ALABAMA DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

In The Matter Of: S & J Mini Mart Ashland Enterprises, Inc. UST Facility ID No. 23442-121-004120 Talladega, Talladega County, Alabama	)))))))	**PROPOSED** **CONSENT ORDER** No._____

PREAMBLE

Pursuant to the provisions of the Alabama Environmental Management Act, §§ 22-22A-1 to 22-22A-16, Ala. Code (2006 Rpl.Vol.); the Alabama Underground Storage Tank and Wellhead Protection Act, §§ 22-36-1 to 22-36-10, Ala. Code (2006 Rpl.Vol.); and the ADEM Administrative Code of Regulations (hereinafter "ADEM Admin. Code r.") promulgated pursuant thereto, the Alabama Department of Environmental Management (hereinafter the "Department" or "ADEM") makes the following FINDINGS:

STIPULATIONS

1. Ashland Enterprises, Inc. is the registered owner of a regulated underground storage tank (UST) facility located at S & J Mini Mart, 1600 Ashland Highway, Talladega, Talladega County, Alabama, designated as ADEM Facility I.D. Number 23442-121-004120.

2. ADEM is a duly constituted agency of the State of Alabama pursuant to §§ 22-22A-1 to 22-22A-16, Ala. Code (2006 Rpl.Vol.).

3. Pursuant to § 22-22A-4(n), Ala. Code (2006 Rpl.Vol.), ADEM is the State Environmental Control Agency for the purposes of federal environmental law, including 42 U.S.C. §§ 6991 to 6991(m), as amended.

4. ADEM is authorized to administer and enforce the provisions of the Alabama Underground Storage Tank and Wellhead Protection Act, §§ 22-36-1 to 22-36-10, Ala. Code (2006 Rpl.Vol.).

CONTENTIONS

5. Based upon an inspection dated December 16, 2009 of the UST facility and/or a review of facility records, the Department has documented the violations alleged herein.

6. Pursuant to ADEM Admin. Code r. 335-6-15-.45(3), upon implementation of delivery prohibition, it shall be unlawful for any regulated substance deliverer to deliver a

regulated substance, and it shall be unlawful for owners and operators of UST systems to accept delivery of a regulated substance to an underground storage tank facility that is under delivery prohibition.

7. The owner accepted delivery of a regulated substance to an underground storage tank facility that was under delivery prohibition.

8. A Notice of Delinquency/Deficiency (NOD) dated March 23, 2009, was issued by the Department requiring the repair of replacement of the cathodic protection system, based on the failed cathodic protection test, with supporting documentation submitted to the Department.

9. On May 15, 2009, upon the Owner's failure to respond to the NOD dated March 23, 2009, the Department issued a Notice of Violation (NOV) requiring the repair or replacement of the cathodic protection system, based on the failed cathodic protection test, with supporting documentation submitted to the Department.

10. On September 1, 2009, upon the Owner's failure to respond to the NOD dated March 23, 2009 and the NOV dated May 15, 2009, the Department issued a Notice of Delinquency (NOD) requiring the repair or replacement of the cathodic protection system, based on the failed cathodic protection test, to pay Underground Storage Tank Regulation Fees for 2007 through 2009, in the amount of $270.00, and to provide leak detection with supporting documentation submitted to the Department.

11. On November 4, 2009, upon the Owner's failure to respond to the NOD dated March 23, 2009 and the NOV dated May 15, 2009 and the NOD dated September 1, 2009, the Department issued a Notice of Proposed Delivery Prohibition requiring the repair and replacement of the corrosion protection system, for failure to submit monthly leak detection test reports for August through October 2009, failure to submit transfer of ownership form and failure to pay UST Regulatory Fees in the amount of $270.00, supporting documentation submitted to the Department.

12. On November 18, 2009, the Department placed the facility on delivery prohibition.

13. On December 16, 2009, a Department inspection revealed that the facility had received fuel on November 20, 2009 while still on delivery prohibition.

14. Pursuant to § 22-22A-5(18)(c), Ala. Code (2006 Rpl. Vol.), in determining the amount of any penalty, the Department must give consideration to the seriousness of the violation, 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 violation 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 be less than $100.00 or 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 be a separate violation.

15. In arriving at the civil penalty assessed in this matter, the Department has considered the following:

(a) Seriousness of the Violation:

The Owner/Operator did not ensure that the facility was not on delivery prohibition. The violations impede the Department's regulatory authority over USTs for threats to public health, safety and the environment.

(b) Standard of Care:

The Owner/Operator did not exhibit a standard of care commensurate with applicable regulatory requirements.

(c) Economic Benefit Which Delayed Compliance May Have Conferred:

The Department has been unable to ascertain if there has been a significant economic benefit conferred on the Owner.

(d) Efforts to Minimize or Mitigate the Effects of the Violation Upon the Environment:

There are no known environmental effects as a result of the alleged violations.

(e) History of Previous Violations:

The Owner/Operator does not have a history of previous violations.

(f) Ability to Pay:

The Owner/Operator has not alleged an inability to pay the civil penalty.

(g) Other Factors:

The Department has carefully considered the six statutory penalty factors enumerated in Ala. Code § 22-22A-5(18)c (2006 Rplc. Vol.), as well as the need for timely and effective enforcement, and has concluded that a civil penalty in the amount of $2,500.00 is appropriate, in keeping with a penalty range imposed by the Department for similar violations at other UST facilities, as follows (see attachment A):

Violation Type	Penalty Range for Violation Type
Unauthorized delivery to a facility on delivery prohibition	$100 - $25,000

16. The Owner neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in this Consent Order. However, in an effort to cooperate with the Department and to resolve the alleged violations, the Owner consents to this Consent Order and agrees to abide by the terms herein.

17. The Department agrees to this Consent Order upon a determination that the terms are in the best interests of the citizens of Alabama in resolving the allegations contained herein without the unwarranted expenditure of State resources in further enforcement actions.

ORDER

Whereas the parties desire to resolve and settle the compliance issues cited above, the Department and the Owner consent to the terms and conditions of this Consent Order and agree as follows:

A. Pursuant to Ala. Code § 22-22A-5(18)a.4. (2006 Rplc. Vol.) Ashland Enterprises, Inc. agrees to pay to the Department a civil penalty in the amount of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars for the violations cited herein. Said penalty shall be paid in twelve monthly installments of Two Hundred Eight Dollars and Thirty Four Cents each. The first payment shall be due on the first day of the first month following the effective date of this Order. Failure to pay the civil penalty as ordered shall constitute cause for the Department to file a civil action in the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Alabama. Payments shall be made by Cashier's Check or Money Order, payable to the Alabama Department of Environmental Management, and addressed as follows:

Office of General Counsel
Alabama Department of Environmental Management
P.O. Box 301463
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-1463

B. The parties agree that not later than fifteen days from the effective date of this Consent Order, Owner shall submit to the Department a plan detailing how he will ensure that Delivery Prohibition will not be violated.

C. 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.

D. That, subject to the terms contained herein and subject to provisions otherwise provided by statute, this Consent Order is intended to operate as a full resolution of the violations alleged in this Consent Order.

E. That the Owner is not relieved from any liability upon the failure to comply with any provision of the Consent Order.

F. That, for purposes of this Consent Order only, the Owner agrees that the Department may properly bring an action to compel compliance with the terms and conditions

contained herein in a court of competent jurisdiction, including, but not limited to, Montgomery County Circuit Court. The Owner also agrees that in any action brought by the Department to compel compliance with the terms of this Agreement, the Owner shall be limited to the defenses of compliance with this Agreement, *Force Majeure*, and physical impossibility.

G. The Department and the Owner agree that the sole purpose of this Consent Order is to resolve and dispose of all allegations and contentions stated 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 Owner shall not object to such future orders, litigation or enforcement action based on the issuance of this Consent Order if such actions address new matters not raised in this Consent Order.

H. That this Consent Order shall not affect the Owner's obligation to comply with any Federal, State, or local laws or regulations.

I. 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 hereof shall remain in full force and effect.

J. That any modifications of this Consent Order must be agreed to in writing signed by both parties.

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

(Signature)

OWNER.

(Please Print Name and Title of Authorized Officer)

Dated: 05/19/2010

Lance R. LeFleur,
Director

Dated: _____

ATTACHMENT A

Penalty Calculation Worksheet

Ashland Enterprises, Inc.
1600 Ashland Hwy.
Talladega, AL 35160

Violation*	Number of Violations*	Seriousness of Violation & Base Penalty*	Standard of Care*	History of Previous Violations*
ADEM Admin Code r. 335-6-15-.45(3) states that it shall be unlawful for any regulated substance deliverer to deliver a regulated substance, and it shall be unlawful for owners and operators of UST systems to accept delivery of a regulated substance to a UST facility that is under delivery prohibition.	1	$5,000	$0	$0
Totals:	1	$5,000	$0	$0

Economic Benefit*:	$0
Mitigating Factors:	-$2,500
Ability to Pay*:	$0
Other Factors:	$0

Total Civil Penalty: $2,500

Footnotes

* See the "Findings" of the Order for a detailed description of each violation and the penalty factors