

# Georgia Department of Natural Resources

## Environmental Protection Division

2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr., S.E., Suite 1154, Atlanta, Georgia 30334-9000

Judson H. Turner, Director

Land Protection Branch

Jeffery W. Cown, Branch Chief

Phone: 404/656-7802 FAX: 404/651-9425

### **Reply To:**

Hazardous Waste Management Program

2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, S.E.

Suite 1066, East Tower

Atlanta, Georgia 30334-9000

Phone: 404/657-8831 Fax 404-463-6676

### **TRIP REPORT**

December 27, 2012

#### **SITE NAME AND LOCATION:**

GC Quality Lubricants, Inc.

1480 Sixth Street

Macon, Bibb Co., 31206

#### **EPA ID NUMBER:**

None

#### **LATITUDE:**

N 32.820815

#### **LONGITUDE:**

W -83.632999

#### **TRIP BY:**

Marvin E. Woods 

Environmental Specialist

Georgia Environmental

Protection Division – Land

Protection Branch - HWMP

#### **DATE OF TRIP:**

November 8, 2012

#### **OFFICIALS CONTACTED:**

Mr. Michael Hutto

Citizen

#### **REFERENCE:**

Hazardous Waste Management

Act and Rules

Complaint # 69629

#### **COMMENTS:**

##### **I. BACKGROUND:**

The inspection was initiated as the result of a complaint that was referred to the Hazardous Waste Management Program of the Land Protection Branch. This citizen's complaint indicated that GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. was a three story warehouse, which had approximately 200-300 drums leaking an oily substance on all floors.

If it could be shown that some entity is disposing of used oil onto the ground, it would constitute a violation of the State and Federal used oil regulations. Therefore, this inspection was conducted to evaluate the conditions at GC Quality Lubricants, Inc., to make observations and to determine the possibility of RCRA violations at the site.



Complaint Tracking System:

Complaint Id: 69629

Received Date: Thu Nov 01 13:13:19 EDT 2012 Received By: nmoye

Entry Date: 2012-11-01 13:24:00.0 Entry Person: nmoye

**Caller**

Caller Name	First Name	Michael
	Last Name	Hutto
	Address	MACON, GEORGIA
	Email Address	borgdrama@yahoo.com
Represent	Citizen	
Caller Primary Phone	(478) 320-6197 Cell	
Caller Secondary Phone		
Caller Other Phone		

**Complaint**

Nature of Complaint	A three-story warehouse, that was formerly the Georgia Carolina Oil Company, has 200-300 drums that are leaking an oily substance on all floors.
Location of Complaint	Bay Street at the Corner of 6th Street Macon, GA
Direction to Complaint	Take I-75 South to exit 162 (Eisenhower Parkway) go East on Highway 80. Turn left to follow Highway 80/ MLK Jr. Boulevard. Turn right onto Bay Street. The warehouse is on the left at the corner of 6th Street, once you come up from under the railroad crossing.
City of Complaint	Macon
County of Complaint	Bibb
Primary Concern *	Hazardous material spill
Secondary Concern	UNDEFINED

**Source**

Facility ID Number	
Contact	Unknown
Source Name	formerly Georgia Carolina Oil Company
Source Address	GEORGIA
Source Primary Phone	

Source Secondary Phone	
Source Other Phone	
Source Email	

### Assignment

Chief Investigator	
Branch *	Land Protection Branch
Program *	Hazardous Waste Branch
Associate *	mwoods
Assigned Date *	Nov 1, 2012
Ten Days Follow	

### Actions

Accept Date	
Initial Investigation Date	
Close Date	
Resolved	

### Review

Approval Status	UNDEFINED
Approved Date	
Comments	
Review By	UNDEFINED

## II. FINDINGS:

I arrived at the referenced site to determine if the violations of the Rules were or had been occurring. When I arrived, there was no one at the facility and the doors were open. One of the three bay doors was open at the time of the inspection, which was open to the public, all weather conditions and anyone that happened to walk-by. I knocked on the front door and the open bay door, but no one answered. The business was closed and appeared to be out of business.

At this time, I proceeded to look around the property for someone to speak with and acknowledge my presence and also to look for any evidence of used oil violations. On this day, I proceeded to go to the open bay door where used oil could be seen on the floors in the building from the outside. I continued into the building looking for employees and found there to be numerous areas of used oil spilled on the concrete floor and there were twenty-two (22) 55-gallon drums on-site with unknown contents and no labels. The contents in the drums appeared to be used oil. There was also a large container which I could not determine the contents and was not labeled. The container was approximately a 10,000-gallon cone bottom tank. At the base of the cone bottom tank, in the secondary containment area, there was what appeared to be used oil that had sheen on top of its surface. On the outside of the building, there was no evidence of used oil being spilled on the concrete or soil.

Next, I walked across the street to another building (1403 Sixth St.), which had the same company name on the front of the building. I also wanted to see if there may be some employees at this location to answer questions about the complaint of used oil. There was no answer at the front of the building, so I proceeded to the side where I found a bay door open and proceeded to go in looking for employees or management. Once I was inside the second location (1403 Sixth St.), I noticed nine (9) 55-gallon drums on-site. Some of the drums had unknown contents, while a couple of the drums were labeled "wheel bearing lube", "non-melting oil" and one was labeled "methyl isobutyl ketone." There was also five (5) 5-gallon buckets of what appeared to be grease at this location. Scattered around all over the floor were test tubes, which indicates this was probably the quality and control laboratory. Before leaving this building, I noticed a back room and in this room there was used oil on the floor and a hole in the roof that would allow rain water to come in whenever it rained. Neither one of these locations was very secure, and it appears that people had been in and out of the buildings over time. I noticed food wrappings in both buildings.

Before leaving the sites, I tried contacting Mr. Michael Hutto, Complainant, to ask him some more questions about the site, but I was unsuccessful in reaching him.

The United States Department of Justice was counsel in the Middle District of Georgia Bankruptcy case (Case No. 01-55087 RFH) against Mr. John Paul Jones, Jr., Defendant/majority shareholder in Bay Street Corporation. GC Quality Lubricants is a subsidiary of Bay Street. The Defendant is the president of GC Quality Lubricants. This bankruptcy case was entered on April 23, 2004.



**CONCLUSIONS:**

Based on this investigation, the following violations were observed:

40 CFR Section 262.11 "Hazardous Waste Determination" - because the owner/operator failed to make a hazardous waste determination on two 55-gallon drums of unknown content.

40 CFR Section 279.22(c)(1) "Used Oil Storage Generator Facilities" - because the owner/operator failed to label one 10,000-gallon cone bottom tank and thirty-one 55-gallon drums containing used oil clearly with the words "Used Oil".

40 CFR Section 279.22(d)(1-3) "Used Oil Storage" (Response to Releases) - because used oil was observed on the concrete and soil. It was determined that the respondent failed to stop the release of used oil, and failed to clean-up and manage properly the released used oil and the soil contaminated with used oil.

**RECOMMENDATIONS/FOLLOW-UP:**

I recommend that a Notice of Violation letter be sent to GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. for the observed violations.

**PHOTOGRAPHS:** 26

**NUMBER OF SAMPLES TAKEN:** None

**REVIEWED BY:** *Freddie L. Dunlap* **DATE:** 01/02/2013


**ATTACHMENTS:** U.S. Bankruptcy Court Middle District of Georgia  
Macon Division and Macon/Bibb Tax Assessors

File: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc., Bibb

S:\rdrive\MarvinW\Complaints\Complaint #69629 GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Trip Report.doc








Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 1 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Outside of facility at location 1408 Sixth Street, Macon, Ga.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 2 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Inside a portion of the warehouse showing twenty 55-gallon drums and what appears to be used oil on the concrete.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 3 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Spilled container of unknown contents on the inside on the concrete.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 4 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Second portion of the warehouse where the office used to be showing stains on the concrete.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 5 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: One 55-gallon drum and used oil on the concrete inside the building.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 6 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: One 55-gallon drum of Wheel Bearing Lube.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 7 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: SPCC Plan prepared for GC Lubricants, Inc.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 8 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: One type of used oil processed at the plant when it was in operation.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 9 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: 10,000-gallon cone bottom tank with secondary containment containing used oil in secondary containment area.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 10 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Another view of tank and secondary containment area.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 11 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Part of warehouse where labeling of motor oil was performed.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 12 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Numerous motor oil labels and oil stains on the concrete.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 13 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Outside of facility location at 1403 Sixth St., Macon, Ga.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 14 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Two large tanks and a 55-gallon drum inside the open bay door.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 15 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: A fourth tank inside the 1403 location, approximately 500-gallons.




Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 16 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Unknown substance on the ground and a crushed 30-gallon drum.






Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 17 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: March stencil ink that's labeled as combustibile and laying on the floor.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 18 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Company labels found inside the facility.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 19 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Three 55-gallon drums, where two are not labeled.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 20 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Unknown contents of a 55-gallon drum and one labeled methyl isobutyl ketone.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 21 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: 55-gallon drum labeled non-melting oil.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 22 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Front office shot and lab area.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 23 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Large amounts of test tubes and small containers on the floor of facility.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 24 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program


Explanation: Rusty drums and wood from where ceiling has caved in, along with what appears to be used oil on the floor.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 25 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Two tanks approximately 250-300 gallons each in a back room.



Site Name: GC Quality Lubricants, Inc. Picture 26 of 26 County Name: Bibb

Date: 11/8/12 Photographer: Marvin Woods, Hazardous Waste Management Program

Explanation: Another photo of the two tanks showing where the ceiling has caved in.



William C. Vaughn II  
Board Chairman  
wvaughn@co.bibb.ga.us

## Macon/Bibb County Board Of Tax Assessors

Andrea Crutchfield  
Chief Appraiser  
acrutchfield@co.bibb.ga.us

653 Second Street, Macon GA 31201 | Phone (478) 621-6701 | Fax (478) 621-6737

The Bibb County Property Assessment Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

### Owner and Parcel Information

Owner Name	GC QUALITY LUBRICANTS INC	Today's Date	11/20/2012
Mailing Address	P O BOX 4304	Parcel Number	NOV 20 2012 Q084-0083
		Tax District	1
		Acres	2.1
	MACON, GA 312130001	Homestead Exemption,	Land Protection Branch SO
Location Address	1480 SIXTH ST	Zoning	M-2
Class Code	C	Neighborhood	3148
Parcel Map	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>Show Parcel Map</span> <span>Area Sales</span> <span>Street Sales</span> </div>		

### Tax Year Value Information

Land Value	Improvement Value	Accessory Value	Total Value	Previous Value
\$73,500	\$145,599	\$5,297	\$224,396	\$224,396

### Land Information

Type	Calculation Method	Acres	Value
Commercial	Acre	2.1	\$73,500

### Residential Improvement Information

Description	Actual Year Built	Value	Heated Square Feet	Basement Area Sq Ft	Attic Area Sq Ft	No. of Stories	Wall Frames
None							
Interior Walls	Roof Cover	Floor Construction	Floor Finish	Ceiling Finish	Heating	Condition	Sketch
None							

### Commercial Improvement Information

Actual Year Built	Value	Square Feet	Used As	Built As	Construction Type	Stories	Building Picture	Sketch
1973	\$86,133	9,800	Warehouse - Storage	Warehouse - Storage	Prefab Structural Steel	1 Story	Building Photo	Building Sketch

Actual Year Built	Value	Square Feet	Used As	Built As	Construction Type	Stories	Building Picture	Sketch
1984	\$59,466	1,920	Warehouse - Storage	Warehouse - Storage	Prefab Structural Steel	1 Story	Building Photo Not Available	Building Sketch

### Accessory Information

Description	Year Built	Value
Fence-Chain Link w/Top Rail	1975	\$5,297





**Sale Information**

Sale Date	Deed Book/Page	Plat Page	Price	Reason	Grantor	Grantee
			\$0	CONVERSION OF PAST SALES		GC QUALITY LUBRICANTS INC

[RETURN TO MAIN SEARCH](#)[TAX ASSESSORS' HOME](#)[BIBB COUNTY HOME](#)

You are Visitor 992207 since 6/8/2009.



[illegible]

**Road Centerline**

## Lake Wildwood

## Lake Tobesofkee

## Rivers

City Line

County Line

Map No./Route No.

Lot No.

Property House No.

## Parcel Lines

**Sale Date = 2009**

**Sale Date = 2010**

**Sale Date = 2011**

## Parcels

**Bibb County GIS**



**William C. Vaughn II**  
Board Chairman  
bvaughn@co.bibb.ga.us


**Macon/Bibb County**  
**Board Of Tax Assessors**

**Andrea Crutchfield**  
Chief Appraiser  
acrutchfield@co.bibb.ga.us

653 Second Street, Macon GA 31201 | Phone (478) 621-6701 | Fax (478) 621-6737

The Bibb County Property Assessment Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

**PHOTOGRAPH FOR PARCEL Q084-0083**



**Close Window**

© 2006 by the County of Bibb, GA



William A. Daughn II  
Board Chairman  
wdaughn@co.bibb.ga.us

# Macon/Bibb County Board Of Tax Assessors

Andrea Crutchfield  
Chief Appraiser  
acrutchfield@co.bibb.ga.us

653 Second Street, Macon GA 31201 | Phone (478) 621-5701 | Fax (478) 621-5737  
The Macon/Bibb County Property Assessment Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein. Its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

## Owner and Parcel Information

Owner Name	GC QUALITY LUBRICANTS INC	Today's Date	11/20/2012
Mailing Address	P O BOX 4304	Parcel Number	Q084-0086
		Tax District	1
		Acres	0.77
	MACON, GA 312130001	Homestead Exemption	50
Location Address	1403 SIXTH ST	Zoning	M-2
Class Code	C	Neighborhood	3147
Parcel Map	Show Parcel Map	Area Sales	Street Sales

## Tax Year Value Information

Land Value	Improvement Value	Accessory Value	Total Value	Previous Value
\$26,950	\$114,745	\$11,973	\$153,668	\$153,668

## Land Information

Type	Calculation Method	Acres	Value
Commercial	Acre	0.77	\$26,950

## Residential Improvement Information

Description	Actual Year Built	Value	Heated Square Feet	Basement Area Sq Ft	Attic Area Sq Ft	No. of Stories	Wall Frames
Interior Walls	Roof Cover	Floor Construction	Floor Finish	Ceiling Finish	Heating	Condition	Sketch
			None				

## Commercial Improvement Information

Actual Year Built	Value	Square Feet	Used As	Built As	Construction Type	Stories	Building Picture	Sketch
1929	\$96,517	11,250	Industrial - Light Manufactur	Industrial - Light Manufactur	Masonry Load Bearing Walls	1 Story	Building Photo	Building Sketch

Actual Year Built	Value	Square Feet	Used As	Built As	Construction Type	Stories	Building Picture	Sketch
1929	\$13,242	968	Industrial - Light Manufactur	Industrial - Light Manufactur	Masonry Load Bearing Walls	1 Story	Building Photo Not Available	Building Sketch

Actual Year Built	Value	Square Feet	Used As	Built As	Construction Type	Stories	Building Picture	Sketch
			Industrial -	Industrial -	Masonry			





1929	\$4,986	192	Light Manufactur	Light Manufactur	Load Bearing Walls	1 Story	Building Photo Not Available	<u>Building Sketch</u>
------	---------	-----	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	------------	---------------------------------	------------------------

### Accessory Information

Description	Year Built	Value
UTILITY BLDG	1940	\$4,235
UTILITY BLDG	1940	\$373
UTILITY BLDG	1940	\$792
Fence-Chain Link w/Top Rail	1940	\$6,573

### Sale Information

Sale Date	Deed Book/Page	Plat Page	Price	Reason	Grantor	Grantee
01/03/1985	1534 / 542		\$0	CONVERSION OF PAST SALES	GEORGIA- CAROLINA OIL CO	GC QUALITY LUBRICANTS INC

[RETURN TO MAIN SEARCH](#)


[TAX ASSESSORS' HOME](#)

[BIBB COUNTY HOME](#)

You are Visitor 991810 since 6/8/2009.



# Bibb County



- Interstate
- Road Centerline
- Lake Wildwood
- Lake Tobesofkee
- Rivers
- City Line
- County Line
- Map No./Route No.
- Lot No.
- Property House No.
- Parcel Lines
- Sale Date = 2009
- Sale Date = 2010
- Sale Date = 2011
- Parcels

Bibb County GIS



**William C. Vaughn II**  
Board Chairman  
bvaughn@co.bibb.ga.us

**Macon/Bibb County  
Board Of Tax Assessors**

**Andrea Crutchfield**  
Chief Appraiser  
acrutchfield@co.bibb.ga.us

653 Second Street, Macon GA 31201 | Phone (478) 621-6701 | Fax (478) 621-6737

The Bibb County Property Assessment Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assesment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

**PHOTOGRAPH FOR PARCEL Q084-0086**



**Close Window**

© 2006 by the County of Bibb, GA



UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

In the Matter of:	:	Chapter 7
JOHN PAUL JONES, JR.,	:	
	:	
Debtor	:	Case No. 01-55087 RFH
	:	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
vs.	:	
	:	
JOHN PAUL JONES, Jr.,	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	Adversary Proceeding
	:	No. 02-5025

BEFORE

ROBERT F. HERSHNER, JR.  
CHIEF UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

COUNSEL:

For Plaintiff:

Ms. Valerie K. Mann  
Environmental Enforcement Section  
Environment and Natural Resources Division  
United States Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 7611  
Washington, DC 20044-7611

Mr. Bernard Snell  
United States Attorney's Office  
Post Office Box 1702  
Macon, Georgia 31202

For Defendant:

Mr. Robert K. Lovett

Post Office Box 185  
Macon, Georgia 31202

Mr. Matthew M. Myers  
Post Office Box 185  
Macon, Georgia 31202

---

VON



## MEMORANDUM OPINION

The United States of America, Plaintiff,<sup>1</sup> filed a motion for summary judgment on December 15, 2003. John Paul Jones, Jr., Defendant, filed a response on January 16, 2004. The Court, having considered the record and the arguments of counsel, now publishes this memorandum opinion.

Plaintiff contends that, as a matter of law, certain civil penalties imposed under the Clean Water Act<sup>2</sup> are nondischargeable under section 523(a)(7) of the Bankruptcy Code.

The following facts are not in dispute: Defendant is the majority shareholder in Bay Street Corporation. GC Quality Lubricants is a subsidiary of Bay Street. Defendant is the president of GC Quality Lubricants. Georgia-Carolina Oil Company is also a subsidiary of Bay Street. Georgia-Carolina Oil Company owns an oil processing facility. The Court will refer to Bay Street, GC Quality Lubricants, and Georgia-Carolina Oil Company collectively as the “oil companies.”

Plaintiff initiated a cleanup of oil pollution at the oil processing facility.

---

<sup>1</sup> The United States of America filed this adversary proceeding on behalf of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

<sup>2</sup> The Clean Water Act is also known as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (“FWPCA”). See, e.g., Loggerhead Turtle v. County Council of Volusia County, Florida, 307 F.3d 1318, 1325 (11th Cir. 2002).

Plaintiff contends the costs for the cleanup totaled almost \$2.6 million.

Plaintiff filed a civil action in federal district court seeking: (1) reimbursement of the cleanup costs of \$2.6 million under the Oil Pollution Act, 33 U.S.C.A. § 2702; (2) civil penalties for the discharge of oil into a navigable water under the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C.A. § 1321(b)(7)(A); and (3) civil penalties for the failure to have a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures plan to prevent and control oil pollution under the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C.A. § 1321(b)(7)(C) and (j). The district court entered an order on June 4, 2003, which held that Defendant, as an individual, and the oil companies are liable for cleanup costs under the Oil Pollution Act and are also liable for civil penalties under the Clean Water Act. The district court has not determined the amount of the cleanup costs and civil penalties.<sup>3</sup>

An order that establishes liability but leaves open the question of damages ordinarily is not a final order for purposes of preclusion.<sup>4</sup> In the pending motion for summary judgment, neither Plaintiff nor Defendant argues that this Court should delay ruling on the issue presented until the district court determines the amount of cleanup costs and civil penalties. The Court is persuaded that the issue presented is legal in

---

<sup>3</sup> United States v. Jones, 267 F. Supp. 2d 1349 (M.D. Ga. 2003).

<sup>4</sup> 18A C. Wright, A. Miller, & E. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure § 4432, p 57 (2002). Contra Metromedia Co. v Fugazy, 983 F.2d 350, 366 (2nd. Cir. 1992), cert denied, 508 U.S. 952, 113 S.Ct. 2445, 124 L. Ed. 2d 662 (1993) (“The mere fact that the damages awarded to the plaintiff have not been yet calculated, though normally precluding an immediate appeal, does not prevent use of a final ruling on liability as collateral estoppel.”).

nature as opposed to being a factual dispute. The Court is persuaded that the issue presented is appropriate for summary judgment because the Court will rule only on the issue of whether the civil penalties are dischargeable under the Bankruptcy Code.

Defendant filed a petition under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code on November 9, 2001. Plaintiff filed on February 4, 2002, an adversary proceeding contending that Defendant's obligations for civil penalties are nondischargeable in bankruptcy. Plaintiff does not contend that Defendant's obligations for cleanup costs are nondischargeable.

Section 523(a)(7) of the Bankruptcy Code provides:

**§523. Exceptions to discharge.**

(a) A discharge under section 727, 1141, 1228(a), 1228(b), or 1328(b) of this title does not discharge an individual debtor from any debt—

...

(7) to the extent such debt is for a fine, penalty, or forfeiture payable to and for the benefit of a governmental unit, and is not compensation for actual pecuniary loss, other than a tax penalty—

(A) relating to a tax of a kind not specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

(B) imposed with respect to a transaction or event that occurred before three years before the date of the filing of the petition;

11 U.S.C.A. § 523(a)(7) (West1993).

Defendant does not contend that the civil penalties at issue are tax penalties.

Defendant does not dispute that the civil penalties are penalties payable to and for the

benefit of a governmental unit. Defendant contends that the civil penalties are “compensation for actual pecuniary loss” and therefore are not excepted from discharge under section 523(a)(7).

“As for the reference to ‘compensation for actual pecuniary loss,’ the Senate Report indicates that the main purpose of this language was to prevent § 523(a)(7) from being applied to tax penalties. S. Rep No. 95-989, supra, at 79.” Kelly v. Robinson, 479 U.S. 36, 107 S.Ct. 353, 93 L. Ed. 2d 216, 229 n 13 (1986).

“The term ‘actual pecuniary loss’ clearly connotes measurable damages from particular instances of wrongdoing. . . . Moreover, it has been held that even if a penalty is based in part on measurable pecuniary loss, it will not be deemed compensation for such loss under 523(a)(7) if its primary purpose is penal.” Kish v. Farmer, (In re Kish), 238 B.R. 271, 285 (Bankr. D.N.J. 1999).

The Clean Water Act provides in part:

**§ 1321. Oil and hazardous substance liability**

...

**(b) Congressional declaration of policy against discharges of oil or hazardous substances; designation of hazardous substances; study of higher standard of care incentives and report to Congress; liability; penalties; civil actions; penalty limitations, separate offenses, jurisdiction, mitigation and damages and costs; recovery of removal costs; alternative remedies and withholding clearance of vessels**

...

**(7) Civil penalty action**

**(A) Discharge, generally**

Any person who is the owner, operator, or person in charge of any vessel, onshore facility, or offshore facility from which oil or a hazardous substance is discharged in violation of paragraph (3), shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount up to \$25,000 per day of violation or an amount up to \$1,000 per barrel of oil or unit of reportable quantity of hazardous substances discharged.

...

**(C) Failure to comply with regulation**

Any person who fails or refuses to comply with any regulation issued under subsection (j) of this section shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount up to \$25,000 per day of violation.

33 U.S.C.A. § 1321(b)(7)(A), (C) (West 2001).

Subsection 1321(j) requires in part that an oil facility have a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure plan to prevent oil pollution from occurring.

“Civil liability under the CWA [Clean Water Act] is strict.”

United States v. Jones, 267 F. Supp.2d 1349, 1361 (2003). “[O]nce a violation has been established, some form of penalty is required. . . . Civil penalties are to be assessed. . . . as a matter of law.” Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Tyson Foods, 897 F.2d 1128, 1142 (11th Cir. 1990).

The Clean Water Act provides that the district court shall consider certain factors in determining the amount of the civil penalties. The civil penalties are deposited into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. The Clean Water Act provides in part:

**(8) Determination of amount**

In determining the amount of a civil penalty under paragraphs (6) and (7), the Administrator, Secretary, or the court, as the case may be, shall consider the seriousness of the violation or violations, the economic benefit to the violator, if any, resulting from the violation, the degree of culpability involved, any other penalty for the same incident, any history of prior violations, the nature, extent, and degree of success of any efforts of the violator to minimize or mitigate the effects of the discharge, the economic impact of the penalty on the violator, and any other matters as justice may require.

33 U.S.C.A. § 1321(b)(8) (West 2001).

**(s) Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund**

The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established under section 9509 of Title 26 shall be available to carry out subsections (b), (c), (d), (j), and (l) of this section as those subsections apply to discharges, and substantial threats of discharges of oil. Any amounts received by the United States under this section shall be deposited in the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

33 U.S.C.A. § 1321(s) (West 2001).

The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund is financed in part from penalties assessed under § 1321(b). The Trust Fund is used in part to compensate the government for cleanup costs. Berman Enterprises, Inc. v. Jorling, 793 F. Supp. 408, 416 (E.D.N.Y. 1992); aff'd 3 F.3d 602 (2nd Cir. 1993), cert denied 510 U.S. 1073, 145 S.Ct. 883,

127 L.Ed.2d 78 (1994).

In determining whether a civil penalty is compensation for actual pecuniary loss, courts consider: (1) whether calculation of the penalty bears any relationship to the costs incurred by the government; (2) whether the penalty collected must be used to mitigate the particular damage caused by the violation; and (3) whether the government suffered any actual pecuniary loss. Arizona v. Ott, (In re Ott), 218 B.R. 118, 122-23 (Bankr. W.D. Wash. 1998); Commonwealth of Kentucky, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet v. Seals, 161 B.R. 615, 620-21 (W.D. Vir. 1993); United States v. Lueking, 125 B.R. 513, 516 (E.D. Tenn. 1990). See also, United States Dept. of Energy v. Seneca Oil Co., (In re Seneca Oil Co.) 906 F.2d 1445, 1455-56 (10th Cir. 1990).

In United States v. WRW Corp.,<sup>5</sup> civil penalties totaling \$90,350 were assessed against the corporation's principals for serious violations of safety standards under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act. The principals served prison sentences and paid criminal fines. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals held that the civil penalties were nondischargeable under section 523(a)(7) and stated in part:

The defendants argue that the imposition of a civil penalty promotes the aims of retribution and deterrence, given the various factors used to determine the amount of the civil penalty. However, even though the application of these factors to a given case may result in a penalty which is punitive, we conclude that imposing a civil penalty for health and safety violations which

---

<sup>5</sup> 986 F.2d 138 (6th Cir. 1993).

varies in amount based upon the severity of the violation and the operator's attempts to come into immediate compliance may as readily be ascribed to the remedial purpose of promoting mine safety.

986 F.2d at 141-42.

The Government argues that the factors to be considered in assessing penalties under 30 U.S.C. § 820(i) [Federal Mine Safety and Health Act] do not relate to any party's pecuniary loss but rather indicate that the penalty is not compensation for actual pecuniary loss, a fact on which the district court relied. . . . In this case, the Government argues that the debt has a remedial, compensatory purpose because it results in rough repayment to the Government of prosecutorial and investigative expenses, but is not compensation for *actual* pecuniary loss because the size of the penalty is not derived from a showing of actual loss. Instead, the penalty amount is based upon factors which focus on the Act's primary remedial purpose of promoting mine safety. There was no actual pecuniary loss to the Government in this case in the traditional sense, but only prosecutorial and investigative expenses.

We conclude that the penalty at issue is not compensation for actual pecuniary loss even though it is rationally related to the goal of making the Government whole by roughly compensating it for prosecutorial and investigative expenses. Concededly, this is a fine distinction. Had the size of the penalty been calculated according to proof of actual pecuniary loss, it would not be excepted from discharge under § 523(a)(7).

986 F.2d at 145 (emphasis original).

In New Hampshire v. Tinkham, (In re Tinkham),<sup>6</sup> Tinkham dumped chemical wastes into the ground and ground waters. Tinkham was ordered to pay cleanup costs, criminal fines, and civil penalties. The bankruptcy court held that the criminal fines

---

<sup>6</sup> 59 B.R. 209 (Bankr. D.N.H. 1986).



and civil penalties were nondischargeable, and stated in part:

With regard to the civil penalty of \$670,000 imposed under the state court civil judgment, Tinkham again argues that that obligation is dischargeable here. As to this civil penalty, Tinkham's contention seems to be that the penalty was in reality a compensation for actual pecuniary loss within the meaning of § 523(a)(7). However, the record establishes that the jury in the civil action imposed the civil penalty under the enabling statute, RSA 149:19, which provides a maximum civil penalty of \$10,000 per day for each day of violation for the discharge of waste without a required permit. The jury's civil verdict against Tinkham imposed a fine of \$10,000 per day for 67 days of violation, totaling the \$670,000 civil penalty in question. The jury by *another* special verdict granted judgment for the *actual* damages suffered by the State in terms of "amount of expenses that the State has incurred to date. . . .[and]. . . . the amount of expenses that the state will probably incur in the future" to a total amount of \$11,357,000. It is obvious therefore that the additional \$670,000 civil penalty was in fact a true "penalty" in the sense of "punishment" and not an attempt [to] reimburse a governmental unit for actual pecuniary loss. The court therefore in its order will likewise determine that the civil penalty in the amount of \$670,000 is nondischargeable pursuant to Bankruptcy Code § 523(a)(7).

59 B.R. at 213 (emphasis original).

In Tull v. United States,<sup>7</sup> Tull, a real estate developer, dumped fill material into wetlands adjacent to navigable waters. The federal government sought, in part, civil penalties under the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d). Tull demanded a jury trial both on liability and the amount of civil penalties. The United States Supreme Court held that Tull was entitled to a jury trial on liability but not on the amount of civil

---

<sup>7</sup> 481 U.S. 412, 107 S.Ct. 1831, 95 L.Ed.2d 365 (1987).

penalties. The Supreme Court stated in part:

Subsection (d) does not direct that the "civil penalty" imposed be calculated solely on the basis of equitable determinations, such as the profits gained from violations of the statute, but simply imposes a maximum penalty of \$10,000 per day of violation. The legislative history of the Act reveals that Congress wanted the district court to consider the need for retribution and deterrence, in addition to restitution, when it imposed civil penalties. . . . A court can require retribution for wrongful conduct based on the seriousness of the violations, the number of prior violations, and the lack of good-faith efforts to comply with the relevant requirements. It may also seek to deter future violations by basing the penalty on its economic impact. Subsection 1319(d)'s authorization of punishment to further retribution and deterrence clearly evidences that this subsection reflects more than a concern to provide equitable relief. . . .

107 S.Ct. at 1838.

The Government contends, however, that a suit enforcing civil penalties under the Clean Water Act is similar to an action for disgorgement of improper profits, traditionally considered an equitable remedy. It bases this characterization upon evidence that the District Court determined the amount of the penalties by multiplying the number of lots sold by petitioner by the profit earned per lot. An action for disgorgement of improper profits is, however, a poor analogy. Such an action is a remedy only for restitution--a more limited form of penalty than a civil fine. Restitution is limited to "restoring the status quo and ordering the return of that which rightfully belongs to the purchaser or tenant." As the above discussion indicates, however, § 1319(d)'s concerns are by no means limited to restoration of the status quo.

107 S.Ct. at 1839.

In United States v. Atlantic Richfield Co.,<sup>8</sup> an "accidental or faultless" oil spill

---

<sup>8</sup> 429 F. Supp. 830 (E.D. Pa. 1977), aff'd 573 F.2d 1303 (3rd Cir. 1978).

occurred. The facility owner promptly reported and cleaned up the spill. The Coast Guard assessed a civil penalty under the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C.A.

§ 1321(b)(6). The facility owner objected to the civil penalty. The district court enforced the penalty assessed by the Coast Guard and stated in part:

These cases raise issues concerning the proper construction and the constitutionality of the "civil penalty" provision of the oil and hazardous substance sections of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (FWPCA), § 1321(b)(6) of 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 et seq. (Supp. 1976). The constructional issues boil down to whether Congress intended to impose the civil penalty on persons who spill oil accidentally, report such spills to the appropriate authorities, and clean it up at their own expense . .

429 F. Supp at 832.

Congress, in the apparently plain language of § 1321(b)(3) and (6), mandated that the Coast Guard assess a "civil" penalty against any person who owns or operates a vessel or facility from which oil has been discharged in harmful quantities into the navigable waters. Congress created no exceptions or defenses to a (b)(6) suit other than denial that the elements of a violation had been proved. . . .

429 F. Supp at 835.

We find that defendants' argument makes most sense when translated into simple economic terms. A rational owner of an oil facility, recognizing his potential liabilities for clean ups under § 1321 (and for damages under common law damage remedies which § 1321 leaves untouched), will attempt to minimize the costs of spills. To accomplish this he will calculate the marginal costs of preventing spills and of potential liabilities. He will thereupon engage in prevention to the point where the marginal

cost of prevention equals his marginal liability for spills. Because that point defines reasonable spill prevention, a reasonable person will spend money for just that much prevention and no more. To spend less would be negligent. See *United States v. Carroll Towing Co.*, 159 F.2d 169 (2d Cir. 1947); Posner, *Economic Analysis of Law* (1972). To spend more would be wasteful or inefficient. See Ackerman, *Economic Foundations of Property Law*, at xi-xiv (1975) (brief definition and analysis of efficiency).

On this basis we can make some sense of defendants' argument that (b)(6) serves no regulatory purpose when applied to "faultless" spillers. But defendants move from the claim that they were "faultless" to the claim that no regulatory purpose would be served by imposing a (b)(6) penalty, an argument we reject because it proceeds from a faulty premise. While it is true that the stipulated facts about the spills themselves would not be sufficient to support an action in negligence, this is not such an action, but rather an action to enforce a penalty.

The elements of this statutory action are only that defendant violated (b)(3) and that the Coast Guard following the appropriate procedure assessed the (b)(6) penalty. The statute does not make "fault" an element of the cause of the action, but rather a factor in the administrative penalty setting procedure. This is proper because there is no principle of law which requires that civil regulability through imposition of penalty be predicated upon a finding of fault. Moreover, a number of factors support civil regulability here in the absence of fault. First, as we explain more fully in our discussion of the Constitutional issues, *infra*, the principal goal of (b)(6) is to deter spills. Second, the Congressional purpose here was to impose a standard of conduct higher than that related just to economic efficiency. Additionally, the Congress obviously believed:

- (a) that no clean up effort could be complete because, after discharge, it is impossible to guarantee against residual harm from quantities of oil too small or too well dispersed to be detectable; and
- (b) that even the transitory pollution of waters was deleterious to the environment.

429 F. Supp at 835.

In the view of the foregoing analysis we must reject defendant's contention that, as applied to accidental, reporting, self-cleaners, (b)(6) is really criminal rather than civil because, (1) the statutory language is not ambiguous; and (2) even where defendants are not at fault, the penalty does not act only as a punishment but serves the ends of civil regulation.

429 F. Supp at 836.

Defendant relies upon Whitehouse v. LaRoche.<sup>9</sup> In that case, the State of Rhode Island filed a complaint in federal district court contending that LaRoche had violated the Clean Water Act and state water pollution acts. Certain creditors filed an involuntary Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceeding against LaRoche. In the district court action, the district court entered a consent decree in which LaRoche agreed to reimburse the state for any "shortfall amount" for the costs of a new water treatment facility.

The state, in the bankruptcy proceeding, contended that LaRoche's obligation was nondischargeable under section 523(a)(7). The First Circuit Court of Appeals held that LaRoche's obligation under the consent decree was enforceable and dispositive of the nondischargeable issue. The circuit court stated in part:

---

<sup>9</sup> 277 F.3d 568 (1st Cir. 2002).

Although Bankruptcy Code § 523(a)(7) applies to both civil *and* criminal penalties, in order to qualify for a dischargeability exception under subsections 523(a)(7), normally the particular penalty must serve some “punitive” or “rehabilitative” governmental aim, rather than a purely compensatory purpose.

Appellants contend that these civil penalties, imposed pursuant to Rhode Island law, *see* R.I. Gen. Laws § 46-12-13, were designed to deter and remediate environmental contamination, a particularly important governmental function implemented under the States’s police and regulatory powers. Moreover, appellants argue, LaRoche potentially was exposed to fines up to \$25,000 per day, a sum which bears neither any obvious nor essential correlation to the amount needed to compensate the State for its actual response costs.

On the other hand, there can be no question but that the *consent decree itself explicitly equates the amount of these civil penalties with the “shortfall amount,”* which in turn plainly was designed to reimburse the State for the *actual losses*, neither more nor less. Appellants respond, however, that their decision to calculate the punitive fines under that convenient methodology cannot deprive these civil penalties of their “punitive” nature. We need not resolve these issues, however, since the CWA/RIWPCA consent decree itself disposes of the contention that appellants’ claim is excepted from discharge under Bankruptcy Code § 523(a)(7).

277 F.3d at 573-74 (emphasis original).

Turning to the case at bar, in the district court action, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties under two subsections of the Clean Water Act. First, the district court has determined that Defendant failed to have a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures plan to prevent and control oil pollution.

“The regulations impose a duty to have a SPCC plan whether there is an oil

spill or not. The point of the SPCC is to be prophylactic - to prevent oil discharges to navigable waters.” Pepperell Assoc. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, 246 F.3d 15, 24 (1st. Cir. 2001).

The Clean Water Act provides that Defendant shall be subject to a civil penalty up to \$25,000 per day for violation of the SPCC regulation.<sup>10</sup> Defendant is subject to this penalty even though no oil spill occurs and even though the government may incur no clean up cost. The penalty collected is not required to be used to mitigate the damages of a particular violation. The Court is persuaded that the civil penalty for failing to have a SPCC plan is not compensation for actual pecuniary loss.

Second, the district court determined that Defendant is responsible for the discharge of oil into a navigable water. The Clean Water Act provides that Defendant shall be subject to a civil penalty up to \$25,000 per day for the violation.<sup>11</sup> The Clean Water Act lists seven non-exclusive factors the district court shall consider in determining the amount of the civil penalty. The cost of clean up is not a listed factor.<sup>12</sup> Plaintiff is seeking reimbursement of the cleanup costs under the Oil Pollution Act, 33 U.S.C.A. 2702. The penalty collected is not required to be used to

---

<sup>10</sup> The civil penalty is increased to \$27,500 per day for violations after January 30, 1997, but before August 1, 2002. Jones, 267 F. Supp. 2d at 1362.

<sup>11</sup> 33 U.S.C.A. § 1321(b)(7)(A). The civil penalty is increased to \$27,500 per day for violations after January 30, 1997, but before August 19, 2002. Jones, 267 F. Supp. 2d at 1361.

<sup>12</sup> 33 U.S.C.A. § 1321(b)(8) (West 2001)(the district court is also to consider “any other matters as justice may require.”).

mitigate the damages of a particular violation. The Court is persuaded that the civil penalty for violation of the Clean Water Act by discharging oil into a navigable water is not compensation for actual pecuniary loss.

Thus, the Court is persuaded that the civil penalties under both subsections of the Clean Water Act are nondischargeable in bankruptcy.

Defendant also contends that he "is entitled to apportionment of the penalty amongst all responsible parties pursuant to the "Gore Factors" found in BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore, 517 U.S. 559, 116 S.Ct. 1589 (S.Ct. 1996)."

Defendant's Response To Plaintiff's Motion For Summary Judgment That Jones's Clean Water Act Penalty Debt Is Not Dischargeable, p.2 (filed Jan. 16, 2004) Docket No. 21.

The Court is persuaded that the issue of apportionment of the civil penalties is for the district court. The only issue that this Court is ruling upon is the issue of dischargeability.

An order in accordance with this memorandum opinion shall be entered this date.

DATED this 23rd day of April, 2004.

---

ROBERT F. HERSHNER, JR.  
Chief Judge  
United States Bankruptcy Court





