



4. The following references and acronyms are used in this 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
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOV	Notice of Violation
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
QCP	ADEM-recognized Qualified Credentialed Professional
UT	Unnamed Tributary

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 March 21, 2016, the Operator submitted to the Department an NOI requesting NPDES coverage under NPDES General Permit ALR100000 (hereinafter "Permit") for regulated disturbance activities and discharges of treated stormwater from the Facility. The Department granted authorization ALR109242 to the Operator on June 9, 2016. General Permit ALR100000 is scheduled to expire on March 31, 2021.

7. Pursuant to Part III. A. of the Permit, the Permittee shall design, install, and maintain effective erosion controls 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. D.

8. Pursuant to Part III. D. 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. The Department, during inspections of the Facility on August 8, 2019, February 6, 2020, and July 1, 2020, observed and documented that the Operator had not properly implemented and maintained effective BMPs, although NPDES construction activity had commenced and was continuing, in violation of Parts III. A. and D. of the Permit.

10. Pursuant to Part III. H. 3. of the Permit, the Permittee shall promptly take all reasonable steps to remove, to the maximum extent practical, pollutants deposited in the UT to Hurricane Branch within The Preserve.

11. During the August 8, 2019, February 6, 2020, and July 1, 2020 inspections, significant accumulations of sediment resulting from discharges at the Facility were observed and documented by the Department in the UT to Hurricane Branch within The Preserve, in violation of Part III. H. 3. of the Permit.

12. Pursuant to Part 1. 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 in the turbidity of the receiving water by more than fifty (50) NTUs above background.

13. During the inspection of the Facility on August 8, 2019, the Department analyzed water samples collected from the discharge of the Facility that indicated a turbidity of 1.41 NTUs, upstream of the Facility in an UT to Hurricane Branch, and a turbidity of 309 NTUs downstream from the Facility discharge. The turbidity samples resulted in an increase of 307.59 NTUs, in violation of Part I. C. 10. of the Permit.

14. During the inspection of the Facility on July 1, 2020, the Department analyzed water samples collected from the discharge of the Facility that indicated a turbidity of 69.7 NTUs, upstream of the Facility in an UT to Hurricane Branch, and a turbidity of 172 NTUs downstream from the Facility discharge. The turbidity samples resulted in an increase of 102.3 NTUs, in violation of Part I. C. 10. of the Permit.

15. On August 26, 2019, a NOV was sent to the Operator by the Department as a result of the August 8, 2019, inspection. The NOV notified the Operator of deficiencies documented at the Facility, and required the Operator to submit to the Department 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. The Department received a response from the Operator on September 12, 2019 stating corrective measures that would be implemented to correct the noted violations.

16. On February 18, 2020, a Non-Compliance letter was sent to the Operator by the Department as a result of the February 6, 2020 inspection. The Non-Compliance letter notified the Operator of continuing non-compliance with the August 26, 2019 NOV. The Department received a response from the Operator on March 25, 2020 stating corrective measures that would be implemented to correct the noted violations.

17. On July 19, 2020, a NOV was sent to the Operator by the Department as a result of the July 1, 2020 inspection. The NOV notified the Operator of deficiencies documented at the Facility.

18. The Operator neither admits nor denies the Department's allegations. The Operator consents to abide by the terms of this Consent Order and to pay the civil penalty assessed herein.

19. The Department has agreed to the terms of this Consent Order in an effort to resolve the violations cited herein without the unwarranted expenditure of State resources in further prosecuting the above alleged violations. The Department has determined that the terms contemplated in this Consent Order are in the best interests of the citizens of Alabama.

#### THE DEPARTMENT'S 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 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 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: Considering the general nature of the violations, the magnitude and duration of the violations, their effects, if any on impaired waters, and lack of any available evidence of irreparable harm to the environment or threat to the public, the Department determined the base penalty to be \$34,000.00.

B. THE STANDARD OF CARE: In considering this factor, the Department noted the substantial off-site environmental impacts to adjacent property. In consideration of the standard of care by the Operator, the Department enhanced the penalty by \$17,000.00.

C. ECONOMIC BENEFIT WHICH DELAYED COMPLIANCE MAY HAVE CONFERRED: The Operator has delayed certain costs associated with maintaining proper BMPs. In consideration of the economic benefit to the Operator, the Department enhanced the penalty by an additional \$900.00.

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 has documented previous violations at the Facility and has accounted for this in an enhanced penalty amount that was included in item B above.

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

G. OTHER FACTORS: 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.

H. The civil penalty is summarized in Attachment 1.

#### USS REAL ESTATE'S CONTENTIONS

20. The NOI submitted to the Department by USS Real Estate and the CBMPP prepared and certified by a QCP identify Hurricane Branch as the receiving stream for discharges of

stormwater from the Facility. There is no evidence of any sediment accumulation or other impacts to Hurricane Branch or any other location offsite of The Preserve.

21. Following the Department's August 8, 2019 inspection, the Department conducted its next site inspection on January 10, 2020 and noted no significant deficiencies.

Subsequently, while Department travel was limited as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, it requested Spectrum Environmental ("Spectrum"), which conducts monthly QCP inspections at The Preserve, to conduct an inspection in April, 2020. Spectrum did so on April 20, 2020, and submitted a QCP inspection report and Certification dated April 23, 2020, again documenting that the site was in compliance.

22. The Department's February 6, 2020 inspection was conducted in the midst of a rain event that exceeded the 2-year, 24-hour design storm event for Jefferson County. Specifically, Jefferson County experienced 1.01 inches of rainfall during the evening of February 5, followed by an additional 4.3 inches of rainfall on February 6, the day of the Department's inspection. Total accumulation of 5.31 inches during this 24-hour period is in excess of the 2-yr, 24-hour design event, which is based on rainfall of 4.21 inches. Thus, BMPs would not be expected to perform as designed under these circumstances, and BMP failures are not violations.

22. Following the Department's July 1, 2020 inspection, Spectrum performed its routine monthly QCP inspection and documented that required BMPs were in place and the site stabilized.

23. USS Real Estate has agreed to the terms of this Consent Order in an effort to address the alleged violations, to avoid the expense and distraction of litigation, and without the admission of wrongdoing or the admission or denial of any allegations contained herein.

#### 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 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 \$26,900.00 in settlement of the violations alleged herein within forty-five (45) days after issuance of this Consent Order. Failure to pay the civil penalty within forty-five (45) days after issuance 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 the Operator shall, within five (5) days from the date of issuance of this Consent Order, have a QCP perform a comprehensive inspection of the Facility, offsite conveyances, and affected State waters.

E. That the Operator shall, within ten (10) days from the date of issuance of this Consent Order, submit to the Department the results of the QCP comprehensive inspection and a plan to return the Facility, offsite conveyances, and affected State waters to compliance with Permit requirements.

F. That the Operator shall, within thirty (30) days from the date of issuance of this Consent Order, 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.

G. That, within seven days of the completion of the activities required in paragraph F 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 General Permit ALR100000 have been implemented, all deficiencies have been corrected, and full compliance with the requirements of NPDES General Permit ALR100000, has been achieved at the Facility, offsite conveyances, and affected State waters.

H. 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.

I. 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.

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

K. 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 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.

L. 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.

M. 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 same.

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

O. 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 (30) days within which to comment on the Consent Order.

P. 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.

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

R. 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.

USS REAL ESTATE



(Signature of Authorized Representative)

JAMMIE P COWDEN

(Print Name of Authorized Representative)

DIRECTOR - REAL ESTATE

Title

Date Signed: 2/24/21

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lance R. LeFleur  
Director

Date Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT 1 - PENALTY SYNOPSIS

USS Real Estate - The Preserve    Hoover, Jefferson County    NPDES ALR109242

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	3	\$9,000	\$4,500	
Discharge/accumulation of sediment offsite	3	\$15,000	\$7,500	
Water Quality Standard violation	2	\$10,000	\$5,000	
Totals:	8	\$34,000	\$17,000	
Economic Benefit*:				\$900
Sub-Total:				\$51,900
Mitigating Factors*:				
Ability to Pay*:				
Other Factors*:				
Amount of Initial Penalty:				\$51,900
Total Adjustments:				-\$25,000
Final Penalty:				\$26,900

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