RECEIVED U.S. E.P.A.

2011 NOV 19 AN 8: 3

In the Matter of: Allen Barry & Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock CWA Appeal No. 11-07 Docket No.: CWA-05-2010-0008.

ENVIR. APPEALS BOARD

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING AND SERVICE (Page 1 of 2)

I hereby certify that today I faxed a copy and mailed for filing the original and three copies of Complainant's RESPONSE TO MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER ELECTING TO EXERCISE SUA SPONTE REVIEW AND PENALTY ORDER and this Certificate to:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Clerk of the Board, Environmental Appeals Board (1103B) Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, D.C. 20460-0001 202-233-0121 FAX

I also faxed and then mailed a copy of the documents by certified mail, return receipt-requested, to:

Michael F. Iasparro, Esq. Hinshaw & Culberton LLP 100 Park Ave. P.O. Box 1389 Rockford, IL 61105-1389 815-490-4901 FAX

I mailed a copy of the documents to:

Honorable Barbara A. Gunning U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Administrative Law Judges Mail Code 1900L/Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20460

Page 1 of 2

November 16, 2011

Donald E. Ayres

Received 11-16-2011

From-EPA

16:34

Opt-Out: *********

To-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL

In the Matter of: Allen Barry & Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock CWA Appeal No. 11-07 Docket No.: CWA-05-2010-0008.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING AND SERVICE (Page 2 of 2)

I also delivered two copies of the documents by hand to:

LaDawn Whitehead Regional Hearing Clerk (E-19J) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 77 W. Jackson Boulevard Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Dated: November 16, 2011

Donald E. Ayres Paralegal Specialist ORC5 MM 2-4 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 312-353-6719

Page 2 of 2

Received 11-16-2011 16:34

6:34

From-EPA

Opt-Out: ********

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

NOV 1 5 2011

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF: C-14J

<u>VIA FAX AND U.S. MAIL</u>

Clerk of the Environmental Appeals Board Mail Code 1103B U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1200 Pennsylvania Avc., NW Washington, D.C. 20460 202-233-0121 FAX

Re: In the Matter of: Allen Barry and Mr. Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock CWA Appeal No. 11-07; Docket No. CWA-05-2010-0008

Dear Clerk:

Enclosed please find Complainant's Response to Respondents' Motion to Reconsider Order Electing to Exercise Sua Sponte Review and Penalty Order to be filed with respect to the above matter. Once filed, please return a file-stamped copy in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours, Luis Oviedo

- Assistant Regional Counsel

Enclosures

Opt-Out: *******

From-EPA

From: (3128860747)

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Mr. Allen Barry, Mr. Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock, 1448 Route 72 East Leaf River, IL 61010 CWA Appeal No. 11-07

Docket No. CWA-05-2010-0008

Respondents.

COMPLAINANT'S RESPONSE TO MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER ELECTING TO EXERCISE SUA SPONTE REVIEW AND PENALTY ORDER

The United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 (U.S. EPA or Complainant), through its undersigned attorncy, hereby submits its Response to Respondents' Motion to Reconsider Order Electing to Exercise Sua Sponte Review and Penalty Order, issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Environmental Appeals Board ("EAB") in this case, and in support thereof states as follows:

BACKGROUND

Over a year ago, on October 1, 2010, Respondents filed a Joint Appearance and Answer in this case. Subsequently, Administrative Law Judge Barbara A. Gunning (ALJ) entered two Orders to Show Cause against Respondents for failure to comply with various deadlines, including the failure to comply with the prehearing exchange deadlines or, in the alternative, to request an extension of time. Even after Respondents' second counsel of record in this case filed his appearance in August 2010, and despite being aware of the extensions and deadlines, neither Respondents nor their counsel participated in the proceedings or complied with the

Opt-Out: *********

Received 11-16-2011 16:34

From-EPA

orders. On September 9, 2011, the ALJ entered her Default Order and Initial Decision upholding the Complainant's assessment of a \$75,000 penalty for Clean Water Act NPDES permit violations in this case. On October 21, 2011, Respondents' third and most recent counsel filed his Appearance and their Motion to Set Aside the Default Order and Initial Decision (Motion to Set Aside). Complainant filed a written response to the motion on October 25, 2011. A copy of that response and its supporting exhibits is attached. On October 27, 2011, the EAB cited the 45-day time limitation in 40 C.F.R. § 22.27(c) within which it may elect to exercise sua sponte review, and on that 45th day filed its Order Electing to Exercise Sua Sponte Review and Penalty Order. The Order affirmed the ALJ's Default Order and Initial Decision in all respects, save for addressing an inconsistency in the application of the rules for Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation. On November 2, 2011, the ALJ entered an Order dismissing the case due to lack of jurisdiction,

ARGUMENT

Respondents' Motion is, in effect, a motion to reconsider a final order and is properly brought pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.32. 40 C.F.R. §22.32 requires that a Motion to reconsider a final order must be filed within 10 days after service of the final order. The EAB order is a final order pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §22.30(f). The EAB transmitted the final order to Respondents' counsel on October 27, 2011 by fax and First Class U.S. Mail. Respondents' Motion was filed November 9, 2011, more than ten days after service. Respondents' Motion, therefore, is untimely.

Respondents' argue that they had 10 days from the date of filing of Complainant's Response to the Motion to Set Aside in which to file a Reply, and claim that had it not been for

2

From-EPA

16:24

Opt-Out: **********

TO-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL

the EAB's Order and the ALJ's ensuing Dismissal, they would have filed such a reply. Respondents did not attach a copy of any reply to their Motion. And, just as they failed to do in their Motion to Set Aside, they did not attach any supporting exhibits.

Next, the Respondents ask the EAB to reconsider the issuance of its Order Electing Sua Sponte Review and Penalty Order and/or stay the effective date of such order until the ALJ issues a ruling on Respondents' Motion to Set Aside. The Rules at 40 C.F.R. §22.32 provide that a motion for reconsideration shall not stay the effective date of the final order, unless so ordered by the EAB. The relief requested by Respondents is, at least in part, contrary to the Rule.

Essentially, Respondents argue that because they may have possibly intended to file a reply to Complainant's Response to their Motion to Set Aside, the EAB should place itself in a position where it is precluded by the 45-day time window of 40 C.F.R. § 22.27(c) from electing sua sponte review. Their arguments are consistent with Respondents' ongoing pattern of delay and disregard for the rules, to the prejudice of all other parties. Moreover, from October 25, 2011 (the date Complainant filed its Response to the Motion to Set Aside) until November 2, 2011 (the date of the ALJ's Order dismissing the case due to lack of jurisdiction), the Respondents had no less than eight (8) days to take some action. Respondents did nothing until an additional seven (7) days later, after they received the ALJ's Order of dismissal. Respondents' Motion requests an outcome that prejudices the Complainant for having filed a Response to their Motion to Set Aside, and is contrary to judicial efficiency.

3

From--EPA

Opt-Out: *********

CONCLUSION

Respondents' requests in its instant Motion are consistent with its pattern and practice, contrary to judicial efficiency, prejudices the Complainant, and are in disregard of the Part 22 Consolidated Rules of Practice and the orders issued in this case. Accordingly, Complainant respectfully requests that the Court deny Respondents' Motion to Reconsider Order Electing to Exercise Sua Sponte Review and Penalty Order.

Respectfully submitted. Luis Oviedo

Associate Regional Counsel U.S. EPA, Region 5 (C-14J) 77 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL 60604

4

Received 11-16-2011 16:34

Opt-Out: *********

From-EPA

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCYS Frequency Region 5

IN THE MATTER OF:

Mr. Allen Barry, Mr. Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock, Docket No. CWA-05-2010-008

Respondents.

Hon. Barbara A. Gunning

COMPLAINANT'S RESPONSE TO MOTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT ORDER AND INITIAL DECISION

The United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 (U.S. EPA or Complainant), through its undersigned attorney, hereby submits its Response to Respondents' Motion to Set Aside the Default Order and Initial Decision of Administrative Law Judge Barbara A. Gunning ("ALJ") in this case, and in support thereof states as follows:

Respondents owned and operated a livestock confined animal feeding operation (CAFO) that failed to comply with the terms of its NPDES Permit No. IL0067229 and an administrative order for compliance issued by Complainant on October 17, 2007. The Complaint alleged that the Complainant documented through multiple inspections that, between March 27, 2007 and February 19, 2002, Respondent discharged pollutants from its facility to a tributary of Mill Creek, a waters of the United States as listed in Respondents' NPDES Permit. Complainant proposed a total penalty of \$75,000.

On October 1, 2010 Respondents filed a Joint Appearance and Answer through Attorney James Meason, but did not request a hearing or assert an inability to pay. On January 25, 2011, Complainant filed its status report on settlement, pursuant to the ALJ's order, reporting that Respondents had failed to engage in discussions per the deadlines set in that order. An Order to

16:34

From-EPA

Opt-Out: **********

To: 2022330121

Show Cause was entered against Respondents on January 31, 2011 for failure to comply with the tribunal's order of November 30, 2010. After their response, the tribunal issued a new order allowing the parties time to hold and report on settlement discussions. Respondent was, again, unresponsive and ultimately the parties did not reach settlement. A pre-hearing order was issued on March 30, 2011 with strict deadlines and consequences. Complainant complied with all deadlines. Respondent did not file anything, not even a request for extension of time. On July 6, 2011, the tribunal issued a second Order to Show Cause against Respondents. Respondents filed a Joint Answer to the Order to Show Cause, and the ALJ in this case allowed them yet additional time to comply with the filing of their prehearing exchange or present a signed consent agreement and final order. On August 9, 2011, Attorney David Smith filed his appearance in this case, and despite being aware of the extensions and deadlines, both Respondents and their counsel still failed to participate in the proceedings and comply with the orders. On September 9, 2011, after two orders to show cause and prolonged and chronic non-compliance with the rules of these proceedings, the tribunal entered its Default Order and Initial Decision upholding the Complainants' assessment of a \$75,000 penalty in this case. On October 21, 2011, Complainant was served with Respondents' Motion to Set Aside Default Order and Initial Decision in this case.

Failure to Show Good Cause

According to the Consolidated Rules, when the Presiding Officer finds that a default has occurred, she "shall issue a default order against the defaulting party as to any or all parts of the proceeding unless the record shows good cause why a default order should not be issued. 40 C.F.R. §22.17(c). Under EPA precedent, a "good cause" determination, predicate to finding a

4

Opt-Out: ********

From-EPA

party in default, takes the "totality of the circumstances" into consideration. In re Pyramid Chemical Company, 11 E.A.D. 657, 661 (EAB 2004). The Environmental Appeals Board has considered a number of factors under the "totality of the circumstances" test including the nature of the procedural omission prompting the default and whether there exists a valid excuse or justification for not complying with the procedural requirement. In re JHNY, Inc., 12 E.A.D. 372, 384 (EAB 2005). The Board has also considered whether the defaulting party would likely succeed on the substantive merits if a hearing were held. Id. With regard to this factor, it is the respondent's burden to demonstrate a "strong probability" that litigating the defense will produce a favorable outcome. Id.

Under Environmental Appeals Board precedent, "an attorncy stands in the shoes of his or her client, and ultimately, the client takes responsibility for the attorneys' failings." In re Pyramid Chemical Company, 11 E.A.D. at 667 (EAB 2004). As a general matter, a client voluntarily chooses its attorney as its representative and thus cannot avoid the consequences of the acts or omissions of its freely selected agent. Id. Only in limited circumstances has the Board recognized the failure of an attorney as the basis for excusing a party from timely compliance with procedural requirements (such as physical incapacitation during a crucial period in litigation), see In re B&L Plating, 11. E.A.D. 183, 191 n.15 (EAB 2003). Such circumstances do not exist here. It is undisputed that Respondents received copies of the orders in this case, and bears responsibility to recognize the failure of counsel to act on Respondents' behalf and to take appropriate timely action. See In re Pyramid Chemical Co., 11 E.A.D. at 668.

Here, counsel for Respondents state that they are "new counsel" with "meritorious arguments" that warrant setting aside the ALJ's Order. In fact, he is the third attorney in a series

5

Received 11-16-2011

From-EPA

16:34

Opt-Out: **********

that began work for Respondents on this case over four years ago. Attorney David Smith first purported to represent Respondents in initial discussions in this case in October 2007. Exhibit 1. Attorney Jim Meason then became involved in the case in May 2010. Exhibit 2. He delayed in filing a formal appearance, however, until October 1, 2010, after June 23, 2010 correspondence and insistence from Complainant urging him to do so. Exhibit 3. Attorney David Smith later filed his letter "re-appearance" (sic) on April 12, 2010, and a formal appearance on August 5, 2011. Exhibit 4. No one in this successive and sometimes overlapping line of lawyers has been able to obtain any cooperation from Respondents. The current attorney claims that he can surely now provide the documents needed from Respondents to substantiate inability to pay or mitigate the penalty. He further claims that, four years after the September 14, 2007 administrative order for compliance was issued to his clients, Respondents have derived little or no economic benefit from the violations. Respondents do not offer any new arguments nor do they assert substantiation for any new facts that are tantamount to good cause. Attorney David Smith initiated discussions with Respondents as far back as four years ago, based on the same allegations, but for unknown reasons was simply never able to obtain Respondents' or their CPA's cooperation in submitting either compliance or financial documents, or otherwise presenting a case. Regardless of whether Respondents' Motion correctly casts fault solely on Attorney Jim Meason by alleging that Respondents had "difficulty working with Attorney Meason, given his military service," it is evident that Respondents share in flouting the series of orders issued by the ALJ and the Agency in this case, and the Part 22 Rules. For the foregoing reasons, Respondents have failed to demonstrate good cause for setting aside the ALJ's Order.

6

Received 11-16-2011 16:34

Opt-Out: *********

From-EPA

Respondents' Motion is Fails to Comply with 40 CFR §20.16(a)

All motions, except those made orally on the record during a hearing, shall, *inter alia*, be accompanied by any affidavit, certificate, or other evidence or legal memorandum relied upon. 40 C.F.R. §20.16(a). Respondents' Motion, albeit introducing no new arguments or evidence, relies on representations that are entirely unsupported by any affidavit or exhibit. In fact, there is no attachment whatsoever support Respondents' factual assertions, nor is there any caselaw cited in support of the Motion. They reference a single Attachment A in paragraph 8.b. of their Motion, but nothing is attached. Notwithstanding, Respondents make several conclusory remarks to advance their argument: "Attorney Jim Meason stated that all corrective action had been completed to the satisfaction of EPA ..." Motion at par. 6. "Examples of facts supporting Respondents' inability to pay are as follows ..." Motion at par. 8. "In short, Respondents do not have the ability to pay a \$75,000 fine, something which there is documentation to establish and which the undersigned counsel is prepared to prove." Motion at par. 9.

It is noteworthy that Respondent Tim Barry claims to have filed for bankruptcy on January 11, 2011 (Motion at par. 8.b.), some ten months after the March 17, 2010 administrative complaint and penalty assessment in this case was filed, yet Complainant was surreptitiously never served with proper notice of the pending bankruptcy.

Moreover, if any evidence does exist to support the arguments they are repeating yet again in the instant Motion, Respondents were obligated to identify and produce it in response to U.S. EPA's Administrative Order and this Court's Order of March 30, 2011 and its successive extensions. Respondent failed to do so, and were rightfully defaulted. They now want another bite at the apple, without presenting any new facts. The default by Respondents constituted an

7

Opt-Out: *********

Received 11-16-2011

From-EPA

16:34

To-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL Page

admission of all facts alleged in the complaint and a waiver of respondents' right to contest such factual allegations. 40 C.F.R. §22.17. Therefore, to set aside the Order and allow Respondents yet another opportunity would greatly prejudice Complainants.

VII. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

Respondents fail to demonstrate good cause to set aside the Order in this case. Respondents' actions have remained consistent with a pattern and practice that began at least four years ago with their violations of their Permít, and continued through their disregard to the orders issued in this case. Accordingly, Complainant respectfully requests that the Court to deny Respondents' Motion.

Respectfully submitted Luis Ovicdo

Associate Regional Counsel U.S. EPA, Region 5 (C-14J) 77 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL 60604

δ

From-EPA

Opt-Out: **********

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY **REGION 5**

))

)

IN THE MATTER OF:

To: 2022330121

Mr. Allen Barry, Mr. Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock, 1448 Route 72 East Leaf River, IL 61010

Docket No. CWA 05-210-008

Respondents.

1	Correspondence from Attorney David Smith to U.S. EPA	October 9, 2007
2	Correspondence from Attorney James E. Meason to U.S. EPA	May 28, 2010
3	Correspondence from U.S. EPA to Attorney James E. Meason, and fax transmission confirmation	June 23, 2010
4	Correspondence from Attorney David Smith to U.S. EPA	April 12, 2010

EXHIBITS

Received 11-16-2011 16:34

From-EPA

Opt-Out: **********

To: 2022330121

17.1

From: (3128860747) 11/16/11 03:34 PM

<u>۳</u>۱,

Page 15 of 22

LAW OFFICES SMITH HAHN MORROW & FLOSKI

GERALD K. GARARD (1908-1979) RICHARD J. HAHN (1958-2002)

DAVID A. SMITH SRICD. MORROW DOUGLAS P. FLOSKI

ROBERT C. MOBHLE, of Counsel

Region 5

Professional Corporation **129 SOUTH FOURTH STREET** POST OFFICE BOX 10 OREGON, ILLINOIS 61061-0010 815/732-6124 FAX 815/732-7528

October 9, 200

131 WEST SECOND STREET BYRON, ILLINOIS 61010-1007 815/234-5454 FAX 815/234-2632

R ENFORCEMENT BRANCH

Re: Mr. Allen Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock (IL0067229), Order for Compliance and Request for Information Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §§ 1318 and 1319(a), Docket No. V-W-07-AO-06

Dcar Ms. Newton:

Ms. Cheryl L. Newton

77 W. Jackson Boulevard Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Acting Director, Water Division U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Via Certified Mail: 7007 0710 0005 2925 7932

In response to your letter concerning the above matter dated September 14, 2007, I immediately called and left a message with Mr. Valdis Aistars that Mr. Barry intended to comply with your Order. This letter confirms that phone call.

I believe the site inspection was made March 27, 2007, over five months ago. Your Order requires the permit holder to respond in varying time periods, some as short as five days. Neither Mr. Barry nor anyone on his staff has the training and expertise to respond to many of the ordered items. We are searching for a consultant to assist us in this regard. I am sure your records indicate Northern Illinois experienced one of its wettest summers on record and some of the precipitation exceeded an expected 25 year, 24 hour event.

Your Order also notes the fact that Mr. Barry's facility applied for renewal of his 1996 permit in March of 2001, but no action has been taken on that renewal application for over six years. It seems the time requirements of your Order have little consideration for the delays experienced by Mr. Barry in dealing with your office.

Very truly yours ₹₩ &d FLOSKI, P.C. 10RRD

David A. Smith

DAS:cbd

CC*

Valdis Aistars, Water Enforcement & Compliance Div. - Certified Mail: 7007 0710 0005 2925 7949 Mike Garretson, IEPA - Cartified Mail: 7007 0710 0005 2925 7956 Allen Barry

EXH

Received 11-16-2011

From-EPA 16:34

Opt-Out: *********

All statements contained herein are true and accurate to the best of the signatory's knowledge and belief. David A. Smith

Subscribed and sworn to before me this <u>9</u> day of <u>Chabes</u>, 2007.

In

Notary Public

OFFICE DEAL CHRISTINE B. DONAHUE NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF ILLINOIS MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 4-27-2010

Opt-Out: **********

From-EPA

James E. Meason Attorney at Law 113 W. Main Street. Rockton, Illinois. 61072. (815) 624-6517

May 28, 2010

Luis Oviedo, Esq. Associate Regional Counsel Region 5, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 77 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Rc: Mr. Allen Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock (IL0067229) Docket No. V-W-07-AO-06

Dear Mr. Oviedo:

As noted in the voicemail message I left you yesterday, Tim Barry has retained me to represent his family in the above noted matter. All future correspondence should be addressed to me.

I understand this matter has some history, and I am getting up to speed as quickly as I can. I pledge I will work with the agency to a mutually beneficial resolution of this matter in a timely fashion. You and I have never met, if memory serves me correctly. I have practiced in the environmental law field since 1992.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully yours,

James E. Meason

cc: T. Barry

e:\my documents\law\barry\environmental\ovisdo lir re introduction

EXM. 7

Received 11-16-2011 16

16:34 From-EPA

Opt-Out: *********

TO-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

RN 232010

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF: C-14J

VIA FAX, ELECTRONIC AND U.S. MAIL

Mr. James E. Meason Attorney at Law 113 W. Main Street Rockton, Illinois 61072 815-624-5955 (FAX) jimmeason@yahoo.com

Re: <u>In re: Allen Barry and Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock (IL 0067229)</u> Docket No. V-W-07-AO-06

Dear Mr. Meason:

During our telephone discussion on May 27, 2010, you advised me that you would take affirmative steps to confer with us at the Agency. I have not yet heard from you regarding your clients' availability for a conference. Compliance with the terms of the Administrative Order and the CWA was required within the time periods specified in the Order. In addition, we have not received your appearance or response to the Administrative Complaint that has been filed against your client. Finally, this letter confirms that, to date, your client has not asserted any inability to pay defense in this case.

Since your client has not been responsive, we intend to move for a default judgment against them in this case. I am providing you with this written notice as a professional courtesy, and in hopes that you will escalate your efforts toward prompt resolution of this case.

Sincerely yours,

Luis Oviedo Associate Regional Counsel

cc: V. Aistars

Received 11-16-2011

16:34 From-EPA

Opt-Out: ********

To-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL

Page 019

EXH 3

Subject		28727	Submitted	6/24/2010 9:27:38 AM	
		20121			
			Recipients	1	
Total	ages	1	Successful	0	and the statement of the second statement of the statement of the second statement of the statement of the second statement of the
Name	ent Resu Number Address	·/ Bee	ult		Elapsed Time
	(815) 62	A-EAEE Can	't complete call: No us:331	on-Fax Result, Line	00:22
	· _				
		Jaren Heinhy			
			Uniter States environmental r Poista Yi nev and de gain Grand II Manu	rotetnich Agency Linard 1910	
			AN 1.3 THE		
				424au in tha shridanadan cu 5-543	
		MA. ISTORY & BAR	CTRONIC ANOLLY, MARL		
		Autorney at Leve 5 (1 W), beleft Stor 6 Geliken, 10 norts 8 JS-0,21-(955 4): 1 Instrument (15 alt	ce 64172 4303		
			5. Barn 1996 Tim Dorre dilah Allas ikar 1. M. M. M. A. C.	Linaviock (IL WAY 1229)	
		Ikras Kile, Africanian	•		
		the CUVA was required related at	TO PRIME REPORT CREATING TO CAR TO CARE. NUMBER	in the Chart. In acklution, we have not	
		INTERNA IN THE ALL AND A	owent has not been requiring (on, we arrem 1 am periodiling you with this withins a desputate water allored transact gamme con	Winner me a swellenkenschalt in instanten and an	
			summerly but	III	
			Luto Diverse Announces Par	from al Counter	
		ere V. Alaska	·	- · ·	
	1				1

From-EPA

Opt-Out: **********

TO-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL

LAW OFFICES SMITH HAHN MORROW & FLOSKI

GERALD K. GARARD (1908-1979) Kichard J. Hahn (1958-2002)

DAVID A. SMITH ERIC D. MORROW DOUGLAS P. FLOSKI

DEBORAH S. MAAS

Professional Corporation 129 SOUTH FOURTH STREET POST OFFICE BOX 10 OREGON, ILLINOIS 61061-0010 815/732-6124 FAX 815/732-7528

131 WEST SECOND STREET BYRON, ILLINOIS 61010-1007 815/234-5454 FAX 815/234-2632

April 12, 2010

Mr. Luis Oviedo Associate Regional Counsel (C-14J) Region 5 77 West Jackson Boulevard Chicago, IL 60604-3590

> Re: Allen Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock Docket No, V-W-07-AO-06

Dear Luis:

Received a call from Allen's son, Tim, last Monday saying that I needed to again become involved in the compliance matter. Unfortunately, letters sent from you or your office to Allen are unopened or misplaced and Tim, who is trying to assist his father with these matters, is unaware of the new correspondence. At least if I am back in the circle, I will make sure that copies of any correspondence or documents coming from your office are shared with Tim and Allen, with my note summarizing what they need to do.

Barrys have hired a new consultant. His name and address is Alan M. Madison, 24459 1500 East Street, Walnut, IL 61376. Hopefully this person will be more understanding of the situation and give better response to your office concerning these pending matters.

Please accept this letter as my reappearance in this matter on behalf of Allen Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock (IL0067229).

Very truly yours,

SMITH, HAHN, MORROW & FLOSKI, P.C.

David A. Smith

Opt-Out: *********

DAS/cbd

cc: Mr. Allen Barry Mr. Tim Barry

16:34

From-EPA

TO-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL

Page 020

In the Matter of: Allen Barry & Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock CWA Appeal No. 11-07 Docket No.: CWA-05-2010-0008.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING AND SERVICE (Page 1 of 2)

I hereby certify that today I faxed a copy and mailed for filing the original and three copies of Complainant's RESPONSE TO MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER ELECTING TO EXERCISE SUA SPONTE REVIEW AND PENALTY ORDER and this Certificate to:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Clerk of the Board, Environmental Appeals Board (1103B) Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avc., NW Washington, D.C. 20460-0001 202-233-0121 FAX

I also faxed and then mailed a copy of the documents by certified mail, return receipt-requested, to:

Michael F. Iasparro, Esq. Hinshaw & Culberton LLP 100 Park Avc. P.O. Box 1389 Rockford, IL 61105-1389 815-490-4901 FAX

I mailed a copy of the documents to:

Honorable Barbara A. Gunning U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Administrative Law Judges Mail Code 1900L/Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20460

Page 1 of 2

November 16, 2011

Donald E. Ayres

Received 11-16-2011

From-EPA

16:34

Opt-Out: *********

To-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL

In the Matter of: Allen Barry & Tim Barry d/b/a Allen Barry Livestock CWA Appeal No. 11-07 Docket No.: CWA-05-2010-0008.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING AND SERVICE (Page 2 of 2)

I also delivered two copies of the documents by hand to:

LaDawn Whitehead Regional Hearing Clerk (E-19J) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 77 W. Jackson Boulevard Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Dated: November 16, 2011

Donald E. Ayres Paralegal Specialist ORC5 MM 2-4 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 312-353-6719

Page 2 of 2

From-EPA

Opt-Out: *********

To-USEPA ENVIRONMENTAL