DAVILLIER LAW GROUP, LLC

1010 Common Street • Suite 2510 • New Orleans • LA • 70112 • Phone: 504-582-6998 • Fax: 504-582-6985

February 3, 2014

VIA U.S. MAIL &
FACSIMILE TO (214) 665-2182

Lorena Vaughn
Paralegal/Regional Hearing Clerk
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75202

RE: In The Matter of Golden Leaf Energy, Inc.
Docket No. CAA-06-2013-3351

Dear Ms. Vaughn,

Enclosed, please find the Respondent's Answer and Request for Hearing in the above referenced matter. This Answer is being filed with your office via facsimile this 3rd day of February 2014. In the attached Answer the Respondent requested a hearing pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 22.15(c); however, the Respondent respectfully request that a hearing not be scheduled at this time pending the completion of the settlement negotiations that are ongoing between the Complainant and the Respondent. Please send confirmation of this filing to the undersigned via facsimile to (504) 582-6985. If there are any questions or if any additional information is needed, please do not hesitate to give me a call. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Albert A. Thibodeaux

UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 6
DALLAS, TEXAS

IN THE MATTER OF:	§	
	§	
GOLDEN LEAF ENERGY, INC.	§	**EPA DOCKET NO. CAA-06-2013-3351**
HARVEY, LA	§	
	§	**RESPONDENT'S ANSWER AND**
JEFFERSON PARISH	§	**REQUEST FOR HEARING**

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 22.15 Golden Leaf Energy, Inc., the Respondent herein files its Answer and Request for Hearing to the Complaint and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing filed by Complainant the Director, Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 6. The Respondent provides the following responses to the factual allegations of the Complaint. The Respondent reserves its right to amend its Answer in these proceedings.

1.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 1 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

2.

The Respondent admits that it is the owner and operator of a biodiesel manufacturing plant in Harvey, Louisiana in the Parish of Jefferson. The Respondent further admits that an incident occurred at its plant on or about August 24, 2012. The remaining factual allegations of

Paragraph 2 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

3.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 3 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

4.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

5.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 5 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

6.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

7.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 7 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

8.

The respondent admits its status as a Louisiana business corporation.

9.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

10.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 10 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

11.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 11 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

12.

The Respondent admits that it is the owner and operator of a biodiesel manufacturing plant in Harvey, Louisiana in the Parish of Jefferson. The remaining factual allegations of Paragraph 12 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge of the factual allegations to justify a belief therein.

13.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 13 of the Complaint are admitted.

14.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 14 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

15.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 15 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

16.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 16 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

17.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 17 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

18.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 18 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

19.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 19 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

20.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 20 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

21.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 21 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

22.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 22 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

23.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 23 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

24.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 24 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

25.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 25 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge of the factual allegation to justify a belief therein.

26.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 26 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

27.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 27 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

28.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 28 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

29.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 29 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

30.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 30 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

31.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 31 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

32.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 32 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

33.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 33 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

34.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 34 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

35.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 35 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

36.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 36 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

37.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 37 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

38.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 38 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

39.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 39 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

40.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 40 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

41.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 41 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

42.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 42 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

43.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 43 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

44.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 44 of the complaint are denied by the respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

45.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 45 of the Complaint are denied as stated by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

46.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 46 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

47.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 47 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

48.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 48 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

49.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 49 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

50.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 50 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

51.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 51 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

52.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 52 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge of the factual allegation to justify a belief therein.

53.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 53 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein.

54.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 54 of the Complaint are denied by the Respondent for lack of sufficient knowledge to justify a belief therein. Respondent specifically alleges that the proposed penalty is inappropriate.

55.

The factual allegations of Paragraph 55 of the Complaint are admitted.

56.

The Respondent specifically alleges that the proposed penalty is inappropriate. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 22.15(e) Respondent reserves its right to amend its Answer to this Complaint.

57.

Paragraph 57 of the Complaint does not require a response from the Respondent.

58.

The allegations of Paragraph 58 of the Complaint require no answer from the Respondent. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 22.15(e) Respondent reserves its right to amend its Answer to this Complaint.

59.

The allegations of Paragraph 59 of the Complaint require no answer from the Respondent.

60.

The allegations of Paragraph 60 of the Complaint require no answer from the Respondent.

61.

The allegations of Paragraph 61 of the Complaint require no answer from the Respondent.

62.

The allegations of Paragraph 62 of the Complaint require no answer from the Respondent.

63.

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 22.15(c) Respondent specifically request a hearing upon the issues raised by the Complaint and Answer as amended. Further, Respondent respectfully requests that

the hearing not be scheduled at this time pending the exhaustion of the settlement negotiations in the instant case.

64.

The allegations of Paragraph 64 of the Complaint require no answer from the Respondent. Respondents reurge and restate its desire to have a hearing in this matter with a date not yet determined. Furthermore, Respondent reserves the right to amend its Answer in the above and foregoing matter.

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 22.15 (c) and 40 C.F.R. 22.15 (e), Respondent Golden Leaf Energy, Inc. restates its request for a hearing and restates its right to amend the foregoing Answer.

Respectfully Submitted,

ALBERT A. THIBODEAUX, LSBA NO. 24895
DAVILLIER LAW GROUP, L.L.C.
1010 Common Street; Suite 2510
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112
(504) 582-6998 Office
(504) 566-4942 Direct Dial
(504) 905-8442 Cell
(504) 582-6985 Facsimile
athibodeaux@davillierlawgroup.com
Counsel for Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned attorney, hereby certify that on the 3rd day of February 2014 a copy of the foregoing Answer and Request for Hearing in the above captioned matter was served on Jay Przyborski, Esq., Assistant Regional Counsel via email to Przyborski.jay@epa.gov and via United States Mail to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6; 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200; Dallas, Texas 75202-2733.

Albert A. Thibodeaux