



UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

06 JUN 28 AM 11:15

BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATOR

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY-REGION VII
REGIONAL HEARING CLERK

IN THE MATTER OF

LEARJET, INC. .

RESPONDENT

)
)
) DOCKET NO. RCRA-07-2005-0402
)
)
)

PREHEARING ORDER

As you previously have been notified, I have been designated by the June 20, 2006 Order of the Chief Administrative Law Judge to preside in the above captioned matter.^{1/} This proceeding arises under the authority of Sections 3008(a) and (g) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, commonly referred to as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (collectively referred to as RCRA ("RCRA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 6928(a) and (g)).^{2/} In the Complaint, Complainant proposes the assessment of a civil administrative penalty against Respondent and seeks the entry of a Compliance Order.

^{1/} The file reflects that the parties have participated in the Alternate Dispute Resolution ("ADR") process offered by this office. Pursuant to the Administrative Law Judges's June 19, 2006 Order Recommending Termination of Alternative Dispute Resolution, the above-cited matter has been reassigned to the undersigned to proceed with the litigation process.

^{2/} This proceeding is governed by the Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties and the Revocation/Termination or Suspension of Permits (the "Rules of Practice"), 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.1-.32. The parties are advised to familiarize themselves with both the applicable statute(s) and the Rules of Practice.

United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") policy, found in the Rules of Practice at Section 22.18(b), 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b), encourages settlement of a proceeding without the necessity of a formal hearing. The benefits of a negotiated settlement may far outweigh the uncertainty, time, and expense associated with a litigated proceeding.

Although the parties have participated in ADR, they have not reached a settlement. As such, the parties shall strictly comply with the requirements of this order and prepare for a hearing. The parties are advised that extensions of time will not be granted absent a showing of good cause. See Section 22.7(b) of the Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. § 22.7(b). The pursuit of settlement negotiations or an averment that a settlement in principle has been reached will not constitute good cause for failure to comply with the prehearing requirements or to meet the schedule set forth in this Prehearing Order. Of course, the parties are encouraged to initiate or continue to engage in settlement discussions during and after preparation of their prehearing exchange.

The following requirements of this Order concerning prehearing exchange information are authorized by Section 22.19(a) of the Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. § 22.19(a). As such, it is directed that the following prehearing exchange takes place:

1. Each party shall submit:
 - (a) the names of any expert or other witnesses it intends to call at the hearing, together with a brief narrative summary of each witness' expected testimony, or a statement that no witnesses will be called; and
 - (b) copies of all documents and exhibits which each party intends to introduce into evidence at the hearing. The exhibits should include a curriculum vitae or resume for each proposed expert witness. If photographs are submitted, the photographs must be actual unretouched photographs. The documents and exhibits shall be identified as "Complainant's" or "Respondent's" exhibit, as appropriate, and numbered with Arabic numerals (e.g., "Complainant's Exhibit 1"); and
 - (c) a statement expressing its view as to the place for the hearing and the estimated amount of time needed to present its direct case.

See Sections 22.19(a), (b), (d) of the Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.19(a), (b), (d); see also Section 22.21(d) of the Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. § 22.21(d).

2. Complainant shall submit a statement explaining in detail how the proposed penalty was determined, including a description of how the specific provisions of any Agency penalty or enforcement policies and/or guidelines were applied in calculating the penalty.
3. Respondent shall submit a statement explaining why the proposed penalty should be reduced or eliminated. If the Respondent intends to take the position that it is unable to pay the proposed penalty or that payment will have an adverse effect on its ability to continue to do business, Respondent shall furnish supporting documentation such as certified copies of financial statements or tax returns.
4. Complainant shall submit a statement regarding whether the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 ("PRA"); 44 U.S.C. §§ 3501 et seq., applies to this proceeding, whether there is a current Office of Management and Budget control number involved herein and whether the provisions of Section 3512 of the PRA are applicable in this case.

See Section 22.19(a)(3) of the Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. § 22.19(a)(3).

The prehearing exchanges delineated above shall be filed in *seriatim* manner, according to the following schedule:


- August 25, 2006 - Complainant's Initial Prehearing Exchange
- September 25, 2006 - Respondent's Prehearing Exchange, including any direct and/or rebuttal evidence
- October 10, 2006 - Complainant's Rebuttal Prehearing Exchange (if necessary)

In its Answer to the Complaint, Respondent exercised its right to request a hearing pursuant to Section 554 of the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), 5 U.S.C. § 554. If the parties cannot settle with a Consent Agreement and Final Order, a hearing will be held in accordance with Section 556 of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 556. Section 556(d) of the APA provides that a party is entitled to present its case or defense by oral or documentary evidence, to

submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Thus, Respondent has the right to defend itself against Complainant's charges by way of direct evidence, rebuttal evidence, or through cross-examination of Complainant's witnesses. Respondent is **entitled to elect any or all three means to pursue its defense**. If Respondent elects only to conduct cross-examination of Complainant's witnesses and to forgo the presentation of direct and/or rebuttal evidence, Respondent shall serve a statement to that effect on or before the date for filing its prehearing exchange. Each party is hereby reminded that failure to comply with the prehearing exchange requirements set forth herein, including the Respondent's statement of election only to conduct cross-examination of Complainant's witnesses, can result in the entry of a default judgment against the defaulting party. See Section 22.17 of the Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. § 22.17.

The original and one copy of all pleadings, statements and documents (with any attachments) required or permitted to be filed in this Order (including a ratified Consent Agreement and Final Order) shall be filed with the Regional Hearing Clerk, and copies (with any attachments) shall be sent to the undersigned and all other parties. The parties are advised that E-mail correspondence with the Administrative Law Judge is not authorized. See Section 22.5(a) of the Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. § 22.5(a). The prehearing exchange information required by this Order to be sent to the Presiding Judge, as well as any other further pleadings, shall be addressed as follows:

Judge Barbara A. Gunning
Office of Administrative Law Judges
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mail Code 1900L
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460-2001
Telephone: 202-564-6281



Barbara A. Gunning
Administrative Law Judge

Dated: June 23, 2006
Washington, DC

In the ADR Matter of *Learjet, Inc.*, Respondent.
Docket No. RCRA-07-2005-0402

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing **Prehearing Order** dated June 23, 2006, was sent in the following manner to the addressees listed below.



Mary Angeles
Legal Staff Assistant

Original and One Copy by Pouch Mail to:

Kathy Robinson
Regional Hearing Clerk
U.S. EPA, Region VII
901 North 5th Street
Kansas City, KS 66101

Copy by Pouch Mail to:

Jonathan W. Meyer, Esq.
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. EPA - Region VII
901 North 5th Street
Kansas City, KS 66101

Copy by First Class Mail

James T. Price, Esq.
Sara S. Hertz, Esq.
1000 Walnut Street, Suite 1400
Kansas City, MO 64106

Dated: June 23, 2006
Washington, DC