

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 2**

-----X  
In the Matter of :  
: :  
: :  
Tower Exterminating, Corp. aka :  
Tower & Son Exterminating Corp. and :  
Wilson J. Torres Rivera :  
: :  
Respondents. :  
: :  
Proceeding Under the Federal :  
Insecticide, Fungicide, and :  
Rodenticide Act, as amended, and :  
the Clean Air Act, as amended. :  
-----X

COMPLAINT AND NOTICE OF  
OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

Docket No. FIFRA-02-2016-5306

REGIONAL HEARING  
2016 MAR 09 PM 2:09  
U.S. Environmental  
Protection Agency-Reg 2

This Complaint and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing (hereinafter referred to as the "Complaint") is filed pursuant to Section 14(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act ("FIFRA"), as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 1361(a); Section 113(d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d) ("CAA"); and in accordance with the Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties and the Revocation/Termination or Suspension of Permits, 40 C.F.R. Part 22 ("Consolidated Rules of Practice" or "CROP").

The Complainant in this proceeding, the Director of the Division of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 ("EPA"), has been duly delegated the authority to institute this action.

This Complaint serves notice of EPA's preliminary determination that Tower & Son Exterminating Corp. ("Tower") and Wilson J. Torres Rivera ("Torres") (hereinafter collectively referred to either individually or as "Respondents") located at Carr. 829 Km 6.2, Barrio Santa Olaya, Sector Cruz Vergara, Bayamon, Puerto Rico (the "Facility"), have violated provisions of

FIFRA and the CAA.

### **FIFRA Statutory and Regulatory Background**

1. Section 2(s) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(s), defines “person” as any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or any organized group of persons whether incorporated or not.
2. Section 2(e)(1) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(e)(1), and 40 C.F.R. § 171.2(a) define a “certified applicator” as any individual who is certified under Section 11 of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. §136i, as authorized to use or supervise the use of any pesticide which is classified for restricted use.
3. Section 2(e)(3) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(e)(3), and 40 C.F.R. § 171.2(a)(9) define a “commercial applicator” as an applicator who uses or supervises the use of any pesticide which is classified for restricted use for any purpose or on any property.
4. Section 2(t) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(t), and 40 C.F.R. § 152.5, define a “pest,” in part, as any insect.
5. Section 2(u) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(u), defines the term “pesticide” as, among other things, “(1) any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling or mitigating any pest.”
6. Section 2(p)(1) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(p)(1), defines the term “label” as written, printed, or graphic matter on or attached to, the pesticide or device or any of its containers or wrappers.
7. Section 2(p)(2) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(p)(2), defines the term “labeling” as all labels and all other written, printed or graphic matter accompanying the pesticide or device at any time, or to which reference is made on the label or in literature accompanying the pesticide.
8. Section 2(ee) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(ee), defines the term “to use any registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling” as to use any registered pesticide in a manner not permitted by the labeling.
9. Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G), states that it is unlawful for any person “to use any registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.”
10. Section 14(b)(4) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. §136l(b)(4), states that “the act, omission or failure of any officer, agent or other person acting for or employed by any person shall in every case be also deemed to be the act, omission, or failure of such person as well as that of the person employed.”

## **CAA Statutory and Regulatory Background**

11. Section 602(a) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671a(a), directs the Administrator of EPA to publish a list of class I substances, and to add to that list any other substance that the Administrator finds causes or contributes significantly to harmful effects on the stratospheric ozone layer.
12. Section 603 of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671b, sets forth monitoring and reporting requirements for producers, importers or exporters of class I controlled substances, and authorizes the EPA Administrator to amend the monitoring and reporting regulations of class I and class II substances.
13. Pursuant to the authority in Section 603 of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671b, the Administrator of EPA promulgated regulations governing stratospheric ozone depleting substances, which are set forth at 40 C.F.R. Part 82.
14. Appendix A to 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart A, lists class I controlled substances, and includes methyl bromide (CH<sub>3</sub>Br) as a class I, Group VI controlled substance.
15. Appendix F to 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart A, lists ozone-depleting chemicals, and includes methyl bromide (CH<sub>3</sub>Br).
16. The use of methyl bromide, a class I ozone-depleting substance, for quarantine and preshipment purposes is regulated under Section 604(d)(5) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671c(d)(5), and the implementing regulations at 40 C.F.R. Part 82.
17. Section 604 of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671c, provides for the phase-out of production and consumption of class I substances, with certain exceptions. One exception, set forth at Section 604(d)(5) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671c(d)(5), provides that, to the extent consistent with the Montreal Protocol's quarantine and preshipment provisions, the EPA Administrator shall exempt from the phase-out the production, importation, and consumption of methyl bromide to fumigate commodities entering or leaving the United States or any State for purposes of compliance with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (U.S. Department of Agriculture) requirements or other international, Federal, State or local food protection standards.
18. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.3, "quarantine applications" are, with respect to class I, Group VI controlled substances, treatments to prevent the introduction, establishment and/or spread of quarantine pests (including diseases), or to ensure their official control, where: (1) official control is that performed by, or authorized by, a national (including state, tribal or local) plant, animal or environmental protection or health authority; (2) quarantine pests are pests of potential importance to the areas endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled.
19. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.3, "preshipment applications" are, with respect to class I, Group VI controlled substances, those non-quarantine applications applied within 21 days prior to export

to meet the official requirements of the importing country or existing official requirements of the exporting country. Official requirements are those which are performed by, or authorized by, a national plant, animal, environmental, health or stored product authority.

20. Section 302(e) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7602(e), and 40 C.F.R. § 82.3 define “person” as any individual or legal entity, including an individual, corporation, partnership, association, state, municipality, political subdivision of a state, Indian tribe; any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States; and any officer, agent, or employee thereof.

21. 40 C.F.R. § 82.3 defines “applicator” as the person who applies methyl bromide.

22. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.3, “distributor of methyl bromide” means the person directly selling a class I, Group VI controlled substance to an applicator.

23. Section 113(d)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d)(1), limits the Administrator’s authority to matters where the total penalty sought does not exceed \$37,500 (the amount as adjusted by 40 C.F.R. § 19.4), and the first alleged date of violation occurred no more than 12 months prior to the initiation of administrative action, except where the Administrator and the Attorney General of the United States jointly determine that the matter involving a larger penalty amount or longer period of violations is appropriate for the administrative penalty action.

24. The Administrator and the Attorney General of the United States, each through their respective delegates, have determined jointly that an administrative penalty action is appropriate for the period of violation alleged in this Complaint.

### **Background**

25. Methyl Bromide is the active ingredient in certain restricted use pesticides regulated under FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136 *et seq.*

26. Meth-O-Gas Q, EPA Reg. No. 5785-41 (“MethQ”), is a pesticide registered pursuant to FIFRA § 3.

27. MethQ’s active ingredient is 100% methyl bromide.

28. The MethQ label (MOGQ-8 REV.C) (the “Label”) and MethQ booklet (MOGQ-2 REV.GLK398F) (the “Booklet”) (collectively the “MethQ labeling”) set forth precautionary statements and specific directions regarding use, storage, handling, sale and disposal of MethQ.

29. M & P Pest Control, Inc. (hereinafter “M & P”), located at 1332 Ave. Jesus T. Pinero, San Juan, Puerto Rico, has been a distributor of pesticides at all times pertinent to this Complaint.

30. M & P Pest Control is a “distributor of methyl bromide” as that term is defined by 40 C.F.R. § 82.3.

31. Acting under the authority and pursuant to the provisions of Section 9(a) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136g(a), duly-authorized Puerto Rico Department of Agriculture (“PRDA”) and EPA Inspectors conducted inspections of M & P on the following dates: March 25-26, 2015, March 31, 2015, April 8, 2015, April 16, 2015, April 17, 2015, April 22, 2015, May 13, 2015, May 20, 2015, and October 19, 2015 (collectively, the “M & P Inspections”).
32. At the M & P Inspections, the inspectors collected records regarding Respondent Tower’s purchases of MethQ during the period February 4, 2013 through December 24, 2014.
33. During the March 26, 2015 M & P Inspection, representatives of M & P provided the inspectors with a copy of the MethQ Labeling, described in Paragraph 28, above, which M & P provided with the sale of every MethQ container.
34. On May 26, 2015, acting under the authority and pursuant to the provisions of Section 8(b) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136f(b), and of Section 114a of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7414, EPA sent M & P an Information Request Letter (“IRL”) requesting information and records regarding the import, distribution, and application of Methyl Bromide.
35. The IRL specifically requested, along with other reporting and recordkeeping documents, that M & P provide copies of certifications that M & P received from applicators stating that the quantity of methyl bromide ordered would be used solely for quarantine or preshipment applications as required by 40 C.F.R. § 82.13(y)(2).
36. On July 17, 2015, M & P provided a response (the “M & P Response”) to EPA’s IRL.
37. In the M & P Response, M & P stated, as a response to the portion of the IRL discussed in Paragraph 35, that “We don’t have any these (sic) documents.”
38. In the M & P Response, M & P provided EPA with a copy of the MethQ Booklet, described in Paragraph 28, above, which M & P further asserted that it distributed with the sale of every MethQ container.
39. M & P sold or otherwise distributed MethQ to Respondent Tower between February 2013 and December 2014.
40. Upon information and belief, the MethQ canisters M & P sold to Respondent Tower bore the MethQ Labeling described in Paragraph 28, above.
41. During the October 19, 2015 Inspection, Mr. Michael Pantoja, the president of M & P stated that “no applicator gave any QPS documentation to M & P.”
42. Acting under the authority and pursuant to the provisions of Section 9(a) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136g(a), duly-authorized EPA and PRDA Inspectors inspected the Respondent Tower’s

Facility, on April 13, 2015, April 15, 2015 and on May 11, 2015 (“Individually or Collectively referred to as the “Tower Inspections”).

43. During the Tower Inspections, the inspectors provided a Notice of Pesticides Use/Misuse Inspection form to the Respondents which identified the reason for each of the Inspections and the violations suspected.

44. During the April 13, 2015 and May 11, 2015 Inspections, the inspectors requested that the Respondents provide all records in their possession relating to their purchase and use of methyl bromide.

45. During the April 13, 2015 and May 11, 2015 Inspections, the inspectors collected forty-one (41) pesticide application records documenting Respondents’ use of MethQ, for which they issued a Receipt for Samples document.

46. Respondents did not provide EPA with the records from each commodity owner requesting the quarantine and preshipment use of methyl bromide and citing legal justification for such use.

47. During the April 15, 2015 Inspection, Respondent Torres made the following statements regarding the MethQ applications to the inspectors:

- a. that he performed all MethQ applications without the supervision of a regulatory agent;
- b. that he did not receive any Chemtura applicator training or any other fumigation training.

### **FIFRA Liability Against Respondents Tower and Torres**

#### **Counts 1-82**

#### **Use of a Registered Pesticide in a Manner Inconsistent with its Label (Applications)**

48. Complainant realleges each allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 47, inclusive, as if fully set forth herein.

49. Respondents have been, and continue to be, “persons” as defined by FIFRA § 2(s), 7 U.S.C. § 136(s), and as such are subject to FIFRA and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

50. Respondents engage, and at all times pertinent to this Complaint have engaged, in commercial activities providing pest control services using pesticides.

51. Respondent Torres is, and has been at all times pertinent to this Complaint, a “certified applicator” within the meaning of Section 2(e)(1) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(e)(1), and 40 C.F.R. § 171.2(a)(8).

52. Each of the Respondents is, and has been at all times pertinent to this Complaint, a “commercial applicator” within the meaning of Section 2(e)(3) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136(e)(3), and 40 C.F.R. § 171.2(a)(9).

53. Each of the Respondents is, and has been at all times pertinent to this Complaint, subject to FIFRA and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

54. The following statements are clearly displayed on the MethQ Label received by Respondent Tower and referenced in Paragraphs 28, 33, 38, and 40, above:

- a. At the top of the label and in all bolded capital letters:  
**“COMMODITY FUMIGANT  
FOR QUARANTINE/REGULATORY USE ONLY  
SUPERVISION BY REGULATORY AGENT REQUIRED.”**
- b. “It is a violation of Federal law to use this product in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.”
- c. “This fumigant is a highly hazardous material ... Before using, read and follow all label precautions and directions.”
- d. “All persons working with this fumigant must be knowledgeable about the hazards, and trained in the use of required respiratory protection equipment and detector devices, emergency procedures, and proper use of the fumigant.”
- e. “MethQ may be used for quarantine/regulatory commodity fumigation only. Supervision by regulatory agent is required.”
- f. “You must carefully read and understand the accompanying use direction, GLK 398F [Booklet], in order to use MethQ.”
- g. “Observe all safety and precautionary statements as set forth in the accompanying use directions, GLK398F [Booklet].”
- h. “Store in a secure manner either outdoors under ambient conditions or indoors in a well-ventilated area.”

55. The directions for use in the MethQ Booklet GLK398F include:

- a. On page 1, in large bold letters –  
**“METHO-O-GAS ®Q  
COMMODITY FUMIGANT  
FOR QUARANTINE/REGULATORY USE ONLY  
SUPERVISION BY REGULATORY AGENT REQUIRED”.**

- b. "READ THIS BOOKLET AND ENTIRE LABEL CAREFULLY PRIOR TO USE. USE THIS PRODUCT ACCORDING TO LABEL INSTRUCTIONS."
- c. Same as 54(b) above
- d. Same as 54(c) above
- e. Same as 54(d) above.
- f. "This is a limited use label for quarantine/regulatory purposes and is to be used by or under the supervision of a State or Federal agency."
- g. Same as 54(h) above.

56. The MethQ Labeling specifies permitted application sites, crops, and pests.

57. The MethQ Labeling does not allow dwellings (*e.g.*, residences) or structures not used for the commercial storage or handling of commodities as application sites.

58. Respondents applied MethQ bearing the MethQ Labeling referenced in Paragraphs 28, 33, 38, and 40, above, and containing the statements set out in Paragraphs 54 and 55, above, on the following dates and at the following locations:

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Treatment Site/ Type of Structure</b>	<b>Invoice Number</b>	<b>Target Pest</b>
1	4/27/2013	Bayamon, PR	Residence	Illegible	Drywood Termite (DWT)
2	7/23/2013	Montehiedra, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
3	7/31/2013	Miramar	Residence	Illegible	DWT
4	9/14/2013	Cond El Monte, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
5	10/4/2013	Trujillo Alto, PR	Business (doors)	Illegible	DWT
6	10/24/2013	Viego San Juan, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
7	11/2/2013	Cidra, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT & PPB
8	11/19/2013	San Juan, PR	Business	Illegible	DWT & PPB
9	11/27/2013	Romany Park, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT & Powder Post Beetles (PPB)



10	11/29/2013	Guaynabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
11	12/3/2013	El Cortijo Bay, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
12	12/28/2013	Old San Juan, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
13	3/7/2014	Miramar, PR	Residence	Illegible	Moth
14	3/13/2014	La Torrimas, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
15	3/--/2014	Gurabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
16	4/11/2014	Rio Piedras, PR	Nursing Home	Illegible	DWT, Moth
17	5/27/2014	Ponce, PR	Business (Kitchen area)	Illegible	DWT
18	7/18/2014	Illegible	For MJ Exterminating (wood panels)	19079	DWT
19	8/6/2014	Illegible	Illegible	27679	DWT
20	8/18/2014	San Juan, PR	Business	Illegible	DWT
21	8/19/2014	Primavera, PR	Illegible	27801	DWT
22	9/11/2014	Ciudad Jardin, Gurabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
23	10/1/2014	San Juan, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
24	10/1/2014	Illegible	Illegible	Illegible	DWT
25	10/3/2014	Illegible	Illegible	27916	DWT
26	10/8/2014	Guaynabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
27	11/13/2014	San Juan, PR	Residence	28021	DWT
28	11/20/2014	Illegible	For Degoss Exterminating (4 Drawers)	Illegible	Illegible
29	12/4/2014	San Juan, PR	Residence	2 232	DWT
30	12/8/2014	Miramar, PR	Residence	23505	DWT
31	12/8/2014	Illegible	For MJ Exterminating (20 chairs)	Illegible	DWT
32	12/10/2014	Illegible	For Home Garden (8 Cabinets)	Illegible	Illegible
33	12/18/2014	Mayaguez, PR	For Temirio Construction (In San Sebastian School --Chairs & Desks)	Illegible	Illegible
34	Illegible	Illegible	For Alicia Exterminating (Wood Pieces)	Illegible	DWT & Moth
35	Illegible	Illegible	For LR Exterminating (Book Shelves)	Illegible	Illegible

36	1/12/2015		Home & Garden Cabinets	Illegible	DWT
37	1/15/2015	For MJ Exterminating	Living room/dining room	Illegible	DWT & PPB
38	2/14/2015	Las Piedras, PR	Residence	28281	DWT
39	2/14/2015	Illegible	Illegible	28280	DWT
40	2/16/2015	Illegible	Boat	28777	DWT
41	3/19/2015	Illegible	For VM Exterminating (Closet)	300	Illegible

59. Respondents conducted applications of MethQ at forty-one (41) application sites, set out in the table in Paragraph 58 above, which were not specified in the MethQ Labeling.

60. The “residences” and “nursing home” identified in the applications listed in the table in Paragraph 58, above, are not application sites specified in the MethQ Labeling.

61. The boat identified in one of the applications listed in the table in Paragraph 58, above, is not an application site specified in the MethQ Labeling.

62. The businesses identified in the applications listed in the table in Paragraph 58 above, is not an application site specified in the MethQ Labeling.

63. The school identified in the applications listed in the table in Paragraph 58 above, is not an application site specified in the MethQ labeling.

64. None of the forty-one (41) MethQ applications set out in the table in Paragraph 58 above, was supervised by a regulatory agent.

65. In the course of the forty-one (41) MethQ applications set out in the table in Paragraph 58, above, Respondent Torres and Respondent Tower each committed 82 separate violations of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G), specifically consisting of:

- a. 41 applications to a site not specified in the MethQ Labeling;
- b. 41 applications not supervised by a regulatory agent as required by the MethQ Labeling;

66. Each of the Respondents’ failures to comply with a specific requirement of the MethQ Label, as described in Paragraphs 60 to 64, above, constitutes a separate use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling, in violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G), for which a penalty may be assessed against each of the Respondents pursuant to FIFRA.

**Counts 83 – 90**

**Use of a Registered Pesticide in a Manner Inconsistent with its Label (Storage)**

67. Complainant realleges each allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 66, inclusive, as if fully set forth herein.

68. On six separate occasions Respondent Tower purchased containers of MethQ from M & P Pest Control, Inc. bearing the MethQ Labeling referenced in Paragraphs 28, 33, 38, and 40, above, and containing the statements set out in Paragraphs 54 and 55, above, on the following dates and in the following quantities:

	Date	Invoice	Quantity
1	2/4/2013	195273	1 50-pound container
2	11/13/2013	189768	1 50-pound container
3	3/27/2014	198333	2 50-pound containers
4	6/23/2014	203547	1 50-pound container
5	9/9/2014	208747	2 50-pound containers
6	12/24/2014	215130	1 50-pound container

69. During the April 15, 2015 Inspection, an inspector observed that the pesticide storage area at the Facility was neither outdoors nor well ventilated.

70. During the April 15, 2015 Inspection, an inspector observed at least one container of MethQ in the pesticide storage area at the Facility which was not stored in a secure manner.

71. Respondents stored each container of MethQ set out in the table in Paragraph 68 above, in the pesticide storage area at the Facility that was indoors and not well ventilated.

72. Respondents stored at least one container of MethQ set out in the table in Paragraph 68 above, in an unsecured manner.

73. Each of the Respondents' failures to store all the containers of MethQ in an outdoor or well-ventilated pesticide storage area constitutes a separate use of a registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling and is a violation of FIFRA Section 12(a)(2)(G), 7 U.S.C. Section 136j(a)(2)(G), for which a penalty may be assessed against each of the Respondents pursuant to FIFRA.

**CAA Liability Against Respondent Tower only**

**Count 91  
Failure to Comply With CAA Recordkeeping Requirements**

74. Complainant realleges each allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 73, inclusive, as if fully set forth herein.
75. Respondent Tower is, and has been at all times pertinent to this Complaint, a “person,” as that term is defined by Section 302(e) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7602(e).
76. Respondent Tower is, and has been at all times pertinent to this Complaint, an “applicator” of methyl bromide within the meaning of 40 C.F.R. § 82.3.
77. Respondent Tower is, and has been at all times pertinent to this Complaint, subject to the CAA and the regulations at 40 C.F.R. Part 82 promulgated thereunder.
78. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.13(z)(1), every applicator of methyl bromide produced or imported solely for quarantine and/or preshipment (“QPS”) applications must maintain, for three years, for every application, a document from the commodity owner, shipper or their agent, requesting the use of methyl bromide for QPS applications and citing the regulatory requirement that justifies its use.
79. Respondent Tower failed to collect and maintain the document described in the previous paragraph for any of the following forty-one (41) applications:

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Treatment Site/ Type of Structure</b>	<b>Invoice Number</b>	<b>Target Pest</b>
1	4/27/2013	Bayamon, PR	Residence	Illegible	Drywood Termite (DWT)
2	7/23/2013	Montehiedra, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
3	7/31/2013	Miramar	Residence	Illegible	DWT
4	9/14/2013	Cond El Monte, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
5	10/4/2013	Trujillo Alto, PR	Business (doors)	Illegible	DWT
6	10/24/2013	Viego San Juan, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
7	11/2/2013	Cidra, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT & PPB
8	11/19/2013	San Juan, PR	Business	Illegible	DWT & PPB
9	11/27/2013	Romany Park, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT & Powder

					Post Beetles (PPB)
10	11/29/2013	Guaynabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
11	12/3/2013	El Cortijo Bay, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
12	12/28/2013	Old San Juan, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
13	3/7/2014	Miramar, PR	Residence	Illegible	Moth
14	3/13/2014	La Torrimas, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
15	3/--/2014	Gurabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
16	4/11/2014	Rio Piedras, PR	Nursing Home	Illegible	DWT, Moth
17	5/27/2014	Ponce, PR	Business (Kitchen area)	Illegible	DWT
18	7/18/2014	Illegible	For MJ Exterminating (wood panels)	19079	DWT
19	8/6/2014	Illegible	Illegible	27679	DWT
20	8/18/2014	San Juan, PR	Business	Illegible	DWT
21	8/19/2014	Primavera, PR	Illegible	27801	DWT
22	9/11/2014	Ciudad Jardin, Gurabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
23	10/1/2014	San Juan, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
24	10/1/2014	Illegible	Illegible	Illegible	DWT
25	10/3/2014	Illegible	Illegible	27916	DWT
26	10/8/2014	Guaynabo, PR	Residence	Illegible	DWT
27	11/13/2014	San Juan, PR	Residence	28021	DWT
28	11/20/2014	Illegible	For Degoss Exterminating (4 Drawers)	Illegible	Illegible
29	12/4/2014	San Juan, PR	Residence	2 232	DWT
30	12/8/2014	Miramar, PR	Residence	23505	DWT
31	12/8/2014	Illegible	For MJ Exterminating (20 chairs)	Illegible	DWT
32	12/10/2014	Illegible	For Home Garden (8 Cabinets)	Illegible	Illegible
33	12/18/2014	Mayaguez, PR	For Temirio Construction (In San Sebastian School --Chairs & Desks)	Illegible	Illegible
34	Illegible	Illegible	For Alicia Exterminating (Wood Pieces)	Illegible	DWT & Moth

35	Illegible	Illegible	For LR Exterminating (Book Shelves)	Illegible	Illegible
36	1/12/2015		Home & Garden Cabinets	Illegible	DWT
37	1/15/2015	For MJ Exterminating	Living room/dining room	Illegible	DWT & PPB
38	2/14/2015	Las Piedras, PR	Residence	28281	DWT
39	2/14/2015	Illegible	Illegible	28280	DWT
40	2/16/2015	Illegible	Boat	28777	DWT
41	3/19/2015	Illegible	For VM Exterminating (Closet)	300	Illegible

80. Respondent Tower's failure to comply with the recordkeeping requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 82.13(z)(1) for the period February 27, 2013 to March 19, 2015 constitutes a violation of the CAA, for which a civil penalty may be assessed under Section 113(d)(1)(B), 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d)(1)(B).

**Count 92**  
**Failure to Comply With CAA Reporting Requirements**

81. Complainant realleges each allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 80, inclusive, as if fully set forth herein.

82. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.13(z)(2), every applicator that purchases methyl bromide that was produced or imported solely for QPS applications shall provide to the distributors from whom they purchase, prior to shipment, a certification that the methyl bromide will be used only for QPS applications.

83. Respondent Tower purchased containers of MethQ from M & P on the following six dates:

	Date	Invoice	Quantity
1	2/4/2013	195273	1 50-pound container
2	11/13/2013	189768	1 50-pound container
3	3/27/2014	198333	2 50-pound containers
4	6/23/2014	203547	1 50-pound container
5	9/9/2014	208747	2 50-pound containers
6	12/24/2014	215130	1 50-pound container

84. As a result of the M & P Inspections, EPA determined that M & P did not receive certifications from Respondent Tower stating that the methyl bromide purchased would be used only for QPS applications.

85. From February 4, 2013 to December 24, 2014, Respondent Tower purchased methyl bromide from M & P without providing, prior to shipment, a certification that the MethQ purchased would be used only for QPS applications.

86. Respondent Tower's failure to comply with the reporting requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 82.13(z)(2) from February 4, 2013 through December 24, 2014 constitutes a violation of the CAA, for which a civil penalty may be assessed under Section 113(d)(1)(B) 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d)(1)(B).

### **PROPOSED CIVIL PENALTY**

Complainant proposes at this time that both of the Respondents be assessed the statutory maximum penalties authorized by FIFRA and that only one Respondent, Tower, also be assessed the statutory maximum penalties authorized by the CAA. After an exchange of information has occurred, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.19, Complainant will file a document with a specific proposed penalty for each Respondent and an explanation of how the proposed penalty was calculated in accordance with the criteria in FIFRA and the CAA. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.14(a)(4)(ii), the text below provides the number of violations for which a penalty is sought, a brief explanation of the severity of each violation alleged and a recitation of the relevant statutory penalty authority of FIFRA and the CAA. Complainant intends to seek penalties for each violation by each Respondent alleged in the above Counts.

### **FIFRA VIOLATIONS AGAINST EACH RESPONDENT (TOWER AND TORRES)**

#### **EPA's FIFRA Penalty Authority and Overview of FIFRA Enforcement Response Policy**

Pursuant to Section 14(a) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136l(a), as amended, Complainant proposes the assessment of a civil penalty of up to \$7,500 per violation against each Respondent for each of the applicable violations of FIFRA alleged in this Complaint.

For the FIFRA violations alleged above, the proposed civil penalty will be determined in accordance with Section 14(a) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136l(a), as amended, which authorizes the assessment of a civil penalty of up to \$7,500 for each violation of "any provision of" subchapter II of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. §§ 136 - 136y. (Pursuant to the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 ("DCIA"), and the Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rules, 61 Fed. Reg. 69360 (December 31, 1996), 69 Fed. Reg. 7121 (February 13, 2004), and 73 Fed. Reg. 75345 (December 11, 2008) (collectively, "Inflation Rules"), as codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 19, the statutory maximum assessment per violation was raised to \$7,500 for violations occurring after January 12, 2009.)

For purposes of determining the amount of any penalty to be assessed, Section 14 of FIFRA requires that EPA “shall consider the appropriateness of such penalty to the size of the business of the person charged, the effect on the person’s ability to continue in business, and the gravity of the violation” (Section 14(a)(4) of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136/(a)(4)).

In developing the proposed penalty for the violations alleged in this Complaint, Complainant will take into account the particular facts and circumstances of this case, to the extent known at the time, and use EPA’s “FIFRA Enforcement Response Policy [for] The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act,” dated December 2009 (hereinafter referred to as the “ERP”). This guidance policy provides rational, consistent and equitable calculation methodologies for applying the statutory penalty criteria enumerated above to particular cases to develop a gravity-based penalty for each violation. A copy of the ERP is available upon request or may be obtained from the Internet at this address: <http://www.epa.gov/enforcement/fifra-enforcement-response-policy>.

Complainant may adjust each gravity-based penalty upward or downward based upon the violator-specific and environmental sensitivity adjustment factors described in the ERP. In addition, Complainant may add a component to reflect any economic benefit gained by Respondents for failing to comply with the regulatory requirement. Complainant will also consider, if raised, Respondents’ ability to pay a civil penalty. The burden of raising and demonstrating an inability to pay rests with the Respondents.

As a basis for calculating a specific penalty pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.19(a)(4), Complainant will consider, among other factors, facts and circumstances unknown to Complainant at the time of issuance of this Complaint that become known after the Complaint is issued.

**Counts 1-82** – Use of a Registered Pesticide in a Manner Inconsistent with its Label (Application), in violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

**Counts 83-90** - Use of a Registered Pesticide in a Manner Inconsistent with its Label (Storage), in violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G), 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G).

For each type of violation associated with a particular product, the penalty amount is determined under the seven-step process in the ERP that considers the Section 14(a)(4) criteria. These steps using the tables and Appendixes in the ERP are as follows:

(1) *Number of independently assessable violations*: The Agency considers each failure of an applicator to follow a distinct label requirement to be an independently assessable violation of FIFRA § 12(a)(2)(G). The number of violations and days of violations are set out in Counts 1-90, above. Each of these independent violations of FIFRA is subject to civil penalties up to the statutory maximum.



(2) *Size of business category for the violator*: In order to provide equitable penalties, civil penalties assessed for violations of FIFRA generally increase as the size of a Respondent increases.

(3) *Gravity of the violation for each independently assessable violation*: The level assigned to each violation of FIFRA represents an assessment of the relative severity of each violation. The relative severity of each violation considers the actual or potential harm to human health and the environment which could result from the violation and the importance of the requirement to achieving the goals of the statute. MethQ is a highly toxic restricted use pesticide. In conducting each of the forty-one applications described herein, each of the Respondents deviated substantially and in multiple ways from the requirements of the MethQ labeling, endangering themselves, their customers, potentially others, and the environment.

(4) *"Base" penalty amount associated with the size of business and the gravity of violation for each independently assessable violation*: The size of business categories and gravity levels are broken out in the ERP Penalty Matrices. FIFRA imposes different statutory ceilings on the maximum civil penalty that may be assessed against persons listed in FIFRA § 14(a)(1) and persons listed in Section 14(a)(2), and the ERP sets out separate penalty matrices for each. As a commercial applicator, each Respondent is subject to civil penalties under FIFRA § 14(a)(1).

(5) *"Adjusted" penalty amount based on case-specific factors using the gravity adjustment criteria*: The Agency has assigned adjustments, for each violation relative to the specific characteristics of the pesticide involved, the harm to human health and/or harm to the environment, compliance history of the violator, and the culpability of the violator. The gravity adjustment values from each gravity category listed in Appendix B of the ERP are to be totaled. Once this base penalty amount is calculated, it is to be rounded to the nearest \$100.

(6) *Economic benefit of noncompliance*: An economic benefit component should be calculated and added to the gravity-based penalty component when a violation results in "significant" economic benefit to the violator. "Significant" is defined as an economic benefit that totals more than \$10,000 for all FIFRA violations alleged in the complaint.

(7) *Violator's ability to continue in business*: FIFRA § 14(a)(4) requires the Agency to consider the effect of the penalty on a respondent's ability to continue in business when determining the amount of the civil penalty.

In instances where the Agency obtains records which evidence multiple applications, sales or distributions for the same violations, the Region may apply a "graduated" penalty calculation.

## CAA VIOLATIONS AGAINST RESPONDENT TOWER

### **EPA's CAA Penalty Authority and Overview of CAA General Policy**

Section 113(d) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d), provides that the Administrator may assess a civil administrative penalty of up to \$25,000 per day for each violation of the CAA. As previously noted, the DCIA requires EPA periodically to adjust its civil monetary penalties for inflation. Pursuant to the DCIA, EPA adopted regulations entitled Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustment Rule which are codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 19 ("Part 19"). The maximum civil penalty per day for each violation that occurred from January 12, 2009 until now is \$37,500.

In determining the amount of penalty to be assessed, Section 113(e) of the CAA requires that the Administrator consider 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 violation as established by any credible evidence, the payment by the violator of penalties previously assessed for the same violation, the economic benefit of noncompliance, the seriousness of the violation, and other factors as justice may require.

In calculating a specific penalty pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.19(a)(4), Complainant will consider, among other factors, facts and circumstances unknown to Complainant at the time of issuance of the Complaint that become known after the Complaint is issued.

Pursuant to Section 113(d) of CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(d), as amended, Complainant proposes the assessment of a civil penalty of up to \$37,500 per day against Respondent Tower for each of the applicable violations alleged in this Complaint.

The violations alleged in Counts 91 and 92 would result in Respondent Tower being liable for the assessment of administrative penalties pursuant to Section 113(d) of the CAA. The proposed penalty will be prepared in accordance with the criteria in Section 113(e) of the CAA, and in accordance with the guidelines set forth in EPA's Clean Air Act Stationary Source Civil Penalty Policy, as amended (General Policy). EPA's General Policy reflects EPA's application of the factors set forth in Section 113(e) of the Act and provides guidance on how EPA is to calculate penalties for the CAA. The policy indicates that EPA should propose a penalty consisting of an economic benefit component and a gravity component. The economic benefit component is the economic benefit the violator gained as a result of the violation. The gravity component, in turn, consists of elements based on the actual or potential harm caused by the violation, the significance of the regulation in question to the regulatory scheme, the sensitivity of the environment and the size of the violator.

*Economic benefit:* The General Policy provides the Region the discretion not to seek economic benefit where the benefit derived from the CAA violations is less than \$5,000.

*Gravity:* The General Policy also indicates that the Region should recover penalties that reflect the "seriousness" of the violation in a gravity component. In measuring the seriousness of these violations, the Region may consider the importance to the regulatory scheme, the duration of the

violation, and the size of the violator.

*Size of the violator:* In order to provide equitable penalties, civil penalties assessed for violations of the CAA will generally increase as the size of the business increases.

**Count 91 - Recordkeeping**—Failure to maintain records from commodity owner requesting use of QPS Methyl Bromide and citing legal justification for such use for 3 years, in violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.13(z)(1).

*Gravity:* Respondent Tower's failure to maintain records as required by 40 C.F.R. Part 82 contravened the essence of the regulatory scheme.

*Importance to regulatory scheme:* Respondent Tower, by failing to keep the required record, deviated substantially from the regulation. Recordkeeping allows regulatory agencies to confirm that QPS methyl bromide is being used properly.

*Duration of violation:* The violation period reflects the total number of days between the first date of a methyl bromide application for which no record was kept through the last date of such an application.

**Count 92 - Reporting**—Failure to provide certifications to distributor, prior to shipment of QPS methyl bromide, that methyl bromide will only be used for QPS applications, in violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.13(z)(2).

*Gravity:* Respondent Tower's failure to provide the required certifications for MethQ contravened the essence of the regulatory scheme.

*Importance to regulatory scheme:* The Respondent Tower, by failing to submit a required certification, deviated substantially from the regulation. Certification requirements help distributors report to EPA that QPS methyl bromide is being sold for a QPS purpose.

*Duration of violation:* The violation period reflects the total number of days between the first date of a methyl bromide purchase for which no certification was provided to the distributor through the last date of such a purchase.

## **PROCEDURES GOVERNING THIS ADMINISTRATIVE LITIGATION**

The rules of procedure governing this civil administrative litigation were originally set forth in 64 Fed. Reg. 40138 (July 23, 1999), entitled, "CONSOLIDATED RULES OF PRACTICE GOVERNING THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSESSMENTS OF CIVIL PENALTIES, ISSUANCE OF COMPLIANCE OR CORRECTIVE ACTION ORDERS, AND THE REVOCATION, TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF PERMITS", and are codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 22. A copy of these rules accompanies the Complaint.

## **A. Answering the Complaint**

If a Respondent(s) intends to contest any material fact upon which the Complaint is based, to contend that the proposed penalty is inappropriate or to contend that either or both of the Respondents is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, the Respondent(s) must file with the Regional Hearing Clerk of EPA, Region 2, both an original and one copy of a written answer to the Complaint, and such Answer must be filed within 30 days after service of the Complaint. 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.15(a) and 22.7(c). The address of the Regional Hearing Clerk of EPA, Region 2, is:

**Regional Hearing Clerk  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2  
290 Broadway, 16th floor  
New York, New York 10007-1866**

(NOTE: Any documents that are filed after the Answer has been filed should be filed as specified in "D" below.)

Respondent(s) shall also then serve one copy of any Answer filed to the Complaint upon Complainant and any other party to the action. 40 C.F.R. § 22.15(a).

Respondent(s)' Answer to the Complaint must clearly and directly admit, deny, or explain each of the factual allegations that are contained in the Complaint and with regard to which Respondent(s) have any knowledge. 40 C.F.R. § 22.15(b). Where Respondent(s) lack knowledge of a particular factual allegation and so states in its Answer, the allegation is deemed denied. 40 C.F.R. § 22.15(b).

The Answer shall also set forth: (1) the circumstances or arguments that are alleged to constitute the grounds of defense, (2) the facts that each Respondent disputes (and thus intends to place at issue in the proceeding) and (3) whether the Respondent(s) requests a hearing. 40 C.F.R. § 22.15(b).

Respondent(s)' failure affirmatively to raise in the Answer facts that constitute or that might constitute the grounds of their defense may preclude Respondent(s), at a subsequent stage in this proceeding, from raising such facts and/or from having such facts admitted into evidence at a hearing.

## **B. Opportunity to Request a Hearing**

If requested by Respondent(s) in their Answer(s), a hearing upon the issues raised by the Complaint and Answer may be held (40 C.F.R. § 22.15(c)). If, however, Respondent(s) do not request a hearing, the Presiding Officer (as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 22.3) may hold a hearing if the Answer raises issues appropriate for adjudication (40 C.F.R. § 22.15(c)).

Any hearing in this proceeding will be held at a location determined in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 22.35(b). A hearing of this matter will be conducted in accordance with the applicable

provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), 5 U.S.C. §§ 551-59, and the procedures set forth in Subpart D of 40 C.F.R. Part 22.

### **C. Failure to Answer**

If Respondent(s) fail in their Answer(s) to admit, deny, or explain any material factual allegation contained in the Complaint, such failure constitutes an admission of the allegation. 40 C.F.R. § 22.15(d). If Respondent(s) fail to file a timely [i.e. in accordance with the 30-day period set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 22.15(a)] Answer to the Complaint, Respondent(s) may be found in default upon motion. 40 C.F.R. § 22.17(a). Default by Respondent(s) constitutes, for purposes of the pending proceeding only, an admission of all facts alleged in the Complaint and a waiver of Respondent(s)' right to contest such factual allegations. 40 C.F.R. § 22.17(a). Following a default by Respondent(s) for a failure to timely file an Answer to the Complaint, any order issued therefore shall be issued pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.17(c).

Any penalty assessed in the default order shall become due and payable by Respondent(s) without further proceedings 30 days after the default order becomes final pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.27(c). 40 C.F.R. § 22.17(d). If necessary, EPA may then seek to enforce such final order of default against Respondent(s), and to collect the assessed penalty amount, in federal court or through other appropriate means. Any default order requiring compliance action shall be effective and enforceable against Respondent(s) without further proceedings on the date the default order becomes final under 40 C.F.R. § 22.27(c). 40 C.F.R. § 22.17(d).

### **D. Filing of Documents Filed After the Answer**

Unless otherwise ordered by the Presiding Officer for this proceeding, all documents filed after Respondent(s) have filed their Answer(s) should be filed with the Headquarters Hearing Clerk acting on behalf of the Regional Hearing Clerk, addressed as follows:

If filing by the United States Postal Service:

Sybil Anderson  
Headquarters Hearing Clerk  
Office of the Administrative Law Judges  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Mail Code 1900R  
Washington, D.C. 20460

If filing by UPS, FedEx, DHL or other courier or personal delivery, address to:

Sybil Anderson  
Headquarters Hearing Clerk  
Office of the Administrative Law Judges  
Ronald Reagan Building, Room M1200  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20460

### **E. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies**

Where Respondent(s) fail to appeal an adverse initial decision to the Agency's Environmental Appeals Board ("EAB") (see 40 C.F.R. § 1.25(e)), pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.30, that initial decision thereby becomes a final order pursuant to the terms of 40 C.F.R. § 22.27(c), Respondent(s) waives their right to judicial review. 40 C.F.R. § 22.27(d).

To appeal an initial decision to the EAB, Respondents must do so "[w]ithin thirty (30) days after the initial decision is served." 40 C.F.R. § 22.30(a). Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.7(c), where service is effected by mail, "five days shall be added to the time allowed by these rules for the filing of a responsive pleading or document." Note that the 45-day period provided for in 40 C.F.R. § 22.27(c) [discussing when an initial decision becomes a final order] does not pertain to or extend the time period prescribed in 40 C.F.R. § 22.30(a) for a party to file an appeal to the EAB of an adverse initial decision.

### **INFORMAL SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE**

Whether or not either or both of the Respondents request a formal hearing, EPA encourages settlement of this proceeding consistent with the provisions of the Act and its applicable regulations. 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b). At an informal conference with a representative(s) of Complainant, Respondent(s) may comment on the charges made in the Complaint, and Respondent(s) may also provide whatever additional information that it believes is relevant to the disposition of this matter, including: (1) actions Respondent(s) have taken to correct any or all of the violations herein alleged, (2) any information relevant to Complainant's calculation of the proposed penalty, (3) the effect the proposed penalty would have on Respondent(s)' ability to continue in business and/or (4) any other special facts or circumstances Respondent(s) wish to raise.

Complainant has the authority to modify the amount of the proposed penalty, where appropriate, to reflect any settlement agreement reached with Respondent(s), to reflect any relevant information previously not known to Complainant, or to dismiss any or all of the charges, if Respondent(s) can demonstrate that the relevant allegations are without merit and that no cause of action as herein alleged exists. Respondent(s) are referred to 40 C.F.R. § 22.18.

Any request for an informal conference or any questions that Respondent(s) may have regarding this complaint should be directed to:

Bruce Aber, Esq.  
Assistant Regional Counsel  
Office of Regional Counsel  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2  
290 Broadway, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10007-1866  
212-637-3224  
[Aber.bruce@epa.gov](mailto:Aber.bruce@epa.gov)

The parties may engage in settlement discussions irrespective of whether Respondent(s) have requested a hearing 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b)(1). Respondent(s) requesting a formal hearing does not prevent them from also requesting an informal settlement conference; the informal conference procedure may be pursued simultaneously with the formal adjudicatory hearing procedure. A request for an informal settlement conference constitutes neither an admission nor a denial of any of the matters alleged in the Complaint. Complainant does not deem a request for an informal settlement conference as a request for a hearing as specified in 40 C.F.R. § 22.15(c).

A request for an informal settlement conference does not affect Respondent(s) obligation to file a timely Answer(s) to the Complaint pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §22.15. No penalty reduction, however, will be made simply because an informal settlement conference is held.

Any settlement that may be reached as a result of an informal settlement conference will be embodied in a written consent agreement. 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b)(2). In accepting the consent agreement, Respondents waive their right to contest the allegations in the Complaint and waive their right to appeal the final order that is to accompany the consent agreement. 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b)(2). To conclude the proceeding, a final order ratifying the parties' agreement to settle will be executed. 40 C.F.R. § 22.18(b)(3).

Respondent(s) entering into a settlement through the signing of such Consent Agreement and their complying with the terms and conditions set forth in such Consent Agreement terminate this administrative litigation and the civil proceedings arising out of the allegations made in the complaint. Respondent(s) entering into a settlement does not extinguish, waive, satisfy or otherwise affect their obligation and responsibility to comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, and to maintain such compliance.

**RESOLUTION OF THIS PROCEEDING WITHOUT HEARING OR CONFERENCE**

If, instead of filing an Answer(s), Respondent(s) wish not to contest the Complaint and wants to pay the penalty within thirty (30) days after receipt of the Complaint, Respondent(s) should promptly contact the Assistant Regional Counsel identified on the previous page.

COMPLAINANT:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Dore LaPosta, Director  
Division of Enforcement and  
Compliance Assistance  
U.S. EPA, Region 2

Dated: 3/1/16,  
New York, New York



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that I have this day caused to be mailed a copy of the foregoing Complaint, bearing docket number FIFRA-02-2016-5306 and a copy of the Consolidated Rules of Practice, 40 C.F.R. Part 22, by certified mail, return receipt requested, to:

Wilson J. Torres Rivera  
c/o Tower Exterminating, Corp. dba Tower & Son  
Exterminating Corp. and Tower Exterminating  
P.O. Box 1045  
Bayamon, PR 00960

Wilson J. Torres Rivera, President  
Tower Exterminating, Corp. dba Tower & Son  
Exterminating Corp. and Tower Exterminating  
P.O. Box 1045  
Bayamon, PR 00960

I hand-carried the original and a copy of the foregoing Complaint to the office of the Regional Hearing Clerk, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2.

Dated: **March 1, 2016**  
New York, New York



John Doe

March 15, 1964