

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION**

**COMPLAINT NO. R2-2008-0064  
FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY  
IN THE MATTER OF  
SANITARY SEWER DISCHARGES  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS) – DISTRICT 4  
SANTA CLARA COUNTY**

The Assistant Executive Officer of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (hereinafter the Water Board), under his delegated authority, hereby alleges that:

1. The State of California Department of Transportation (hereinafter the Discharger), has violated provisions of law for which the Water Board may impose civil liability pursuant to California Water Code (CWC) Sections 13323 and 13385 subdivisions (a)(2), and (a)(4).
2. The Discharger violated general discharge prohibitions contained in the Caltrans Statewide Storm Water Permit, Order No. 99-06-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000003 (Statewide Permit) by discharging waste to waters of the State and waters of the United States in a manner causing or threatening to cause a condition of pollution or nuisance.
3. The Discharger violated the San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), Discharge Prohibition 15, by discharging 155,000 gallons of raw sewage into waters of the State and United States.
4. Unless waived, a hearing on this Complaint will be held before the Water Board on November 12, 2008, at the Elihu M. Harris State Building, First Floor Auditorium, 1515 Clay Street, Oakland, California. The Discharger or its representative will have an opportunity to be heard and contest the allegations in this Complaint and the imposition of the civil liability. An agenda for the meeting will be mailed to the Discharger not less than 10 days before the hearing date. The procedures for the hearing and the submission of evidence are set forth in the attached Public Notice of Hearing.
5. At the hearing, the Water Board will consider whether to affirm, reject, or modify the proposed civil liability, to refer the matter to the Attorney General for recovery of judicial liability, or take other enforcement actions.
6. This Complaint is based on the following facts:
  - a. In June 2006, the Discharger completed an emergency repair to Interstate 880 (I-880) at Route 82 in the City of San Jose, Santa Clara County. The project consisted of making emergency repairs to segments of the I-880 mainline and on-ramp at the Alameda overcrossing that had settled due to excessive groundwater flow in the area and that

posed a safety risk for the traveling public. Major items of work included roadway excavation and reconstruction, placement of permeable blanket and pavement underdrain drainage systems, placement of sheet piles, temporary traffic staging and control systems, removal and replacement of drainage systems, and implementation of an extensive Traffic Management Plan to complete this work. According to the Discharger, due to the emergency nature of the project, the work commenced on Friday June 16, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. without engineering plans, specifications, or local permits.

- b. During the above-referenced repair, on Saturday June 17, 2006 at 3:00 a.m., the Discharger, by the actions of its contractor, RGW Construction (RGW), severed an active sanitary sewer line, resulting in a two-day discharge of approximately 155,000 gallons of raw sewage to the Guadalupe River, a water of the State and United States. Regulatory agencies were not notified of the discharge until Monday June 19, 2006, when RGW discovered the discharge and notified the Santa Clara Water District, who in turn notified the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (O.E.S.). The Discharger did not notify O.E.S. directly.
- c. On Saturday June 17, 2006 at 3:00 a.m., after almost completing the installation of sheet piles needed to control existing groundwater flow on-site, an excessive amount of water (noted to also be temporarily discolored) suddenly appeared around the sheet piles. Work continued until 7:00 a.m. The Discharger has stated in correspondence to the Water Board and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) that they knew they had encountered an unknown underground obstruction, but assumed it was a surge of groundwater resulting from sheet piling vibrations or that an abandoned line had been hit. All drainage from the project area flowed to a storm drain inlet located in middle of the on-ramp loop, and was then pumped through a pump station to a nearby storm drain line, which discharged to the Guadalupe River.

Work resumed at 7:00 p.m. Saturday June 17, 2006. At that time, workers noticed a "slight odor" and observed that the water flowing from around the sheet piles was darker than observed the previous day; however, the Discharger stated that "the flow rate was not abnormal" and work continued until Sunday, June 18, 2006 at 6:00 a.m., when all workers left the site until Monday morning.

On Monday June 19, 2006, at 7:00 a.m., the flow rate had increased and a stronger odor was detected. Thus, it was confirmed that a sewer line had been broken and the City of San Jose (City) was called to help stop the discharge. By 9:30 a.m., the City had shut down the downstream storm drain pump station and by 1:00 p.m., sewage flows upstream and downstream of the break were diverted to a secondary sewer line. RGW excavated the general area of discharge and determined that they had ruptured one of two 10-inch gravity-fed sanitary sewer lines. RGW repaired the broken line throughout the night.

- d. On Monday June 19, 2006, the Discharger and/or RGW also notified SCVWD of the discharge, but did not notify O.E.S. or our office. At 1:45 p.m. on Monday, June 19, 2006, SCVWD was the first to notify our office of the discharge. SCVWD then notified OES at 1:53 p.m. In response, Board staff called the District 4 Storm Water Program

Manager, who was not yet aware of the incident. Two days later, on June 21, 2006, the Program Manager emailed Board staff an initial spill report.

- e. Upon completion of the sewer line repair on Wednesday June 21, 2006, the affected area around the storm drain inlet was disinfected with chlorinated water and rinsed with clean water. The wash water was circulated within the drainage system and pump station and then discharged to the sanitary sewer. The regular groundwater flow was then circulated through the pump station and discharged to the sanitary sewer for about 6 hours, before the drainage system was reopened for normal operation.
- f. The Discharger conducted limited sampling of the sediments around the discharge inlet within the Interstate 880 loop onramp, and immediately upstream and downstream of the outfall in the river. However, this sampling was conducted on June 27, 2006 (one week after the discharge) not in response to the sewage spill, but instead to an accidental June 27, 2006 discharge of sediment-laden water (see finding g.), and to confirm that the methods that had been used to disinfect the area affected by the sewage spill were adequate. Analytical results provided by the Discharger indicate a 6-fold increase in fecal coliform downstream of the discharge point, 10 days after the incident. This fact suggests that residual sewage may have continued to affect the drainage system that conveyed the sediment-laden water and ongoing groundwater seepage.
- g. On June 27, 2006, a second waste discharge occurred during this project. While performing soil excavation for the installation of a drainage pipe, a pump that conveyed the groundwater flow through the Baker tanks and filter system failed. This failure caused sediment-laden water to flow into the DI, which bypassed the Best Management Practices (BMPs) protecting the DI, and discharged to the storm drainage system. The discharge lasted for about 2 hours until the flow was redirected away from the DI, discharging approximately 18,000 gallons of sediment-laden water into the drainage system. The plume of turbid water was carried downstream in the Guadalupe River and was visible for about one mile. Within 3 hours of the initial discharge the system was back in proper working order and all flows from the site were conveyed through the Baker tanks and filters.
- h. By discharging 155,000 gallons of raw sewage and 18,000 gallons of sediment-laden water, through the City of San Jose storm drain system to the Guadalupe River, the Discharger violated the terms of its Statewide Permit. Specifically, the discharger has violated Section A. General Discharge Prohibitions 1, 3 and 7 which state in part:
  - Prohibition 1: Any discharge from Caltrans rights-of-way or Caltrans properties, facilities, and activities within those rights-of-way that is not composed entirely of “storm water” to waters of the United States is prohibited unless authorized pursuant to Section B of this NPDES Permit...
  - Prohibition 3: The discharge of waste to waters of the State in a manner causing or threatening to cause a condition of pollution or nuisance defined in CWC section 13050, is prohibited.

- Prohibition 7: Wastes or wastewater from road sweeping vehicles or from other maintenance or construction activities shall not be discharged to any surface waters or to any storm drain leading to surface water bodies.

- i. In addition to violating the terms of the Statewide Permit, the Discharger also violated the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan is the Board's master water quality control planning document. It designates beneficial uses and water quality objectives for waters of the State, including surface waters and groundwater. It also includes programs of implementation, including prohibitions, to achieve water quality objectives.

The Discharger violated Prohibition 15 in Table 4-1 of the Basin Plan, which prohibits the discharge of raw sewage, or any waste failing to meet waste discharge requirements, to any waters of the region. The Discharger discharged 155,000 gallons of raw sewage to the Guadalupe River, a water of the State and United States within the region, in violation of Prohibition 15 of the Basin Plan.

The Discharger violated Prohibition 9 in Table 4-1 of the Basin Plan, which prohibits the discharge of silt, sand, clay, or other earthen materials from any activity in quantities sufficient to cause deleterious bottom deposits, turbidity or discoloration in surface waters or to unreasonably affect or threaten to affect beneficial uses. The Discharger discharged 18,000 gallons of sediment-laden water to the Guadalupe River, resulting in a one-mile plume of turbid water.

- j. In sum, the Discharger violated its Statewide Permit and the Basin Plan by discharging 155,000 gallons of raw sewage and 18,000 gallons of sediment-laden water to the Guadalupe River. These are violations of the CWC for which the Board may impose administrative civil liability. Therefore, the Discharger is civilly liable for these violations pursuant to CWC Sections 13385 (2), and (4). The authority and process for imposing civil liability are set forth in CWC Section 13323.
8. On July 5, 2006, the Discharger submitted a spill report describing the circumstances of the two-day discharge of sewage, the one-day sediment discharge, and the corrective actions implemented by the Discharger and RGW. The spill report also states in part, "Since this is an emergency project, there were no engineering drawings available on site and field personnel did not have as built plans readily available... According to the Contractor, USA (Underground Service Alert) confirmed through PG&E and the City of San Jose the absence of any utility pipes in the area of excavation."

After reviewing the spill report, Water Board staff found several inconsistencies between the spill report and information obtained during staff's investigation of the incident. In fact, information was available to the Discharger and should have been provided to RGW, such that if used could have avoided a discharge of raw sewage. This conclusion is supported by the following findings:

- a. Common practices for marking of underground lines not observed:  
CA Gov. Code Section 4216(j) does not require the marking of any subsurface non-pressurized sewers or storm drains, and such is the common professional practice. USA

and City of San Jose records indicate that RGW made an initial USA request for utility surveys as early as June 5, 2006, for storm line, grading and paving in the same area. A subsequent request for sewer and gas surveys was called in on **June 12, 2006 (7 days prior to rupturing the line)**. On June 13, 2006, a second request (pertaining to sewer and gas surveys) was filed for a field meeting with the surveying agencies. In response, Jose Campos of City of San Jose Public Works called and talked to Valentine Ibarra of RGW and informed him that a field meeting was not necessary since there were no City facilities in that location that required marking. Mr. Ibarra asked Mr. Campos about the presence of storm or sewer lines; to which Mr. Campos replied, "We do not mark gravity fed lines and if you suspect the presence of any on those lines, you should go back to Caltrans and check their plans". Since, it is clear that RGW personnel suspected the presence of utilities in the area and were notified that USA markings are not required for gravity-fed lines (of which most professional contractors are already aware); they and on-site Caltrans engineers had sufficient time to check existing Caltrans plans and maps prior to commencing emergency work on June 16, 2006.

b. Existing maps and plans were available, but not used and/or provided to RGW:

As stated above, records indicate that work in this area was started much earlier than reported. In fact, there were many "special projects" under construction (and contracted to RGW) within Santa Clara County for which designs and plans were approved. One of these special projects is located at Interstate 880 and Hwy 82, the same location as the break. The Discharger could have easily consulted plans/maps from this project to determine the existence and location of the active sewer lines. In fact, Board staff has obtained a copy of the utility plan for this location, which was approved and signed by Caltrans on June 7, 2005. This plan clearly shows both the sewer line in question and nearby manholes.

The plans indicate that the lines are vitrified clay pipes; but in fact they were cast-iron pipes that, according to the City of San Jose, were constructed by a past freeway-widening project, for which the discharger should also have the "as-built" map. These maps should have been provided to RGW by the Discharger when they initially requested a sewer and gas survey on June 12, 2006, and more importantly when RGW and Discharger engineers knew they had encountered an unknown underground obstruction on June 17, 2006.

c. Appropriate notification of both discharges not made by Discharger:

The spill report states, "The discharge was first reported to the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Board) over the phone on Monday, June 19, 2006, upon confirming the discharge and collecting sufficient information about the incident."

Water Board staff has no record of such a notification. The Discharger did not notify OES or our office when it became aware of the discharge at 7 a.m. on June 19, 2006. However, the Discharger did call the City of San Jose to help stop the discharge, which then notified SCVWD. SCVWD then notified Water Board staff at 1:45 p.m. and OES at 1:53 p.m. Water Board staff's first contact with the Discharger was our subsequent call to the Discharger's Storm Water Program Manager, who was unaware of the discharge.

In reference to the June 27, 2006 sediment discharge, the spill report states that SCVWD and our office were notified of the discharge the same day and that SCVWD met with Caltrans the following day to inspect the site. However, Board staff does not have any record of such notification and first learned of this discharge upon reviewing the spill report.

Water Code Section 13271 states that OES notification is required for all hazardous substances, including sewage, upon discovery.

### **PROPOSED CIVIL LIABILITY**

9. As provided by CWC Section 13385(c)(1) and (c)(2), the Board can administratively assess a liability of \$10,000 for each day in which a violation occurs, and \$10 per gallon for volume discharges not cleaned-up that exceeds 1,000 gallons.
10. a. For discharging 155,000 gallons of raw sewage, the Discharger is subject to a maximum liability of \$20,000 for the two days of discharge, plus \$1,540,000 for the gallons of waste discharged but not cleaned up in excess of 1,000 gallons (i.e., \$10 per gallon x 154,000 gallons) under CWC Sections 13385(a)(4) and (c). For violating Basin Plan Prohibition No. 15, the Discharger is civilly liable for up to \$10,000 under Water Code Section 13385(a)(4) and (c). Thus, the maximum civil liability that may be imposed against the Discharger is \$1,570,000.
- b. For discharging 18,000 gallons of sediment-laden water, the Discharger is subject to a maximum liability of \$10,000 for the one-day discharge, plus \$170,000 for the gallons of waste discharged but not cleaned up in excess of 1,000 gallons (i.e., \$10 per gallon x 17,000 gallons) under CWC Sections 13385(a)(4) and (c). For violating Basin Plan Prohibition No. 9, the Discharger is civilly liable for up to \$10,000 under Water Code Section 13385(a)(4) and (c). Thus, the maximum civil liability that may be imposed is \$190,000.
11. Pursuant to Water Code Section 13385(e), the Regional Board must consider the following factors in determining the amount of civil liability:
  - The nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation,
  - Whether the discharge is susceptible to cleanup or abatement,
  - The degree of toxicity of the discharge,
  - Discharger's the ability to pay and the effect on ability to continue in business,
  - Any voluntary cleanup efforts undertaken,
  - Any prior history of violations,
  - The degree of culpability,
  - The economic benefit or savings, if any, resulting from the violation, and,
  - Other such matters as justice may require.

### Nature, Circumstance, Extent and Gravity of the Violation

The Discharger and its contractor RGW conducted an emergency repair to the Discharger's right-of-way without engineering plans, specifications, or local permits, resulting in the discharge of 155,000 discharge of raw sewage to the Guadalupe River. This discharge could have been avoided and/or significantly reduced had the Discharger utilized the available resources as described in the Findings.

The gravity of the violation is significant because of the relatively large volume of sewage that was discharged during dry weather to a flowing riparian corridor of the Guadalupe River. The Discharger did not conduct any impact assessments during or immediately after the discharge; however, ten days after the incident, analytical results provided by the Discharger indicate increased fecal coliform levels downstream of the discharge point. In addition, photos of the discharge point during the incident clearly show a significantly discolored plume entering the river.

The existing beneficial uses of the Guadalupe River are: cold freshwater habitat, fish migration, municipal and domestic supply, preservation of rare and endangered species, fish spawning, warm freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat. From the point of discharge, the river flows for approximately 7 miles before entering the Alviso Slough and, ultimately, the San Francisco Bay. This stretch of river is also part of a recent restoration effort by the City of San Jose, including the Guadalupe River Trail system. During the month of May, steelhead trout and possibly chinook salmon may be present in various life stages and may include late spawning steelhead redds, juveniles and adults. Sewage may adversely affect these and other aquatic species, as described below. The adverse impact of raw sewage is of particular concern within this watershed.

### Susceptibility of the Discharge to Cleanup or Abatement

Since the discharge continued for 2 days before discovery, most of the sewage traveled downstream prior to the shut down of the pump station. However, since the discharge occurred during dry weather, once the pump station was shut down the accumulated sewage in and around the storm drain inlet could be contained. Nonetheless, had the Discharger utilized existing maps and/or followed prevailing industry practices for locating suspect utility lines, such as potholing and/or checking manholes (as described below), the discharge could have been prevented or effectively contained.

### Degree of Toxicity of Discharge

Given that the discharge was diluted with rising groundwater at an unknown ratio and the lack of monitoring data, it is difficult to assess the direct impacts of this discharge. However, raw sewage typically has varying degrees of toxicity that may adversely affect beneficial uses of receiving waters to different extents. Possible adverse effects include: deposition of biosolids, potentially leading to low dissolved oxygen conditions and/or covering of aquatic substrate that is aquatic species habitat; creation of a localized toxic environment within the water column; and, impairment due to elevated bacteria levels including pathogens. Case file photos indicate that the Guadalupe River had adequate early summer flows and riparian vegetation needed to support aquatic life. At 155,000 gallons, this non-storm related discharge likely posed a significant toxic impact.

#### Ability to Pay and Ability to Continue Business

The discharger is a department of the State of California with an annual budget of approximately \$14 billion. The Water Board has no evidence that the Discharger would be unable to pay the proposed liability set forth in this Complaint or that the amount of the liability would cause undue financial hardship.

#### Voluntary Cleanup Efforts Undertaken

Upon discovering that construction crews ruptured the sewer line 2 days prior, the Discharger requested the City of San Jose's assistance to cease the discharge. The City shut down the pump station and diverted upstream sewer flows and contained sewage to an alternate sanitary sewer line. Approximately 45,000 gallons (of the 200,000 gallon estimated total discharge) was recovered from the drainage system. All wastewater remaining on site around a ten-meter radius of the storm drain inlet was pumped through a series of Baker tanks and filter systems prior to discharge to the sanitary sewer. The impacted area was then disinfected with a 10 mg/l chlorine spray and the system was flushed to the sanitary sewer. Before the system was reopened for normal operation, uncontaminated groundwater flow was allowed to circulate through the pump station and discharged to the sanitary sewer for about 6 hours.

#### Prior History of Violations

Within approximately the past two years, the Water Board has issued five Notices of Violation (NOV) and one Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) to the Discharger for activities conducted within the San Francisco Bay Region.

In July 2007, an NOV was issued for failure to obtain Water Board approval of their Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prior to commencing construction on a phase of the new eastern span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

Two separate NOVs were issued for failure to implement adequate erosion and sediment controls for the Pigeon Pass State Route 84 Realignment Project (December 2007) and the Devil's Slide Bridge and Approach Road Contract (June 2006).

Two separate NOVs were issued, for failure to enforce water quality protection requirements of their contractors. One for the pressure washing of oil off the contractor's barge, subsequent to the Cosco-Busan oil spill (December 2007); and one for storm water permit violations associated with concrete cutting/grinding waste from on-gong repaving projects located in Eastern Alameda County (February 2007).

In October 2007, a CAO was issued for the illegal deposition of animal carcasses and refuse in an area adjacent to a creek in Santa Clara County.

The Discharger considered each of these projects to be high priority, time-sensitive projects. Similar to the June 2006 sewage discharge, these permit violations occurred partly due to poor site planning and communication.

#### Degree of Culpability

The Discharger is responsible for complying with its Statewide Permit, which prohibits such discharges from its facilities. In addition to the spill report inconsistencies discussed in the



Findings, Water Board staff found that the Discharger and/or RGW did not follow prevailing industry standards and practices regarding the location of suspect utility lines. According to City of San Jose engineers, it is not normal to ever rely on USA markings for project design, especially if sewer and storm lines are suspected. Even in emergency situations, a procedure called "potholing" is used to check for lines. Also, manholes in the area should be checked for existing flow and pipe depth. The lines in question were approximately 12-14 feet below grade, and may have been found by potholing. Also, maps indicate that sewer manholes were located nearby. Thus, the lines' location might have been determined by inspecting the manholes. The Discharger or RGW took neither of these precautions and should also be well aware that USA markings do not include gravity-fed sewer and storm lines.

#### Economic Savings

It is unlikely that the Discharger realized an economic savings from this incident overall. However, accelerating the schedule to make the repair without designs, plans, or local permits, and avoiding longer road closures may have potentially reduced project costs.

#### Other Matters as Justice May Require

The Discharger discovered the sewage spill at 7:00 a.m. on Monday June 19, 2006, and soon after notified the City of San Jose, but not OES. After receiving notification from the City, SCVWD notified Water Board staff and OES of the spill at approximately 1:50 p.m.; but the Water Board did not receive information from the Discharger until June 20, 2006.

Staff time to investigate the incident and prepare the Complaint and supporting evidence is estimated to be 150 hours. Based on an average cost to the State of \$125 per hour, the total cost is \$18,750.

12. Based on the above factors, the Assistant Executive Officer proposes civil liability be imposed on the Discharger in the amount of \$248,000 for the violations cited above.
13. This action is an enforcement action and is, therefore, exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15321.
14. The Discharger can waive its right to a hearing to contest the allegations contained in this Complaint by (a) paying the civil liability in full or (b) undertaking an approved supplemental environmental project (SEP) in an amount not to exceed \$124,000 and paying the remainder of the civil liability, all in accordance with the procedures and limitations set forth in the attached waiver.

September 19, 2008  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Executive Officer

Attachment: Waiver of Hearing Form

**WAIVER**

If you waive your right to a hearing, the matter will be included on the agenda of a Water Board meeting but there will be no hearing on the matter, unless a) the Water Board staff receives significant public comment during the comment period, or b) the Water Board determines it will hold a hearing because it finds that new and significant information has been presented at the meeting that could not have been submitted during the public comment period. If you waive your right to a hearing but the Water Board holds a hearing under either of the above circumstances, you will have a right to testify at the hearing notwithstanding your waiver. **Your waiver is due no later than October 20, 2008, 5 p.m.**

Waiver of the right to a hearing and agreement to make payment in full.

By checking the box, I agree to waive my right to a hearing before the Water Board with regard to the violations alleged in this Complaint and to remit the full penalty payment to the State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account, c/o Regional Water Quality Control Board at 1515 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612. I understand that I am giving up my right to be heard, and to argue against the allegations made by the Assistant Executive Officer in this Complaint, and against the imposition of, or the amount of, the civil liability proposed unless the Water Board holds a hearing under either of the circumstances described above. If the Water Board holds such a hearing and imposes a civil liability, such amount shall be due 30 days from the date the Water Board adopts the order imposing the liability.

Waiver of right to a hearing and agree to make payment and undertake an SEP.

By checking the box, I agree to waive my right to a hearing before the Water Board with regard to the violations alleged in this Complaint, and to complete a supplemental environmental project (SEP) in lieu of the suspended liability up to the amount identified in this Complaint and pay the balance of the fine to the State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account (CAA). The SEP proposal shall be submitted no later than October 31, 2008. I understand that the SEP proposal shall conform to the requirements specified in Section IX of the Water Quality Enforcement Policy, which was adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on February 19, 2002, and be subject to approval by the Assistant Executive Officer. If the SEP proposal, or its revised version, is not acceptable to the Assistant Executive Officer, I agree to pay the suspended penalty amount within 30 days of the date of the letter from the Assistant Executive Officer rejecting the proposed/revised SEP. I also understand that I am giving up my right to argue against the allegations made by the Assistant Executive Officer in the Complaint, and against the imposition of, or the amount of, the civil liability proposed unless the Water Board holds a hearing under either of the circumstances described above. If the Water Board holds such a hearing and imposes a civil liability, such amount shall be due 30 days from the date the Water Board adopts the order imposing the liability. I further agree to satisfactorily complete the approved SEP within a time schedule set by the Assistant Executive Officer. I understand failure to adequately complete the approved SEP will require immediate payment of the suspended liability to the CAA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title/Organization