



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Region 1

5 Post Office Square, Suite 1000
Boston, MA 02109-3912

RECEIVED

2011 SEP 22 P 2: 37
EPA ORC
OFFICE OF
REGIONAL HEARING CLERK

BY HAND

September 22, 2011

Wanda I. Santiago, Regional Hearing Clerk
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code ORA18-1
Boston, MA 02109-3912

Re: Cedar's Mediterranean Foods, Inc.
Docket No. CAA-01-2011-0055

Dear Ms. Santiago:

Enclosed are an original and one copy of the Complaint and Certificate of Service for filing with respect to the above-captioned matter.

Kindly file the documents in the usual manner. Thanks very much for your help.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas T. Olivier".

Thomas T. Olivier
Senior Enforcement Counsel

Enclosures

cc: Robin Main, Esq.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 1 - NEW ENGLAND

RECEIVED

2011 SEP 22 P 2: 37

)
)
IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Docket No. CAA-01-2011-0055

EPA ORC
OFFICE OF
REGIONAL HEARING CLERK

Cedar's Mediterranean Foods, Inc.
50 Foundation Avenue
Ward Hill, MA 01835

**COMPLAINT AND NOTICE
OF OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING**

I. STATEMENT OF AUTHORITY

1. The United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1 - New England ("EPA") issues this administrative Complaint and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Complaint") to Cedar's Mediterranean Foods, Inc. ("Cedar's") under Section 113(d) of the Clean Air Act ("CAA" or "Act"), 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d).

2. Sections 113(a)(3) and (d)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7413(a)(3) and (d)(1), provide authority for the assessment of penalties for violations of the Act and implementing regulations, including the CAA's Stratospheric Ozone Provisions (CAA Subchapter VI) and implementing regulations.

3. This Complaint notifies Cedar's that EPA intends to assess penalties for violations of Section 608 of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671g, and its implementing regulations found at 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart F, arising from Cedar's failure to comply with federal requirements for the service, maintenance, repair, and disposal of industrial process refrigeration ("IPR") appliances that contain ozone-depleting substances ("ODS"), commonly referred to as "refrigerant." The Notice of Opportunity for Hearing describes the option of Cedar's to file an

Answer to the Complaint and to request a formal hearing.

4. The EPA Administrator and the Attorney General for the U.S. Department of Justice have jointly determined that this Complaint, which addresses certain violations that commenced more than 12 months ago, is an appropriate administrative penalty action under Section 113(d)(1) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d)(1).

II. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

5. Subchapter VI of the Act, Sections 601–618, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7671–7671q, was enacted in 1990 to protect the layer of stratospheric ozone that shields the earth and its inhabitants from harmful radiation by reducing emissions of substances that have or may have harmful effects on the stratospheric ozone layer.

6. Section 602(a) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7671a(a), lists class I substances which “cause[] or contribute[] significantly to harmful effects on the stratospheric ozone layer,” and Section 602(b) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7671a(b), lists class II substances which are “known or may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to harmful effects on the stratospheric ozone layer.”

7. Under Section 601 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7671, an “appliance” is defined as “any device which contains and uses a class I or class II substance as a refrigerant and which is used for household or commercial purposes, including any air conditioner, refrigerator, chiller, or freezer.”

8. The requirements of 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart F (“Subpart F”), apply to, among others, appliance owners and operators. 40 C.F.R. § 82.150(b). Subpart F includes requirements for repairing leaks of refrigerant from appliances, testing to ensure that leak repairs on appliances are successful, and recordkeeping related to the servicing of appliances.

9. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.152, “refrigerants” are substances containing ozone-depleting class I or class II substances. Section 602(b) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7671a(b) lists hydrochlorofluorocarbon-22 (“HCFC-22”) as a class II substance. HCFC-22 is also known as “R-22.”

10. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.152, “leak rate” means the rate at which an appliance is losing refrigerant, measured between refrigerant charges. The leak rate is expressed in terms of the percentage of the appliance’s full charge that would be lost over a 12-month period if the current rate of loss were to continue over that period.

11. Under 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i), owners or operators of IPR equipment normally containing more than 50 pounds of refrigerant are required to do the following, if the appliance is leaking at a rate such that 35% or more of its refrigerant charge would leak from the unit over a twelve-month period:

a. Repair the leak within specified time frames, such that the leak rate after the repair is below 35% over a twelve-month period; and either

b. Verify that the repair was successful by conducting initial and follow-up leak testing; or

c. Instead of repairing the leak, or upon finding that an attempted leak repair was not successful (i.e., follow-up leak verification testing demonstrates that the IPR unit is still leaking at a rate equal to or greater than 35%), develop a plan to retrofit or retire the IPR unit, and then retrofit or retire the unit within one year.

12. Under 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k), owners or operators of IPR equipment normally containing more than 50 pounds of refrigerant are required to keep records documenting the date and type of service conducted on the equipment, including the quantity of refrigerant added to

the equipment.

III. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

13. Cedar's is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of New Hampshire with a principal place of business located at 50 Foundation Avenue, Ward Hill, Massachusetts. Cedar's is a manufacturer of Mediterranean cuisine such as hommus, fresh salads, tzatziki, and pita chips.

14. Cedar's is a "person" as defined by Section 302(e) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7602(e), and in 40 C.F.R. § 82.152.

15. Cedar's owns or operates a manufacturing facility located at 50 Foundation Avenue in Ward Hill, Massachusetts (the "Facility").

16. Cedar's is the owner or operator of an IPR unit at the Facility that uses ODS, in particular R-22, as a refrigerant. This IPR unit has refrigerant capacity of over 50 pounds and so is subject to certain requirements contained in 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart F.

17. On July 7, 2010, EPA conducted an inspection of the Facility to determine its compliance with the requirements of Subpart F. Cedar's subsequently submitted documents to EPA conveying additional information requested during the inspection.

18. In April, 2011, EPA issued an Administrative Order ("AO") to Cedar's containing findings that Cedar's violated certain requirements of Subpart F and ordering Cedar's to comply with Subpart F and with Section 608 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7671g.

IV. VIOLATIONS

COUNT I **(Failure to Repair Leaks)**

19. Paragraphs 1 through 18, above, are incorporated by reference.

20. At the Facility, Cedar's owns or operates an IPR unit that is an "appliance" as defined by Section 601 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7671, and 40 C.F.R. § 82.152.

21. This IPR unit is an appliance that normally contains more than 50 pounds of refrigerant and, therefore, is subject to certain requirements of Subpart F.

Leak Discovered on March 20, 2008

22. On March 20, 2008, Cedar's or its contractor discovered a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

23. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

24. As a result of this leak, approximately 375 pounds of refrigerant had leaked from the IPR unit, which has a maximum refrigerant capacity of 8000 pounds.

25. Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting the repair of this leak, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

26. Cedar's did not repair, within 30 days of March 20, 2008, the leak referenced in paragraph 22, above, such that the leak rate would be below 35%, in accordance with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(2).

27. Cedar's did not, within 30 days of discovering the leak of March 20, 2008, develop a plan to retrofit or retire the IPR unit, and then retrofit or retire the unit within one year, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(6).

28. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i).

Leak Discovered on August 27, 2008

29. On August 27, 2008, Cedar's or its contractor discovered a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

30. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

31. As a result of this leak, approximately 1000 pounds of refrigerant had leaked from the IPR unit, which has a maximum refrigerant capacity of 8000 pounds.

32. Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting the repair of this leak, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

33. Cedar's did not repair, within 30 days of August 27, 2008, the leak referenced in paragraph 29, above, such that the leak rate would be below 35%, in accordance with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(2).

34. Cedar's did not, within 30 days of discovering the leak of August 27, 2008, develop a plan to retrofit or retire the IPR unit, and then retrofit or retire the unit within one year, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(6).

35. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i).

COUNT II
(Failure to Perform Leak Repair Verification Tests)

36. Paragraphs 1 through 35, above, are incorporated by reference.

Leak Discovered on April 2, 2007

37. On April 2, 2007, Cedar's or its contractor discovered and attempted to repair a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

38. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

39. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 37, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. §

82.166(k).

40. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 37, above, Cedar's failed to conduct an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

41. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 37, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records of a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

42. After the leak repair attempt referenced in paragraph 37, above, Cedar's failed to conduct a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

43. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3).

Leak Discovered on July 3, 2007

44. On July 3, 2007, Cedar's or its contractor discovered and attempted to repair a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

45. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

46. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 44, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

47. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 44, above, Cedar's failed to conduct an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

48. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 44, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records of a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

49. After the leak repair attempt referenced in paragraph 44, above, Cedar's failed to conduct a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

50. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3).

Leak Discovered on August 23, 2007

51. On August 23, 2007, Cedar's or its contractor discovered and attempted to repair a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

52. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

53. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 51, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

54. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 51, above, Cedar's failed to conduct an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

55. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 51, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records of a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

56. After the leak repair attempt referenced in paragraph 51, above, Cedar's failed to conduct a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

57. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3).

Leak Discovered on September 28, 2007

58. On September 28, 2007, Cedar's or its contractor discovered and attempted to repair a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

59. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

60. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 58, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

61. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 58, above, Cedar's failed to conduct an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

62. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 58, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records of a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

63. After the leak repair attempt referenced in paragraph 58, above, Cedar's failed to conduct a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

64. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3).

Leak Discovered on May 19, 2008

65. On May 19, 2008, Cedar's or its contractor discovered and attempted to repair a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

66. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

67. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 65, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

68. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 65, above, Cedar's failed to conduct an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

69. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 65, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records of a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

70. After the leak repair attempt referenced in paragraph 65, above, Cedar's failed to conduct a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

71. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3).

Leak Discovered on October 9, 2008

72. On October 9, 2008, Cedar's or its contractor discovered and attempted to repair a leak of refrigerant from its IPR unit.

73. The IPR unit was leaking at a rate such that the loss of refrigerant would exceed 35% of the total charge over a twelve-month period.

74. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 72, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records documenting an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

75. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 72, above, Cedar's failed to conduct an initial verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

76. After the leak repair attempt described in paragraph 72, above, Cedar's failed to create and maintain records of a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k).

77. After the leak repair attempt referenced in paragraph 72, above, Cedar's failed to conduct a follow-up verification test, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3), to determine whether the repair attempt was successful.

78. Accordingly, Cedar's violated 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3).

V. PENALTY

79. Sections 113(d)(1)(B) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d)(1)(B), the Debt Collection Improvement Act ("DCIA"), 31 U.S.C. § 3701, and EPA's Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rules, promulgated thereunder at 40 C.F.R. Part 19, authorize the assessment of a civil administrative penalty of up to \$32,500 per day for each violation of the Clean Air Act occurring from March 16, 2005 through January 12, 2009. Based on the allegations above, and taking into consideration the penalty assessment criteria of Section 113(e) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(e), EPA proposes to assess Respondent a civil penalty of \$108,320.

80. The penalty assessment criteria of Section 113(e) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(e) include the size of the business, the economic impact of the penalty on the business, the violator's full compliance history and good faith efforts to comply, the duration of the violations, payment of penalties previously assessed for the same violations, the economic benefit of noncompliance, the seriousness of the violations, and such other factors as justice may require. To apply these criteria, where applicable, EPA has used *Appendix X*, dated June 1, 1994 ("Appendix X"), of the October 25, 1991 *Clean Air Act Stationary Source Penalty Policy* ("CAA Penalty Policy"), copies of which are enclosed with this Complaint.

81. In particular, EPA considers violations involving the release, or potential release,

of refrigerant from an appliance without repair to be serious. The violations are also serious because Respondent failed to ensure or document that, when required repairs were made, the repairs were successful. The following is a violation-by-violation summary of the penalty components used to calculate the proposed penalty for the violations described in this Complaint. The specified penalty amounts are derived from Appendix X.

GRAVITY COMPONENT

Count I (Failure to Repair Leaks or, in the Alternative, Failure to Maintain Adequate Records of Leak Repair)

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| March 20, 2008..... | \$19,343 ¹ |
| August 27, 2008..... | \$3,869 ² |
| <u>Subtotal (Count I).....</u> | <u>\$23,212</u> |

Count II (Failure to Perform Leak Repair Verification Tests or, in the Alternative, Failure to Maintain Adequate Records of Leak Repair Verification Tests)

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| April 2, 2007 (Initial Test)..... | \$11,606 |
| April 2, 2007 (Follow-Up Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| July 3, 2007 (Initial Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| July 3, 2007 (Follow-Up Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| August 23, 2007 (Follow-Up Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| September 28, 2007 (Initial Test)..... | \$774 |
| May 19, 2008 (Initial Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| May 19, 2008 (Follow-Up Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| October 9, 2008 (Initial Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| October 9, 2008 (Follow-Up Test)..... | \$2,321 |
| <u>Subtotal (Count II).....</u> | <u>\$30,948</u> |

Total for Counts I and II..... \$54,160

Size of Violator Upward Adjustment..... \$54,160

¹ Gravity-based penalties include an upward inflationary adjustment from the amounts presented in the Appendix X, in accordance with the DCIA, 31 U.S.C. § 3701, and EPA’s Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rules, promulgated thereunder at 40 C.F.R. Part 19.

² Appendix X provides for, after calculating the penalty amount using the primary penalty matrix for the first instance of violation of a particular requirement, using the secondary penalty matrix to calculate penalty amounts for additional violations of the same requirement (which results in lower, per violation penalty amounts).

ECONOMIC BENEFIT COMPONENT

EPA currently understands that any economic benefit enjoyed by Respondent as a result of its noncompliance was less than \$500. Accordingly, under Appendix X, no economic benefit amount is proposed herein. Should subsequent information indicate otherwise, EPA will consider it at that time.

TOTAL PROPOSED PENALTY.....\$108,320

82. An adjustment for the economic impact of the penalty on Respondent’s business will be considered if properly raised and documented by Respondent.

83. If Respondent agrees to pay the proposed penalty without further proceedings, it shall pay the penalty within thirty (30) days of receiving the Complaint. If Respondent needs more than thirty (30) days in which to pay the penalty, Respondent may file a statement with the Regional Hearing Clerk within thirty (30) days of receiving the Complaint, stating that it agrees to pay the penalty. In that event, payment of the penalty shall be due within sixty (60) days of receipt of the Complaint. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(a).

84. Payment of the penalty may be made by cashier’s or certified check in the amount of \$108,320, payable to the “Treasurer, United States of America,” and mailed to:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Fines and Penalties
Cincinnati Finance Center
P.O. Box 979077
St. Louis, MO 63197-9000

The check and an accompanying cover letter must include the case name and the docket number of this matter (“In re: Cedar’s Mediterranean Foods, CAA-01-2011-0055”). Copies of the check must be sent to the Regional Hearing Clerk and EPA’s attorney, at the addresses provided below.

85. The assessment or payment of a civil penalty shall not affect the Respondent’s on-going obligation to comply with the Clean Air Act and other applicable federal, state, and local laws.

VI. OPPORTUNITY TO REQUEST A HEARING AND FILE AN ANSWER

86. As provided by Section 113(d) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d), Respondent has a right to request a hearing on issues raised in this Complaint. Any such hearing will be conducted in accordance with the Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties, Issuance of Compliance or Corrective Action Orders, and the Revocation, Termination or Suspension of Permits, 40 C.F.R. Part 22 (“Consolidated Rules of Practice”), a copy of which is enclosed. In the event that Respondent intends to request a hearing to contest any material fact set forth in the Complaint, or contends that the amount of the proposed penalty is inappropriate, or contends that it is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law, Respondent must file a written Answer to this Complaint with the Regional Hearing Clerk and serve a copy on EPA at the following addresses:

Wanda I. Santiago, Regional Hearing Clerk
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code ORA18-1
Boston, MA 02109-3912

and

Thomas T. Olivier, Senior Enforcement Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code OES04-3
Boston, MA 02109-3912

An Answer must be filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of the Complaint. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 22.15 for the required contents of an Answer.

87. The failure to file an Answer will constitute an admission of all facts alleged in the Complaint and a waiver of Respondent’s right to a hearing under Section 113(d)(2) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d)(2). In that event, the proposed penalty would become due and payable

by Respondent sixty (60) days after EPA issues a final order finding Respondent in default.

VII. SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

88. Whether or not Respondent requests a hearing, it may confer informally with EPA concerning the violations or amount of the proposed penalty. Respondent may wish to be represented by counsel at the informal conference. If settlement is reached, it will be finalized by a written Consent Agreement and Final Order. To explore the possibility of settlement in this matter, please have your attorney contact EPA attorney Thomas T. Olivier, at 617-918-1737. Under Section 22.5(c)(4) of the Consolidated Rules of Practice, Mr. Olivier is authorized to receive service on behalf of EPA. Please note that a request for an informal settlement conference does not enlarge the thirty-day period for submission of a written Answer.

Susan Studlien
Susan Studlien, Director
Office of Environmental Stewardship
U.S. EPA, Region 1 - New England

09/22/11
Date

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION I**


| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| In the Matter of: |) | |
| Cedar's Mediterranean Foods, Inc. |) | Docket No. CAA-01-2011-0055 |
| 50 Foundation Avenue |) | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE |
| Ward Hill, MA 01835 |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| |) | |

I hereby certify that the foregoing Administrative Complaint and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing has been sent to the following persons on the date noted below:

| | |
|--|--|
| Original and One Copy (Hand-Delivered): | Wanda I. Santiago, Regional Hearing Clerk U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100 Mail Code ORA18-1 Boston, MA 02109-3912 |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Copy, including 40 C.F.R. Part 22, CAA Penalty Policy, and Appendix X (Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested): | Charles I. Hanna, President Cedar's Mediterranean Foods, Inc 50 Foundation Avenue Ward Hill, MA 01835 |
|---|--|

Dated: 9/22/11



Thomas T. Olivier, Senior Enforcement Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code OES04-3
Boston, MA 02109-3912