FILED 1 NANCY J. MARVEL Regional Counsel 2 2008 JUN 25 AM 10: 05 EDGAR P. CORAL Assistant Regional Counsel 3 U.S. EPA-KELHUK IX
REGIONAL HEARING CLERK U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX 4 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105 5 (415) 972-3898 6 UNITED STATES 7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION IX 8 9 10 Docket No. FIFRA-09-2008-00 In the Matter of: 11 Nevada Onion, COMPLAINT AND NOTICE OF 12 OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING 13 Respondent. 14 15 16 I. AUTHORITY AND PARTIES 17 1. This is a civil administrative action brought pursuant to Section 14(a) of the Federal 18 Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act ("FIFRA"), 7 U.S.C. § 136l(a), for the assessment of 19 a civil administrative penalty against Nevada Onion ("Respondent") for the use of registered 20 pesticides in a manner inconsistent with their labeling in violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of 21 FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G), and the Worker Protection Standard set forth at 40 C.F.R. Part 22 170. 23 2. Complainant is the Associate Director for Agriculture of the Communities and 24 Ecosystems Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), Region IX. The 25 Administrator of EPA delegated to the Regional Administrator of Region IX the authority to 26 bring this action under FIFRA by EPA Delegation Order Number 5-14, dated May 11, 1994. The 27

Regional Administrator of Region IX further delegated the authority to bring this action under

8

11

13

15

20

22

24

FIFRA to the Associate Director for Agriculture of the Communities and Ecosystems Division by EPA Regional Order Number 1255.08 CHG1, dated June 9, 2005.

3. Respondent is Nevada Onion, a corporation headquartered in Yerington, Nevada.

II. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 4. Respondent is a corporation and therefore fits within the definition of "person" as that term is defined by Section 2(s) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(s). As such, Respondent is subject to FIFRA and the implementing regulations promulgated thereunder.
- At all times relevant to this matter, Respondent owned and/or operated a facility (the "Facility") located at 61 Bowman Lane in Yerington, Nevada.
- 6. This Facility is a "farm" and therefore an "agricultural establishment" as those terms are defined at 40 C.F.R. § 170.3.
 - 7. Respondent is an "agricultural employer" as that term is defined at 40 C.F.R. § 170.3.
 - 8. Respondent is a "handler employer" as that term is defined at 40 C.F.R. § 170.3.
- 9. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.3, "worker" means any person, including a self-employed person, who is employed for any type of compensation and who is performing activities relating to the production of agricultural plants on an agricultural establishment.
- 10. Lannate LV (EPA Reg. No. 352-384), Champ Dry Prill (EPA Reg. No. 55146-57), Dithane DF (EPA Reg. No. 62719-402), Thiosperse (EPA Reg. No. 55429-4-AA), Thiolux (EPA Reg. No. 100-1138), and Diatec II (EPA Reg. No. 42850-4) are registered "pesticides" as that term is defined in Section 2(u) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(u).
- 11. At all times relevant to this matter, Fields 3 and 5 at the Facility were "treated areas" as that term is defined at 40 C.F.R. § 170.3.
- 12. Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G), makes it unlawful for any person to use any registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.
- 13. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), a person who has a duty under 40 C.F.R. Part 170, as referenced on the pesticide label, and who fails to perform that duty, violates Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G), and is subject to a civil penalty under Section 14 of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136l.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

- COUNT 1: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 14. Paragraphs 4 through 13 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 1 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 15. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c), when workers are on an agricultural establishment and a pesticide has been applied on the establishment in the production of agricultural plants within the past 30 days, the agricultural employer shall display the following information about the pesticide: (1) the location and description of the treated area; (2) the product name, EPA registration number, and active ingredient(s) of the pesticide; (3) the time and date the pesticide is to be applied; and (4) the restricted-entry interval for the pesticide.
- 16. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(b)(2), the pesticide information shall be posted before the application takes place if workers will be on the establishment during application.
- 17. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.3, "treated area" means any area to which a pesticide is being directed, or has been directed.
- 18. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the registered pesticide Lannate LV (EPA Reg. No. 352-384), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 19. Lannate LV is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 20. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Lannate LV included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 21. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 22. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to display any of the pesticide information required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 23. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

COUNT 2:	Use of a	registered	pesticide	in a m	anner in	nconsiste	nt with i	its labelin	g (failure to
display req	uired pesti	cide inform	nation), '	7 U.S.C	. § 136	j(a)(2)(G) and 40) C.F.R. §	170.122.

- 24. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 2 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 25. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Champ Dry Prill (EPA Reg. No. 55146-57), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
- 26. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 27. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 28. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 29. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to display any of the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 30. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 3: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 31. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 3 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 32. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Dithane DF (EPA Reg. No. 62719-402), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 33. Dithane DF is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 34. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 35. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.

	36.	On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to display any of the pesticide
inforn	natio	n required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).

- 37. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 4: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 38. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 4 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 39. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiosperse (EPA Reg. No. 55429-4-AA), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 40. Thiosperse is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 41. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiosperse included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 42. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 43. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to display any of the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiosperse and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 44. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiosperse and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 5: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 45. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 5 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 46. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Champ Dry Prill (EPA Reg. No. 55146-57), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 47. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural

plants.

- 48. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 49. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 50. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 51. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 6: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 52. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 6 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 53. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg. No. 100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 54. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 55. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 56. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 57. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 58. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

COUNT 7: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.

- 59. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 7 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 60. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Dithane DF (EPA Reg. No. 62719-402), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 61. Dithane DF is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 62. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 63. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 64. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 65. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 8: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 66. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 8 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 67. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Ditatec II (EPA Reg. No. 42850-4), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - . Ditatec II is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 69. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Ditatec II included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 70. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.

71. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information
(i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. §
170.122(c).
72. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide
information required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a
violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
COUNT 9: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
73. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 9 by reference
as if the same were set forth herein in full.
74. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Lannate LV (EPA Reg.
No. 352-384), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
75. Lannate LV is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
76. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Lannate LV
included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §
170.122(c).
77. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
78. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information
(i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R.
§ 170.122(c).
79. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide

79. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

COUNT 10: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.

80. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 10 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.

81.	On or about June 2,	, 2007, Respondent	applied the pestion	cide Champ Dry P	rill (EPA
Reg. No. 55	5146-57), or had it a	pplied, to Field 5 a	t the Facility.		

- 82. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 83. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 84. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 85. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 86. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 11: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 87. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 11 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 88. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg. No. 100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
 - 89. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 90. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 91. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 92. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).

104. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Ditatec II

included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).

- 105. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 106. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 107. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 14: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 108. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 14 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 109. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Lannate LV (EPA Reg. No. 352-384), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
 - 110. Lannate LV is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 111. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Lannate LV included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 112. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 113. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 114. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

COUNT 15:	Use of a registered	pesticide in a r	nanner inconsist	ent with its l	abeling (failure to
display requi	red pesticide inform	nation), 7 U.S.C	C. § 136j(a)(2)(C	and 40 C.F	.R. § 170.122.

- 115. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 15 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 116. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Champ Dry Prill (EPA Reg. No. 55146-57), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
- 117. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 118. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 119. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 120. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 121. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 16: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 122. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 16 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 123. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg. No. 100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 124. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 125. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).

136. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 18 by

reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.

27

137.	On or about June 10,	, 2007, Respond	lent applied the	pesticide Champ	Dry Prill (El	PA
Reg. No. 55	146-57), or had it appl	lied, to Field 5	at the Facility.			

- 138. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 139. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 140. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 141. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
- 142. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 19: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
- 143. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 19 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 144. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg.No. 100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
 - 145. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 146. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 147. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
- 148. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).

2	information required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a
3	violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
4	COUNT 20: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
5	display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122.
6	150. Paragraphs 4 through 23 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 20 by
7	reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
8	151. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Dithane DF (EPA
9	Reg. No. 62719-402), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
10	152. Dithane DF is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
11	153. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF
12	included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §
13	170.122(c).
14	154. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had workers at the Facility.
15	155. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information
16	(i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R
17	§ 170.122(c).
18	156. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide
19	information required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c) constitutes a
20	violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
21	COUNT 21: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
22	display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
23	157. Paragraphs 4 through 13 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 21 by
24	reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
25	158. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c), when handlers are on an agricultural
26	establishment and a pesticide has been applied on the establishment in the production of
27	agricultural plants within the past 30 days, the handler employer shall display the following
28	information about the pesticide: (1) the location and description of the treated area; (2) the

149. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide

product name, EPA registration number, and active ingredient(s) of the pesticide; (3) the time and date the pesticide is to be applied; and (4) the restricted-entry interval for the pesticide.

- 159. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(b)(2), the pesticide information shall be posted before the application takes place if workers will be on the establishment during application.
- 160. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.3, "treated area" means any area to which a pesticide is being directed, or has been directed.
- 161. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the registered pesticide Lannate LV (EPA Reg. No. 352-384), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
 - 162. Lannate LV is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 163. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Lannate LV included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.122(c).
 - 164. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 165. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to display any of the pesticide information required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
- 166. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 22: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
- 167. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 22 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 168. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Champ Dry Prill (EPA Reg. No. 55146-57), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
- 169. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 170. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §

28

Count 24 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.

182. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiosperse (EPA

Reg. No. 55429-4-AA), or had it applied, to Fig	eld 3 at th	ne Facility.
---	-------------	--------------

- 183. Thiosperse is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 184. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiosperse included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 185. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 186. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to display any of the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiosperse and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
- 187. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiosperse and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 25: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
- 188. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 25 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 189. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Champ Dry Prill (EPA Reg. No. 55146-57), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
- 190. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 191. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 192. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 193. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 194. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide

1	information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a
2	violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
3	COUNT 26: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
4	display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
5	195. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this
6	Count 26 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
7	196. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg. No.
8	100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
9	197. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
0	198. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux
1	included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §
2	170.222(c).
3	199. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
4	200. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information
5	(i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. §
6	170.222(c).
7	201. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide
8	information required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a
9	violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
0	COUNT 27: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
1	display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
2	202. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this
3	Count 27 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
4	203. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Dithane DF (EPA Reg.
5	No. 62719-402), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
6	204. Dithane DF is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.

- 205. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c). 206. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility. 207. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c). 208. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G). COUNT 28: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222. 209. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 28 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full. No. 42850-4), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
- 210. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Ditatec II (EPA Reg.
 - 211. Ditatec II is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 212. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Ditatec II included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 213. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 214. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
- 215. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §

27

28

170.222(c).

227. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the

- 228. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
- 229. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 31: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
- 230. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 31 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 231. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg. No. 100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
 - 232. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 233. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 234. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 235. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
- 236. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 32: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
- 237. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 32 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.

- 238. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Dithane DF (EPA Reg. No. 62719-402), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
 - 239. Dithane DF is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 240. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 241. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 242. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
- 243. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNT 33: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
- 244. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 33 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 245. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Ditatec II (EPA Reg. No. 42850-4), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
 - 246. Ditatec Π is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 247. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Ditatec II included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 248. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 249. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).

plants.

250. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide
information required by the labeling of Ditatec II and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a
violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
COUNT 34: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
251. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this
Count 34 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
252. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Lannate LV (EPA Reg.
No. 352-384), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
253. Lannate LV is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
254. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Lannate LV
included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §
170.222(c).
255. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
256. On or about June 2, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information
(i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R
§ 170.222(c).
257. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide
information required by the labeling of Lannate LV and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a
violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
COUNT 35: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
258. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this
Count 35 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
259. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Champ Dry Prill (EPA
Reg. No. 55146-57), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.

260. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural

261. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill
ncluded language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §
170.222(c).
262. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
263. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information
i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40
C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
264. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide
nformation required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a
violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
COUNT 36: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
265. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this

ated in this Count 36 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.

266. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg. No. 100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.

- 267. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 268. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
 - 269. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 270. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).
- 271. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

23

24

25

26

3	272. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this
4	Count 37 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
5	273. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Dithane DF (EPA
6	Reg. No. 62719-402), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
7	274. Dithane DF is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
8	275. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF
9	included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §
10	170.222(c).
11	276. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
12	277. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information
13	(i.e., the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R.
14	§ 170.222(c).
15	278. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide
16	information required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a
17	violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
18	COUNT 38: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to
19	display required pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.
20	279. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this
21	Count 38 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
22	280. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Champ Dry Prill (EPA
23	Reg. No. 55146-57), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.
24	281. Champ Dry Prill is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural
25	plants.
26	282. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill
27	included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. §
28	170.222(c).

283.	On or about June	10, 2007,	Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
284.	On or about June	10, 2007,	Respondent failed to display the pesticide

284. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).

285. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

COUNT 39: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.

286. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 39 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.

287. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent applied the pesticide Thiolux (EPA Reg. No. 100-1138), or had it applied, to Field 5 at the Facility.

288. Thiolux is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.

289. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiolux included language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).

290. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.

291. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information (*i.e.*, the active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c).

292. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide information required by the labeling of Thiolux and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a violation of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

COUNT 40: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to display required pesticide information)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222.

293. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 157 through 166 above are hereby incorporated in this Count 40 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.

1	
2	Reg. N
3	
4	
5	include
6	170.22
7	
8	
9	(i.e., th
10	§ 170.2
11	
12	inform
13	violatio
14	COUN
15	to prov
16	170.15
17	
18	referen
19	
20	deconta
21	worker
22	was ap
23	contact
24	water,

	294.	On or about June	10, 2007,	Respondent	applied the	pesticide	Dithane	DF (EPA
Reg.	No. 62	719-402), or had it	applied,	to Field 5 at	the Facility.				

- 295. Dithane DF is a pesticide that was applied in the production of agricultural plants.
- 296. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF ed language referencing the pesticide information display requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 2(c).
 - 297. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent had handlers at the Facility.
- 298. On or about June 10, 2007, Respondent failed to display the pesticide information e active ingredients of the pesticide) required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. 222(c).
- 299. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failure to display the pesticide ation required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222(c) constitutes a on of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- TS 41-46: Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure ride decontamination supplies to workers), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 0.
- 300. Paragraphs 4 through 13 above are hereby incorporated in these Counts 41-46 by ice as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 301. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a), the agricultural employer must provide amination supplies for workers in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 170.150 whenever any on the agricultural establishment is performing an activity in the area where a pesticide plied or a restricted-entry interval was in effect within the last 30 days and the worker ts anything that has been treated with the pesticide, including, but not limited to, soil, plants, plant surfaces, and plant parts.
- 302. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the registered pesticide Lannate LV (EPA Reg. No. 352-384), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.

310. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Champ Dry Prill

included language referencing the worker decontamination supplies requirement of 40 C.F.R. §

Complaint and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing

In re Nevada Onion

 170.150(a).

311. On or about August 1, 2007, workers Mariana Mesa Hurtado, Moises Preciados Guardo, Roberto Carlos Pacheco de la Cruz, Nabor Gomez Cruz, Sabino de Leon de Santiago, and Donaciano Bravo Perez were performing activities in the area where the pesticide Champ Dry Prill was applied.

- 312. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to provide decontamination supplies to workers Mariana Mesa Hurtado, Moises Preciados Guardo, Roberto Carlos Pacheco de la Cruz, Nabor Gomez Cruz, Sabino de Leon de Santiago, and Donaciano Bravo Perez as required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a).
- 313. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failures to provide decontamination supplies to each of these workers, as required by the labeling of Champ Dry Prill and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a), constitute six separate violations of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNTS 53-58: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to provide decontamination supplies to workers)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150.
- 314. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 300 through 307 above are hereby incorporated in these Counts 53-58 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 315. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the registered pesticide Dithane DF (EPA Reg. No. 62719-402), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
- 316. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Dithane DF included language referencing the worker decontamination supplies requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a).
- 317. On or about August 1, 2007, workers Mariana Mesa Hurtado, Moises Preciados Guardo, Roberto Carlos Pacheco de la Cruz, Nabor Gomez Cruz, Sabino de Leon de Santiago, and Donaciano Bravo Perez were performing activities in the area where the pesticide Dithane DF was applied.
 - 318. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to provide decontamination supplies

to workers Mariana Mesa Hurtado, Moises Preciados Guardo, Roberto Carlos Pacheco de la Cruz, Nabor Gomez Cruz, Sabino de Leon de Santiago, and Donaciano Bravo Perez as required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a).

- 319. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failures to provide decontamination supplies to each of these workers, as required by the labeling of Dithane DF and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a), constitute six separate violations of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).
- COUNTS 59-64: <u>Use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling (failure to provide decontamination supplies to workers)</u>, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150.
- 320. Paragraphs 4 through 13 and 300 through 307 above are hereby incorporated in these Counts 59-64 by reference as if the same were set forth herein in full.
- 321. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent applied the registered pesticide Thiosperse (EPA Reg. No. 55429-4-AA), or had it applied, to Field 3 at the Facility.
- 322. At all times relevant to this complaint, the labeling of the pesticide Thiosperse included language referencing the worker decontamination supplies requirement of 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a).
- 323. On or about August 1, 2007, workers Mariana Mesa Hurtado, Moises Preciados Guardo, Roberto Carlos Pacheco de la Cruz, Nabor Gomez Cruz, Sabino de Leon de Santiago, and Donaciano Bravo Perez were performing activities in the area where the pesticide Thiosperse was applied.
- 324. On or about August 1, 2007, Respondent failed to provide decontamination supplies to workers Mariana Mesa Hurtado, Moises Preciados Guardo, Roberto Carlos Pacheco de la Cruz, Nabor Gomez Cruz, Sabino de Leon de Santiago, and Donaciano Bravo Perez as required by the labeling of Thiosperse and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150(a).
- 325. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 170.9(b), Respondent's failures to provide decontamination supplies to each of these workers, as required by the labeling of Thiosperse and 40 C.F.R. §

4 5

28 the (

170.150(a), constitute six separate violations of Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

IV. PROPOSED CIVIL PENALTY

Section 14(a)(1) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136*l*(a)(1), and the Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule, 40 C.F.R. Part 19, authorize the assessment of a civil administrative penalty of up to \$6,500 for each violation of FIFRA occurring on or after March 15, 2004. For purposes of determining the amount of the civil penalty to be assessed, FIFRA Section 14(a)(4) requires EPA to consider the size of Respondent's business, the effect on Respondent's ability to continue in business and the gravity of the violations alleged. Based on the violations alleged in this Complaint, and after consideration of the statutory factors enumerated above, EPA proposes to assess the following civil penalty pursuant to FIFRA Section 14(a) and the FIFRA Enforcement Response Policy dated July 2, 1990 (a copy of which is enclosed with this Complaint), which provides a rational, consistent and equitable calculation methodology for applying the statutory penalty factors enumerated above:

TOTAL	\$70,400
Counts 41-64 (Use of the registered pesticides Lannate LV, Champ Dry Prill, Dithane DF, and Thiosperse in a manner inconsistent with their labeling (failure by agricultural employer to provide decontamination supplies to six separately identifiable workers, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.150)	\$26,400
Counts 21-40 (Use of the registered pesticides Lannate LV, Champ Dry Prill, Dithane DF, Thiosperse, Thiolux, and Diatec II in a manner inconsistent with their labeling (failure by handler employer to display specific pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.222)	\$22,000
Counts 1-20 (Use of the registered pesticides Lannate LV, Champ Dry Prill, Dithane DF, Thiosperse, Thiolux, and Diatec II in a manner inconsistent with their labeling (failure by agricultural employer to display specific pesticide information), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) and 40 C.F.R. § 170.122)	\$22,000

V. NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO REQUEST A HEARING

You have the right to request a formal hearing to contest any material fact set forth in this Complaint or to contest the appropriateness of the proposed penalty. Any hearing requested will be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 551 et seq., and the Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties

and the Revocation or Suspension of Permits ("Consolidated Rules of Practice"), 40 C.F.R. Part 22. A copy of the Consolidated Rules of Practice is enclosed with this Complaint.

You must file a written Answer within thirty (30) days of receiving this Complaint to avoid being found in default, which constitutes an admission of all facts alleged in the Complaint and a waiver of the right to a hearing, and to avoid having the above penalty assessed without further proceedings. If you choose to file an Answer, you are required by the Consolidated Rules of Practice to clearly and directly admit, deny, or explain each of the factual allegations contained in this Complaint to which you have any knowledge. If you have no knowledge of a particular fact and so state, the allegation is considered denied. Failure to deny any of the allegations in this Complaint will constitute an admission of the undenied allegation.

The Answer shall also state the circumstances and arguments, if any, which are alleged to constitute the grounds of defense, and shall specifically request an administrative hearing, if desired. If you deny any material fact or raise any affirmative defense, you will be considered to have requested a hearing. The Answer must be filed with:

Regional Hearing Clerk (ORC-1) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105

In addition, please send a copy of the Answer and all other documents that you file in this action to:

Edgar P. Coral
Office of Regional Counsel (ORC-2)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

You are further informed that the Consolidated Rules of Practice prohibit any *ex parte* (unilateral) discussion of the merits of any action with the Regional Administrator, Regional Judicial Officer, Administrative Law Judge, or any person likely to advise these officials in the decision of the case, after the Complaint is issued.

VI. INFORMAL SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

EPA encourages all parties against whom a civil penalty is proposed to pursue the possibility of settlement through informal conferences. Therefore, whether or not you request a hearing, you may confer informally with EPA through Mr. Coral, the EPA attorney assigned to this case, regarding the facts of this case, the amount of the proposed penalty, and the possibility of settlement. An informal settlement conference does not, however, affect your obligation to file an Answer to this Complaint.

VII. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The parties also may engage in any process within the scope of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, 5 U.S.C. § 581 *et seq.*, which may facilitate voluntary settlement efforts. Dispute resolution using alternative means of dispute resolution does not divest the Presiding Officer of jurisdiction nor does it automatically stay the proceeding.

VIII. QUICK RESOLUTION

Instead of requesting an informal settlement conference or filing an Answer requesting a hearing, you may choose to resolve the proceeding by paying the specific penalty proposed in the Complaint and filing a copy of the check or other instrument of payment with the Regional Hearing Clerk within thirty (30) days after receiving the Complaint. If you wish to resolve the proceeding in this manner instead of filing an answer but need additional time to pay the penalty, you may file a written statement stating that you agree to pay the proposed penalty in accordance with 40 C.F.R § 22.18(a)(1) with the Regional Hearing Clerk within 30 days after receiving the Complaint. The written statement need not contain any response to, or admission of, the allegations in the Complaint. Within sixty (60) days after receiving the Complaint, the full amount of the proposed penalty must be paid. Failure to make such payment within this sixty-day period may subject you to default. Upon receipt of payment in full, the Regional Judicial Officer will issue a Final Order. Payment by a respondent shall constitute a waiver of the respondent's rights to contest the allegations and to appeal the Final Order. In addition, full payment of the proposed penalty shall only resolve Respondent's liability for Federal civil penalties for violations and facts alleged in the Complaint and does not affect the right of EPA or

the United States to pursue appropriate injunctive or other equitable relief or criminal sanctions for any violations of law.

IX. CONSENT AGREEMENT AND FINAL ORDER

EPA has the authority, where appropriate, to modify the amount of the proposed penalty to reflect any settlement reached with you in an informal conference or through alternative dispute resolution. The terms of such an agreement would be embodied in a Consent Agreement and Final Order. A Consent Agreement signed by both parties would be binding as to all terms and conditions specified therein when the Regional Judicial Officer signs the Final Order.

Dated at San Francisco, California on this 23day of June, 2008.

KATHERINE A. TAYLOR

Associate Director for Agriculture Communities and Ecosystems Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the original and one copy of the foregoing Complaint and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing (Docket No. FIFRA-09-2008-00_07) was hand delivered to:

Regional Hearing Clerk U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, California 94105

and that a true and correct copy of the Complaint; the Consolidated Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R.

Part 22; and the FIFRA Enforcement Response Policy were placed in the United States Mail, certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed to the following:

David Little President Nevada Onion 61 Bowman Lane Yerington, NV 89447-9723

Dated: June 25, 2008

By:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

17 18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27