

*Mumford, Protsch & Pardy, L.L.P.*

*Attorneys at Law*

*Mumford Building*

*112 North Main*

*P.O. Box 153*

*Howard, South Dakota 57345-0153*

*Telephone (605) 772-4488*

*Telefax (605) 772-5720*

*E-mail: [mpp@alliance.com.net](mailto:mpp@alliance.com.net)*

DEC 5 2007 PM 2:07

*Wheaton, SD 57185*

*Telephone (605) 796-8130*

*Telefax (605) 796-8248*

*E-mail: [mppw@alliance.com.net](mailto:mppw@alliance.com.net)*

*P.O. Box 510*

*Madison, SD 57042-0510*

*Telephone (605) 256-6543*

*Telefax (605) 256-6544*

*E-mail: [mpplaw@iw.net](mailto:mpplaw@iw.net)*

*Franklin L. Mumford (1858-1917)*

*F.M. Mumford (1894-1960)*

*E.M. Mumford (1889-1964)*

*Vincent J. Protsch (of Counsel)*

*Thomas R. Pardy (of Counsel)*

*Gregory A. Protsch*

*Patrick T. Pardy*

December 5, 2007

Tina Artemis

Regional Hearing Clerk

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (8RC)

1595 Wynkoop Street

Denver, CO 80202-1129

Re: TW SERVICE INC.TSCA-08-2007-0015

TSCA-08-2007-0017

Tina:

Please find enclosed for filing one original and one copy of the ANSWER AND REQUEST FOR HEARING for TSCA-08-2007-0015 and one original and one copy of the ANSWER AND REQUEST FOR HEARING for TSCA-08-2007-0017. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Patrick T. Pardy

of Mumford, Protsch & Pardy, L.L.P.

PTP/mp

cc:

Dana J. Stotsky

UNITED STATES  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 8

2007 DEC -7 PM 2:07

DOCKET NO. TSCA-08-2007-0017

RECEIVED  
REGISTRATION DIV  
HEARINGS/CHERK

TW Services, Inc. )  
1606 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street ) Answer and Request for Hearing.  
Madison, SD 57042 )

Comes now the Respondent, TW Services, Inc., and for its answer to the administrative Complaint, states and alleges:

- 1) Denies each and every matter and allegation contained in the Complaint except such as are specifically admitted herein, or constitute admissions against Complainant's interest.
- 2) That Complainant fails to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted.
- 3) It is the respondent's intention to place all factual allegations of the Complaint that are not admitted at issue at the hearing.
- 4) Admits paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 of the General Allegations.
- 5) Respondent admits paragraphs 20 of COUNT 1.
- 6) Respondent denies paragraphs 21 & 22 of COUNT 1 and relegates the complainant to its strict proof thereof.
- 7) As to paragraphs 20, 21 & 22; Respondent alleges the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations, laches, estoppels and compliance.

- 8) Respondent admits paragraphs 23 of COUNT 2.
- 9) Respondent denies paragraphs 24 & 25 of COUNT 2 and relegates the complainant to its strict proof thereof.
- 10) As to paragraphs 23, 24 & 25, Respondent alleges the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations, laches, estoppels and compliance.
- 11) Respondent admits paragraphs 26 of COUNT 3.
- 12) Respondent denies paragraphs 27 & 28 of COUNT 3 and relegates the complainant to its strict proof thereof.
- 13) As to paragraphs 26 27 & 28, Respondent alleges the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations, laches, estoppels and compliance.
- 14) Respondent admits paragraphs 30 & 32 of COUNT4.
- 15) Respondent denies paragraphs 29, 31, 33 & 34 of COUNT 4 and relegates the complainant to its strict proof thereof.
- 16) As to paragraphs 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 & 34 Respondent alleges the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations, laches, estoppels and compliance.
- 17) Respondent admits paragraphs 36 of COUNT 5 .
- 18) Respondent denies paragraphs 35, 37, 38, & 39 of COUNT 5 and relegates the complainant to its strict proof thereof.
- 19) As to paragraphs 35, 36, 37, 38, & 39 respondent alleges the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations, laches, estoppels and compliance.

20) Respondent admits paragraphs 40, 41, 42, & 43 COUNT 6 .

21) As to paragraphs 40, 41, 42, & 43 respondent alleges the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations, laches, estoppels and compliance.

22) Respondent alleges that the proposed fines are onerous, burdensome, and in violation of the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution which prohibits excessive fines being imposed or unusual punishments inflicted.

23) Respondent hereby requests a hearing before an EPA Administrative Law Judge on the allegations in the Complaint.

Wherefore, Respondent prays that this action be dismissed, that it have its costs and disbursements herein, and for any other and further relief which the Court deems just and equitable.

Dated at Madison, South Dakota this 5<sup>th</sup> Day of December, 2007.

By: 

Patrick T. Pardy

Mumford, Protsch & Pardy L.L.P

Attorney At Law

P.O. Box 510

Madison, SD 57042

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 5th day of December, 2007, a copy of the foregoing was served by United States mail, postage prepaid, properly addressed to:

Dana J. Stotsky

Senior Enforcement Attorney

United States Environmental Protection Agency

Region 8, Office of Enforcement, Compliance and Environmental Justice

1595 Wynkoop Street (ENF-L)

Denver, CO 80202

Complainant

An original and one copy was sent via CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED, POSTAGE PREPAID to:

Tina Artemis

Regional Hearing Clerk

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (8RC)

1595 Wynkoop Street

Denver, CO 80202-1129



Patrick T. Pardy

Mumford, Protsch & Pardy LLP

Attorney At Law

P.O. Box 510

Madison, SD 57042