	Date is a
	FILED
PATRICIA M. O'TOOLE, State Bar No. 1 THE O'TOOLE LAW FIRM	
P. O. Box 352348	2008 JAN - 3 PM 2: 24
Los Angeles, California 90035-0260 Felephone: (213) 630-4200	U.S. EPA. REGION IX REGIONAL HEARING CLERK
Facsimile: (213) 683-1148	
Attorney for Respondent J.S. POLE COMPANY, INC.	
S. I OLE COMI ANI, INC.	
PEEO	RE THE
	MENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
	GION IX
n the Matter of:	Docket No. CAA-09-2007-0031
J.S. POLE COMPANY, INC.,	NOTICE OF MOTION AND
	MOTION TO EXTEND TIME
Respondent	TO ANSWER COMPLAINT AND REQUEST OPPORTUNITY
nespondent	FOR HEARING; DECLARATION
	OF PATRICIA M. O'TOOLE
	/
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Resp	pondent U.S. Pole Company, Inc. will move the
Regional Judicial Officer of the United St	ates Environmental Protection Agency –
Region IX to enter an Order further exter	nding the time for Respondent (i) to answer the
complaint filed by the United States Envi	ironmental Protection Agency – Region IX
	est a hearing, for an additional 30 days until
February 6, 2008.	
This Motion is brought pursuant to	0 40 CFR §22.7(b), governing motions
	ely thereunder as the Complaint in this matter
	ondent's answer and request for hearing is due
on January 7, 2008.	and the second and to queet for neuring is une
	requested extension of time in this case
	been engaged in settlement discussions since
and the second of the second s	been engaged in settlement discussions since

-1 -

28 the service of the Complaint; (2) on November 6, 2007, EPA-IX and Respondent reached

an agreement in principle on the terms of a settlement of all allegations set forth in the 2 Complaint, including the monetary component of such settlement; (3) the parties have 3 been working collaboratively and diligently on issues relating to assurance of Respondent's continued compliance with and/or exemption from the requirements of 40 4 CFR 63.1500 et seq. in the future, including the testing of various compliance options, 5 but need additional time to finalize the details of a plan for compliance assurance under 6 the particular circumstances of Respondent's operations; (4) the parties also need additional time to document the settlement properly and to obtain all required approvals; and (5) requiring Respondent to prepare and file an answer and request for hearing by January 7, 2008 would, under these circumstances, impose an unnecessary burden on Respondent and require an unnecessary allocation of resources for both Respondent and EPA-IX to prepare for a hearing that is unlikely to occur.

Therefore, Respondent is moving for a further extension of 30 days, until February 6, 2008, to file an answer and request a hearing in this matter.

On December 26, 2007, counsel for EPA-IX, Mr. Daniel Reich, contacted Respondent's counsel to discuss this Motion, and Mr. Reich confirmed that EPA-IX concurs in Respondent's motion for an additional 30-day extension of time to answer the Complaint and request a hearing.

This Motion is based on this Notice, the attached Declaration of Patricia M. O'Toole, all pleadings and papers on file in this action, and on such further evidence and arguments as may be presented in any hearing on this Motion.

- 2 -

January 2, 2008

## THE O'TOOLE LAW FIRM

BY:

Patricia M. O'Toole Attorney for Respondent U.S. Pole Company, Inc.

1

7

# DECLARATION OF PATRICIA M. O'TOOLE

I, Patricia M. O'Toole declare:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1. I am an attorney admitted to practice before all the Courts of the State of California, the United States District Court for the Central District of California, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and I am the attorney representing the Respondent, U.S. Pole Company, Inc. ("Respondent"), in this matter. I am familiar with the following facts from my personal observations and experience and, if called as a witness, I would and could testify as follows:

2. The United States Environmental Protection Agency – Region IX ("EPA-IX") served a Complaint in this matter on U.S. Pole on October 9, 2007.

3. EPA-IX and Respondent have been engaged in settlement discussions since the service of the Complaint.

4. On November 6, 2007, EPA-IX and Respondent reached an agreement in principle on the terms of a settlement of all allegations set forth in the Complaint, including the monetary component of such settlement.

5. The parties have been working collaboratively and diligently on issues relating to assurance of Respondent's continued compliance with and/or exemption from the requirements of 40 CFR 63.1500 *et seq.* in the future, including the testing of various compliance options to ensure that only "clean charge" (as defined in 40 CFR 63.1500 *et seq.*) is used in Respondent's operations. However, the parties need additional time to finalize the details of a plan for compliance assurance under the particular circumstances of Respondent's operations.

<sup>23</sup>
 6. The parties also need additional time to document the settlement properly and to
 <sup>24</sup>
 <sup>24</sup> obtain all required approvals.

25
25
26
26
26
27
27
27
28
29
29
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
25
26
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
27
<

28

8.

Requiring Respondent to prepare and file an answer and request for hearing by

-1 -

January 7, 2008 would, under these circumstances, impose an unnecessary burden on
 Respondent and require an unnecessary allocation of resources for both Respondent and
 EPA-IX to prepare for a hearing that is unlikely to occur.

9. On December 26, 2007, counsel for EPA-IX, Mr. Daniel Reich, contacted
Respondent's counsel to discuss this Motion, and Mr. Reich confirmed that EPA-IX
concurs in Respondent's motion for an additional 30-day extension of time to answer the
Complaint and request a hearing.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of January 2008 at Los Angeles, California.

Patricia M. O'Toole

## PROOF OF SERVICE

### United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX

## IN RE U.S. POLE COMPANY, INC. Docket No. CAA-09-2007-0031

#### STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and am not a party to the within action. My business address is The O'Toole Law Firm, P. O. Box 352348, Los Angeles, California 90035-0260.

On November 6, 2007, I served the foregoing documents described as Notice of Motion and Motion to Extend Time to Answer Complaint and Request Opportunity for Hearing; Declaration of Patricia M. O'Toole on the following parties and interested persons at the following addresses:

## Daniel Reich, Esq. Office of Regional Counsel U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street, ORC-2 San Francisco, CA 94105

BY OVERNIGHT COURIER: I placed a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope and deposited such envelope with Federal Express at Los Angeles, California, with delivery charges thereon fully prepaid.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on January 2, 2008 at Los Angeles, California.

Patricia M. O'Toole

SIGNATURE: Daturia M. O. Toole