

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD  
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

---

In Re: )  
 )  
Rocky Well Service, Inc. & ) SDWA Appeal Nos. 08-02 & 08-03  
E. J. Klockenkemper )  
 )  
Docket No. SDWA-05-2001-002 )  

---

 )

**APPELLEE'S BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO APPELLANT  
E. J. KLOCKENKEMPER'S REVISED BRIEF  
IN SUPPORT OF HIS AMENDED NOTICE OF APPEAL**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **CASES:**

<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986) .....	28, 30, 53
<i>In re Advanced Elecs., Inc.</i> , 10 E.A.D. 385 (EAB 2002), <i>appeal voluntarily dismissed</i> , No. 02-1868 (7th Cir. May 21, 2003) .....	9
<i>Arbaugh v. Y &amp; H Corp.</i> , 546 U.S. 500 (2006) .....	10
<i>In the Matter of Asbestos Specialists, Inc.</i> , 4 E.A.D. 819 (EAB 1993) .....	22, 23, 24
<i>In re B&amp;R Oil Company</i> , 8 E.A.D. 39 (EAB 1998) .....	52
<i>Barry Aviation Inc. v. Land O'Lakes Municipal Airport Com'n</i> , 377 F.3d 682 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) .	23
<i>Beauty of Flowers v. City of Des Plaines, Illinois</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 37544 (May 22, 2007) .....	25
<i>In re Bil-Dry Corp.</i> , 9 E.A.D. 575 .....	9
<i>In re Billy Yee</i> , 10 E.A.D. 1, at 10 (EAB 2001), <i>pet. dismissed</i> No. 01-2627 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. Jan. 24, 2002) .....	8
<i>In re: B. J. Carney Industries, Inc.</i> , 7 E.A.D. 171 (EAB 1997) .....	51, 52
<i>In re Boliden-Metech, Inc.</i> , 3 E.A.D. 439 (CJO 1990) .....	9
<i>Browning Ferris Industries of Illinois, Inc. v. Ter Maat</i> , 195 F.3d 953 (7th Cir. 1999) .	15, 16, 26
<i>In re The Bullen Companies., Inc.</i> , 9 E.A.D. 620 (EAB 2001) .....	8
<i>In re Carroll Oil Company</i> , Docket No. 8-99-05, 2002 EPA App. LEXIS 14, (July 31, 2002) .....	22, 23, 58, 59
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986) .....	28, 30
<i>Center for Biological Diversity v. United States Fish and Wildlife Service</i> , 453 F.3d 1331 (11th Cir. 2006) .....	46
<i>In re Chempace Corporation</i> , 9 E.A.D. 119 .....	9

*In the Matter of: City of St. Charles, Illinois, a Municipal Corporation operating as St. Charles Wastewater Treatment Facility, Respondent*, Docket No. CWA-04-2008-5192, 2008 EPA ALJ LEXIS 15, (April 8, 2008) . . . . . 22, ftnt. 15

*In re City of Salisbury*, 10 E.A.D. 263, 278-79 (EAB 2002) . . . . . 8

*In re Clarksburg Casket Company*, 8 E.A.D. 496 (EAB 1999) . . . . . 27

*In re: Commercial Cartage Company, Inc.*, 5 E.A.D. 112, (EAB 1994) . . . . . 24

*Corbell v. Southern Illinois Healthcare*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 101386 (December 16, 2008) 24

*Crestview Village Apts. v. U.S. Dept of Housing & Urban Dev.*, 383 F.3d 52 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) . . 23

*In The Matter of Crown Central Petroleum Corp.*, Docket No. CWA-08-2000-06, 2002 EPA ALJ LEXIS 1 (January 8, 2002) . . . . . 49, 50

*In re Dos Republicas Resources Co.*, 6 E.A.D. 643 (EAB 1996) . . . . . 29

*Duthie and Condron v. Matria Healthcare, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84203 (N.D. II E.D. 2008) . . . . . 23

*In re Echevarria*, 5 E.A.D. 626 (EAB 1994) . . . . . 9

*Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. Alexander*, 614 F.2d 474, 477-78 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 919 (1980)) . . . . . 49

*In re Everwood Treatment Co.,*, 6 E.A.D. 589 (EAB 1996), aff'd, No. 96-1159-RV-M (S.D.Ala., Jan. 21, 1998) . . . . . 58

*Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962) . . . . . 21, 22, 23

*In the Matter of Frontier Stone, Inc.*, CAA Docket No. II-95-0105; 1997 EPA ALJ LEXIS 131, (March 10, 1997) . . . . . 45

*General Electric Capital Corporation v. Lease Resolution Corporation*, 128 F.3d 1074 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) . . . . . 24, 29

*Gilbert Martin Woodworking Co. d/b/a Martin Furniture*, Docket No. EPCRA 09-00-0016; 2001 EPA ALJ LEXIS 27 . . . . . 62

*Glazer v. Abercrombie & Kent, Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78337 (October 23, 2007) . . . . . 25

*Goins v. Ajax Metal Processing, Inc.*, 984 F. Supp. 1057 (E.D. Mich. 1997) ..... 29

*In re Green Thumb Nursery, Inc.*, 6 E.A.D. 782 (EAB 1997) ..... 27, 29

*In re: Harmon Electronics, Inc.*, 7 E.A.D. 1 (EAB 1997) ..... 36, 37, 39, 40, 44, 45, 47

*In re J. Phillip Adams*, 13 E.A.D. \_\_\_\_ (EAB 2007) ..... 10

*Klockenkemper v. Fisher*, No. 77-L-24 (Ill. App. April 22, 1997) ..... 53, 54

*Kraft v. United States*, 991 F.2d 292 (6th Cir. 1993) ..... 29

*In re Larry Richner, Nancy Sheepbouwer & Richway Farms*, 10 E.A.D. 619 (EAB 2002) ..... 7

*In re: Lazarus, Inc.*, 7 E.A.D. 318 (EAB 1997) ..... 36, 37, 39, 40, 47

*In re LVI Envtl. Servs.*, 10 E.A.D. 99 (EAB 2001) ..... 7

*Marks v. CDW Computer Centers, Inc.*, 122 F.3d 363 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) ..... 24

*Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574 (1986) ..... 28, 29

*In re Mayaguez Reg'l Sewage Treatment Plant*, 4 E.A.D. 772 (EAB 1993),  
*aff'd sub nom. Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Auth. V. EPA*, 35 F.3d 600 (1st Cir. 1994),  
*cert denied*, 513 U.S. 1148 (1995) ..... 29

*McMillian v. Collection Professionals, Inc.*, 455 F.3d 754 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006) ..... 24

*In The Matter of Minnesota Metal Finishing, Inc.*, Docket No. RCRA-05-2005-0013, 2007 EPA  
ALJ LEXIS 1 (January 9, 2007) ..... 23, fnt. 15, 49

*Morgan v. Koch*, 419 F.2d 993 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1969) ..... 49

*Nevada v. United States*, 463 U.S. 110 (1983) ..... 49

*In re Newell Recycling Co.*, 8 E.A.D. 598 (EAB1999) ..... 51, 52, 53

*In re Ocean State Asbestos Removal*, 7 E.A.D. 522 (EAB 1998) ..... 8, 9

*Philadelphia's Church of Our Savior v. Concord Township*, No. 03-1766; 2004 U.S.  
Dist. LEXIS 1941 (D.C. Pa.) (February 4, 2004)) ..... 26, fnt 16

*In re Port of Oakland and Great Lakes Dredge and Dock Company*, 4 E.A.D. 170 (EAB 1992) ..... 22, 23

*In re Phoenix Construction Services, Inc.*, 11 E.A.D. 379 (EAB 2004) ..... 59

*In re Predex Corp.*, 7 E.A.D. 591 (EAB 1998) ..... 59

*In re Roger Antkiewicz & Pest Elimination Products of America*, 8 E.A.D. 218 (EAB 1999) ... 8

*In the Matter of Sandoz, Inc.*, 2 E.A.D. 324 (CJO 1987) ..... 8

*Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232 (1974) ..... 24

*Schiel v. Commissioner*, 855 F.2d 364, 367 (6th Cir. 1988) ..... 53

*In the Matter of: Service Oil, Inc.*, Docket No. CWA-08-2005-0010; 2006 EPA ALJ LEXIS 15, (April 10, 2006) ..... 23, fnt. 15

*In the Matter of Sunbeam Water Company, Inc.*, Docket No. 10-97-0066-SDWA, EPA ALJ LEXIS 79 (October 28, 1999) ..... 17, fnnts. 11 and 12, 25, 26, fnt. 16, 67

*In re Tifa Ltd.*, 9 E.A.D. 145 (EAB 2000) ..... 9

*United States of America v. Alisal Water Corporation*, 114 F. Supp. 2d 927, (N.D. Ca. San Jose Div. 2000) ..... 12, 15, fnt. 6, 26, 67

*U.S. v. Anderson*, 923 F.2d 450 (6th Cir. 1988) ..... 53

*United States v. Arkwright, Inc.*, 690 F. Supp. 1133 (D.N.H. 1988) ..... 52

*U.S. v. Arrow Transp. Co.*, 658 F.2d 392 (5th Cir. 1981) ..... 49

*United States v. Bestfoods*, 524 U.S. 51 (1998) ..... 15, 16

*United States v. City of Toledo*, 867 F. Supp. 603, 607 (N.D. Ohio 1994) ..... 52

*United States of America v. LaSalle Bank*, 2008 U.S. LEXIS 60756 (July 29, 2008) ..... 24

*United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 584, 586, 61 S. Ct. 767, 769 (1941) ..... 46, fnt. 28

*In re: V-1 Oil Company*, 8 E.A.D. 729 (EAB 2000) ..... 51, 58

*Wathen v. General Electric Co.*, 115 F.3d 400 (6th Cir. 1997) ..... 28

*In the Matter of Wayne Vaughn, Sr., Wayne Vaughn, Jr., and Carriage Homes, Respondents,*  
Docket No. CWA-9-2001-0002, 2002 EPA ALJ LEXIS 43, (July 25, 2002) . . . . . 23, ftnt. 15

*In the Matter of Wego Chemical & Mineral Corporation,* 4 E.A.D. 513  
(February 24, 1993) . . . . . 22, ftnt. 14

**FEDERAL STATUTES:**

15 U.S.C. § 2605(e)(2)(A) . . . . . 37, 39

16 U.S.C. § 1533(b)(6)(A) . . . . . 46

16 U.S.C. § 1533(b)(6)(C)(ii) . . . . . 46

28 U.S.C. § 2461 . . . . . 60, ftnt. 32

28 U.S.C. § 2462 . . . . . 36, 48

33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(1) . . . . . 10

42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1) . . . . . 10, ftnt. 5

Section 3004 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6924 . . . . . 36, 37, ftnt. 21, 39, ftnt. 23

Section 3008 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6928 . . . . . 40

Section 3010 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6930 . . . . . 44

Section 1401(12) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300f(12) . . . . . 11, 13

Section 1412(b)(1)(B)(i)(III), U.S.C. §§ 300g-1(b)(1)(B)(i)(III) . . . . . 12, ftnt. 6

Section 1414(b), 42 U.S.C. § 300g-3(b) . . . . . 12, ftnt. 6

Section 1421(b)(1)(A) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h(b)(1)(A) . . . . . 38

Section 1421(b)(1)(D) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h(b)(1)(D) . . . . . 20

Section 1422 of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-1 . . . . . 38

Section 1422(b)(3) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-1(b)(3) . . . . . 11, 34

Section 1423(a) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(a) .....	11
Section 1423(a)(1) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(a)(1) .....	34
Section 1423(b) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(b) .....	40
Section 1423(c) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(c) .....	2, 5, 11
Section 1423(c)(2) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(c)(2) .....	40
Section 1423(c)(4)(B) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(c)(4)(B) .....	55
Section 1423(c)(7) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(c)(7) .....	12, ftnt. 6
Section 1423(d) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-2(d) .....	20
Section 1425(c) of the SDWA, 42 U.S.C. § 300h-4(c) .....	11, 34

**STATE STATUTES AND ACTS:**

225 Ill. Consol. Stat. § 725/8a .....	12
225 Ill. Consol. Stat. § 725/26 .....	12, ftnt. 8
Ill. Rev. Stat. Ch. 96 ½, Section 5456 .....	12, ftnt. 8

**FEDERAL REGULATIONS:**

40 C.F.R. Part 22 .....	27
40 C.F.R. § 22.14(c) .....	21
40 C.F.R. § 22.20(a) .....	23, 27
40 C.F.R. § 22.22(c) .....	62, ftnt. 34
40 C.F.R. § 22.24(a) .....	8
40 C.F.R. § 22.24(b) .....	8

40 C.F.R. § 22.30 .....	7
40 C.F.R. § 22.30(a)(2) .....	1
40 C.F.R. § 22.30(f) .....	7
40 C.F.R. Part 142 .....	18, 41
40 C.F.R. Part 144 .....	18
40 C.F.R. § 144.5(b)-8 .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 144.11 .....	41
40 C.F.R. §§ 144.11-144.14 .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 144.12 .....	41
40 C.F.R. § 144.12(a) .....	18
40 C.F.R. §§ 144.21-144.26 .....	19
40 C.F.R. §§ 144.31-144.36 .....	19
40 C.F.R. §§ 144.38-144.40 .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 144.51 .....	18
40 C.F.R. § 144.51(q) .....	18, 42
40 C.F.R. Part 145 .....	18
40 C.F.R. § 145.1(c) .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 145.1(f) .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 145.1(g)(1) .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 145.11(a) .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 145.13(a) .....	19
40 C.F.R. § 147.701 .....	19

40 C.F.R. § 147.701(a)(1) ..... 12

**STATE CODES:**

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62, Part 240 ..... 1

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62, § 240.10 ..... 12

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62, § 240.150 ..... 12, 34

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62 § 240.760 ..... 2, 13

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62 § 240.760(e) ..... 3

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62 § 240.760(e)(6) ..... 3, 43, 45, 47

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62 § 240.760(f) ..... 43, 47

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62 § 240.760(f)(1) ..... 45

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62 § 240.760(h) ..... 44

Ill. Admin. Code Title 62 § 240.780(e) ..... 2, 13, 65

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

*BLACKS LAW DICTIONARY* 787 (5th ed. 1979) ..... 49, 51 fnt. 30

J. Moore, W. Taggart & J. Wicker, *Moore's Federal Practice* (2d. ed. 1987) ..... 27

Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ..... 27, 28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. AUTHORITY ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 1

III. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES ON APPEAL ..... 6

IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW ..... 7

V. ARGUMENT ..... 9

A. The Regional Judicial Officers Had Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Appellee’s Claim Against Appellant EJK For His Violations of the SDWA and The Illinois UIC Program Authorized Under the SDWA ..... 9

B. Corporate Officer Can Be Found Directly, Individually Liable for Violations of the SDWA and Its Regulations Authorized Under the SDWA ..... 14

    1. Federal Case Law Illustrates That Corporate Officers Who Act As Operators Can Be Found Directly, Individually Liable For Violations of the SDWA And Its Regulations ..... 14

    2. The Illinois UIC Program, Approved Under the SDWA, Must Include *Operators* as *Persons* Who Can be Found Liable for Violations of the Approved State Regulations and the SDWA ..... 17

C. RJO Kossek Correctly Granted Appellee’s Motion to Amend the Complaint In Her 2/6/03 Order ..... 20

    1. RJO Kossek Had Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Appellee’s Claim Against Appellant EJK ..... 20

    2. Amendment of Complaint Was Appropriate, as Appellee’s Claim Against Appellant EJK Was Not Futile ..... 21

        a. Permissive Amendment Policy Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a), As Modified By Factors in the Supreme Court’s *Foman* Case ..... 21

        b. Futility of Amendment Examined Under Motion to Dismiss Standards . 23

c.	Appellee Raised a Colorable Claim Against Appellant Appellant, Alleging Direct, Individual Liability As An Operator For His Violations of the SDWA And the Illinois MIT Regulations . . . . .	25
D.	RJO Kossek Correctly Denied Appellant EJK’s Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint in Her 5/3/05 Order Because Appellee/Complainant Presented a Colorable Claim Against Appellant . . . . .	26
E.	RJO Toney Correctly Granted Appellee’s Partial Motion for Accelerated Decision, Finding Appellant EJK Liable For SDWA and Illinois UIC Program Violations, in Her 12/27/06 Order . . . . .	27
1.	Appellant EJKs Challenges to the Basic Facts Cannot Defeat RJO Toney’s Finding of Appellant Klockenkenkemper’s Direct Individual Liability . . . . .	27
2.	Affirmative Defenses Cannot Defeat RJO Toney’s Finding of Appellant Klockenkenkemper’s Direct Individual Liability . . . . .	33
a.	Proper Federal Notice of Violation Issued To Appellant EJK; Second Affirmative Defense Based on Alleged Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction, Properly Rejected By the RJO . . . . .	33
b.	Claims Against Appellant EJK For Violations of the Illinois Mechanical Integrity Testing Requirements and the SDWA, Not Barred By Statute of Limitations; Eleventh Affirmative Defense Properly Rejected by RJO . . . . .	35
c.	The Equitable Doctrine of Laches Does Not Apply To Shield Appellant EJK From Being Found Liable For His Violations of the Illinois UIC Program Requirements and the SDWA; Fourth Affirmative Defense Properly Rejected by the RJO . . . . .	49
d.	Equitable Estoppel/Estoppel en Pais Does Not Apply To Shield Appellant EJK From Being Found Liable For His Violations of the Illinois UIC Program Requirements and the SDWA; Third Affirmative Defense Properly Rejected by the RJO . . . . .	51
e.	Selective Enforcement Does Not Apply To Shield Appellant EJK From Being Found Liable For His Violations of the Illinois UIC Program Requirements and the SDWA; Twelveth Affirmative Defense Properly Rejected by the RJO . . . . .	52

f.	Impossibility Defense Does Not Apply To Shield Appellant EJK From Liability For His Violations of the Illinois UIC Program Requirements and the SDWA; Fourteenth Affirmative Defense Properly Rejected by the RJO .....	53
F.	RJO Toney Correctly Determined that Appellants were Jointly Responsible for a \$105,590 Civil Penalty for Their Violations of the SDWA, and the Illinois UIC Program, Authorized Under the SDWA, in her 7/23/08 Post-Hearing Order .....	55
1.	RJO Toney Assessed The Civil Penalty In This Matter, Based Upon the Evidence in the Record And In Accordance With the Penalty Criteria Set Forth In the SDWA .....	55
a.	The RJO Properly Evaluated the High Level of Seriousness of Appellant EJK’s MIT Violations .....	56
b.	The RJO Properly Focused Upon the Correct Method Of Calculating The Penalty In This Case .....	59
c.	Respondents’ “Expert” Witness Did Not Provide Credible Testimony With Regard To An Appropriate Penalty in This Matter .....	61
d.	Appellant EJK Did Not Display Good Faith Efforts That Warranted A Larger Reduction in the Penalty .....	64
e.	The Penalty For Appellant EJK’s Failure to Report Violations Was Properly Assessed In This Case .....	65
f.	A Joint Penalty Was Properly Assessed Against Both Appellants .....	67
G.	Appellant EJK Was Afforded A Fair Hearing .....	68
VI.	CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....	70