and shall be remitted to:

Office of General Counsel
Alabama Department of Environmental Management
PO Box 301463
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-1463

C. That the Operator shall take immediate action to prevent, to the maximum extent practicable, sediment and other pollutants in stormwater leaving the Facility and prevent noncompliant and/or unpermitted discharges of pollutants to waters of the State.

D. That, within five (5) days of the date of issuance of this Consent Order, the Operator shall have a QCP perform a comprehensive inspection of the Facility, offsite conveyances, and affected State waters.

E. That, within thirty (30) days of the date of issuance of this Consent Order, the Operator shall fully implement effective BMPs, designed by a QCP, that meet or exceed the technical standards outlined in the Alabama Handbook, the site CBMPP plan, and NPDES General Permit ALR100000, and correct all deficiencies at the Facility and offsite conveyances, including sediment removal or remediation.

F. That within seven (7) days of the completion of the activities required in paragraph E. above, the Operator shall submit to the Department a certification signed by the QCP that effective BMPs that meet or exceed the technical standards outlined in the Alabama Handbook, the site CBMPP plan, and NPDES Permit ALR100000 have been implemented, all deficiencies have been corrected, and full compliance with the requirements of NPDES Permit ALR100000, has been achieved at the Facility, offsite conveyances, and affected State waters.

G. That this Consent Order shall apply to and be binding upon both parties, their directors, officers, and all persons or entities acting under or for them. Each signatory to this Consent Order certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the party he or she represents to enter into the terms and conditions of this Consent Order, to execute the Consent Order on behalf of the party represented, and to legally bind such party.

H. That, subject to the terms of these presents and subject to provisions otherwise provided by statute, this Consent Order is intended to operate as a full resolution of the violations which are cited in this Consent Order.

I. That the Operator is not relieved from any liability if the Operator fails to comply with any provision of this Consent Order.

J. That, for purposes of this Consent Order only, the Department may properly bring an action to compel compliance with the terms and conditions contained herein in the Circuit Court of Montgomery County. In any action brought by the Department to compel compliance with the terms of this Agreement, the Operator shall be limited to the defenses of Force Majeure, compliance with this Agreement and physical impossibility. A Force Majeure is defined as any event arising from causes that are not foreseeable and are beyond the reasonable control of the Operator, including the Operator's contractors and consultants, which could not be overcome by due diligence (i.e., causes which could have been overcome or avoided by the exercise of due diligence will not be considered to have been beyond the reasonable control of the Operator) and which delays or prevents performance by a date required by the Consent Order. Events such as unanticipated or increased costs of performance, changed economic circumstances, normal precipitation events, or failure to obtain federal, state, or local permits shall not constitute Force Majeure. Any request for a modification of a deadline must be accompanied by the reasons (including documentation) for each extension and the proposed extension time. This information shall be submitted to the Department a minimum of ten (10) working days prior to the original anticipated completion date. If the Department, after review of the extension request, finds the work was delayed because of conditions beyond the control and without the fault of the Operator, the Department may extend the time as justified by the circumstances. The Department may also grant any other additional time extension as justified by the circumstances, but the Department is not obligated to do so.

K. That the sole purpose of this Consent Order is to resolve and dispose of all allegations and contentions stated herein concerning the factual circumstances referenced herein. Should additional facts and circumstances be discovered in the future concerning the Facility which would constitute possible violations not addressed in this Consent Order, then such future violations may be addressed in Orders as may be issued by the Director, litigation initiated by the Department, or such other enforcement action as may be appropriate, and the Operator shall not object to such future Orders, litigation or enforcement action based on the

issuance of this Consent Order if future orders, litigation or other enforcement action address new matters not raised in this Consent Order.

L. That this Consent Order shall be considered final and effective immediately upon signature of all parties. This Consent Order shall not be appealable, and the Operator does hereby waive any hearing on the terms and conditions of the same.

M. That this Consent Order shall not affect the Operator's obligation to comply with any federal, State, or local laws or regulations.

N. That final approval and entry into this Consent Order are subject to the requirements that the Department give notice of proposed penalty Orders to the public, and that the public have at least thirty days within which to comment on the Consent Order.

O. That, should any provision of this Consent Order be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction or the Environmental Management Commission to be inconsistent with federal or State law and therefore unenforceable, the remaining provisions herein shall remain in full force and effect.

P. That any modifications of this Consent Order must be agreed to in writing and signed by both Parties.

Q. That, except as otherwise set forth herein, this Consent Order is not and shall not be interpreted to be a permit or modification of an existing permit under federal, State or local law, and shall not be construed to waive or relieve the Operator of the Operator's obligations to comply in the future with any permit coverage.

Executed in duplicate with each part being an original.

COPART INC

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT


(Signature of Authorized Representative)

Lance R. LeFleur
Director

GARY BROWN
(Print Name of Authorized Representative)

Date Signed: _____

VP OF CONSTRUCTION
Title

Date Signed: 11/20/19

ATTACHMENT 1 - PENALTY SYNOPSIS

Copart – Copart Theodore, Mobile County NPDES ALR10BE96

Violation	Number of Violations	Seriousness of Violation & Base Penalty*	Standard of Care*	History of Previous Violations*
Effective Best Management Practices (BMPs) not implemented and/or maintained	1	\$3,000	\$3,750	\$0
Water Quality Standard violation	1	\$5,000	\$6,250	\$0
Totals:	2	\$8,000	\$10,000	\$0

Economic Benefit*: \$1,800

Sub-Total: \$19,800

Mitigating Factors*: \$0

Ability to Pay*: \$0

Other Factors*: \$4,800

Amount of Initial Penalty: \$19,800

Total Adjustments: \$0

Final Penalty: \$15,000

*See the Department's "Contentions" portion of the Order for a detailed description of each violation and the penalty factors.