1

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 9

2008 SEP 30 AM 9: 17

REGIONAL HEARING CLERK

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the Matter of:

BAE Systems Information and Electronic Systems Integration, Inc.,

Respondent.

Docket No. EPCRA-09-2008- 0025

CONSENT AGREEMENT AND FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13 AND 22.18

I. CONSENT AGREEMENT

- 1. The Director of the Communities and Ecosystems Division ("Complainant"), United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") Region 9, and BAE Systems Information and Electronic Systems Integration, Inc. ("Respondent" or "BAE Systems") agree to settle this matter and consent to the filing of this Consent Agreement and Final Order Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13 and 22.18 ("CAFO"), which simultaneously commences and concludes this matter in accordance with 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13(b) and 22.18(b).
- This is a civil administrative proceeding initiated pursuant to Section 325(c) of Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, 42 U.S.C. § 11001 et seq., also known as the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 ("EPCRA"), for violation of Section 313 of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 11023, and the regulations promulgated to implement Section 313 at 40 C.F.R. Part 372.
- 26 3. Complainant has been duly delegated the authority to file
 27 this action and sign a consent agreement settling this
 28 action. Respondent is a corporation incorporated in

Delaware.

- 4. Pursuant to Sections 313 and 328 of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 11023 and 11048, EPA promulgated the Toxic Chemical Release Reporting: Community Right-to-Know Rule at 40 C.F.R. Part 372.
 - Section 313(a) of EPCRA, as implemented by 40 C.F.R.

 § 372.30, provides that an owner or operator of a facility that meets the criteria set forth in EPCRA Section 313(b) and 40 C.F.R. § 372.22, is required to submit annually to the Administrator of EPA and to the State in which the facility is located, no later than July 1st of each year, a toxic chemical release inventory reporting form (hereinafter "Form R") for each toxic chemical listed under 40 C.F.R. § 372.65 that was manufactured, processed or otherwise used at the facility during the preceding calendar year in quantities exceeding the thresholds established under EPCRA Section 313(f) and 40 C.F.R. §§ 372.25, 375.27, and 372.28.
- 6. Section 313(b) of EPCRA and 40 C.F.R. § 372.22 provide that the requirements of Section 313(a) and 40 C.F.R. § 372.30 apply to an owner and operator of a facility that has 10 or more full-time employees; that is in a Standard Industrial Classification major group codes 10 (except 1011, 1081, and 1094), 12 (except 1241), 20 through 39; industry codes 4911, 4931, or 4939 (limited to facilities that combust coal and/or oil for the purpose of generating power for distribution in commerce), or 4953 (limited to facilities regulated under the

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, subtitle C, 42 U.S.C. \$6921 et seq.), or 5169, 5171, or 7389 (limited to facilities primarily engaged in solvent recovery services on a contract or fee basis); and that manufactures, processes, or otherwise uses one or more toxic chemicals listed under Section 313(c) of EPCRA and 40 C.F.R. § 372.65 in quantities in excess of the applicable thresholds established under EPCRA Section 313(f) and 40 C.F.R. §§ 372.25, 372.27, and 372.28.

- 7. Section 325(c) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 11045(c) and 40 C.F.R. Part 19 authorize EPA to assess a penalty of up to \$27,500 for each violation of Section 313 of EPCRA that occurred on or after January 31, 1997, but before March 15, 2004, and up to \$32,500 for each violation of Section 313 of EPCRA that occurred on or after March 15, 2004.
- 15 8. Respondent is a "person," as that term is defined by Section 329(7) of EPCRA.
 - 9. At all times relevant to this CAFO, Respondent was the owner and operator of a "facility," as that term is defined by Section 329(4) of EPCRA and 40 C.F.R. § 372.3, located at 1501 Sabovitch Street Building 66, Mojave, California ("Facility"); the Facility had 10 or more "full-time employees" as that term is defined at 40 C.F.R. § 372.3; and the Facility was classified in Standard Industrial Classification Code 3728, Aircraft Parts and Auxiliary Equipment, not elsewhere classified.
- 26 10. During calendar years 2003 and 2005, Respondent processed the

following amounts (in pounds) of lead, a chemical listed under 40 C.F.R. § 372.28(a)(1):

<u>Year</u> <u>lead</u>
2003 5,000
2005 5,000

- 11. The quantities of lead that the Respondent processed at the Facility during calendar years 2003 and 2005 exceeded the established threshold of 100 pounds set forth at 40 C.F.R. § 372.28(a)(1).
- 12. Respondent failed to submit Form Rs for lead processed at the Facility to the EPA Administrator and to the State of California on or before July 1, 2004, for calendar year 2003, and to the EPA Administrator and to the State of California on or before July 3, 2006, for calendar year 2005, as required by Section 313(a) of EPCRA and 40 C.F.R. § 372.30.
- 13. Respondent's failure to submit Form Rs for lead processed at the Facility for calendar years 2003 and 2005 constitute two violations of Section 313 of EPCRA and 40 C.F.R. § 372.30.
- 14. The EPA Enforcement Response Policy for EPCRA Section 313 dated August 10, 1992, provides for a penalty of sixty-one thousand dollars (\$61,000) for these violations.
- 15. In executing this CAFO, Respondent certifies that (1) it has now fully completed and submitted to EPA all of the required Form Rs in compliance with Section 313 of EPCRA and the regulations promulgated to implement Section 313; and (2) it has complied with all other EPCRA requirements at all facilities under its control.

- 16. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b)(2) and for the purpose of this proceeding, Respondent (i) admits that EPA has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this CAFO and over Respondent; (ii) admits the violations and facts alleged in this CAFO; (iii) consents to the terms of this CAFO; (iv) waives any right to contest the allegations in this CAFO; and (v) waives the right to appeal the proposed final order contained in this CAFO.
- 17. The terms of this CAFO constitute a full settlement of the civil administrative matter filed under the docket number above.
- Discovery, Disclosure, Correction and Prevention of

 Violations, 65 Fed. Reg. 19617 (April 11, 2000) ("Audit

 Policy") has several important goals, including encouraging

 greater compliance with the laws and regulations which

 protect human health and the environment and reducing

 transaction costs associated with violations of the laws EPA

 is charged with administering. If certain specified criteria

 are met, reductions in gravity-based penalties of up to 100%

 are available under the Audit Policy. These criteria are (1)

 discovery of the violation(s) through an environmental audit

 or due diligence; (2) voluntary disclosure; (3) prompt

 disclosure; (4) discovery and disclosure independent of

 government or third party plaintiff; (5) correction and

 remediation; (6) prevent recurrence; (7) no repeat

- 19. Complainant has determined that Respondent has satisfied all of the criteria under the Audit Policy and thus qualifies for the elimination of civil penalties in this matter.

 Accordingly, the civil penalty assessed in this matter is zero (\$0) dollars.
- 20. Complainant's finding that BAE Systems has satisfied the criteria of the Audit Policy is based upon documentation that BAE Systems has provided to establish that it satisfies these criteria. Complainant and Respondent agree that, should any material fact upon which Complainant relied in making its finding subsequently prove to be other than as represented by BAE Systems, this CAFO may be voided in whole or in part.
 - 1. Nothing in this CAFO modifies, affects, exempts or relieves
 Respondent's duty to comply with all applicable provisions of
 EPCRA and other federal, state or local laws and permits. In
 accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(c), this CAFO only resolves
 Respondent's liability for federal civil penalties for the
 violations and facts specifically alleged in this CAFO.
 Nothing in this CAFO is intended to or shall be construed to
 resolve (i) any civil liability for violations of any
 provision of any federal, state, or local law, statute,
 regulation, rule, ordinance, or permit not specifically
 alleged in this CAFO; or (ii) any criminal liability. EPA
 specifically reserves any and all authorities, rights, and

remedies available to it (including, but not limited to, injunctive or other equitable relief or criminal sanctions) to address any violation of this CAFO or any violation not specifically alleged in this CAFO.

- 22. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.18(b)(3) and 22.31(b), this CAFO shall be effective on the date that the final order contained in this CAFO, having been approved and issued by either the Regional Judicial Officer or Regional Administrator, is filed.
- 23. The provisions of this CAFO shall be binding upon Respondent, its agents, successors or assigns. Respondent's obligations under this Consent Agreement, if any, shall end when Respondent has performed all of the terms of the Consent Agreement in accordance with the Final Order. Complainant and Respondent consent to the entry of the CAFO without further notice.

FOR COMPLAINANT:

19

23

24

25

26

27

28

FOR RESPONDENT:

Ms. Sophia Rafatjah

Vice President and Chief BAE Systems Information and Electronic

Manzanilla, Director

Communities and Ecosystems Division

Systems Inc.

EPA Region 9

FINAL ORDER

Complainant EPA Region 9 and Respondent BAE Systems
Information and Electronic Systems Integration, Inc., having
entered into the foregoing Consent Agreement,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Consent Agreement and Final Order Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13 and 22.18 (Docket No. EPCRA-09-2008- 0025) be entered.

c9/29/48 Date

Steven L. Jawgiel Regional Judicial Office

U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency, Region 9

15 //////////////// 16 ////////////////

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the original fully executed Consent Agreement and Final Order ("CAFO"),

Docket Number EPCRA-09-2008- 00 2 vgs filed this day with the Regional Hearing Clerk,

U.S. EPA, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California, 94105, and that a true and

correct copy of the CAFO was sent to Respondent at the following address:

Ms. Sophia Rafatiah VP & Senior Counsel BAE Systems, Inc. 6500 Tracor Lane – ATX28026 Austin, TX 78725

Certified Mail No: 7007 3020 0000 9807 1101

Danielle Carr

Regional Hearing Clerk

Region IX, EPA

Office of Regional Counsel

SEP 3 0 2008

Date