

## SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE

This SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE (hereinafter "Agreement") is entered into between the STATE OF CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (hereinafter "ARB") 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814, and White Arrow LLC (hereinafter "White Arrow"), 824 S Vail Ave, Montebello, CA 90640.

### I. RECITALS

- (1) California Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 44011.6 established the Heavy Duty Vehicle Inspection Program (HDVIP). It authorizes ARB to inspect on-road heavy-duty vehicles for excessive smoke emissions and engine tampering and to issue citations, accordingly. The program also requires the vehicle owner to repair its engines that exceed the prescribed ARB smoke opacity standards, perform a post-repair opacity test, and submit proof of repairs and any assessed penalties under the Regulations of the Heavy-Duty Smoke Inspection Program, chapter 3.5, sections 2180-2188, title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR).
- (2) HSC section 43701 provides that ARB shall adopt regulations that require owners or operators of heavy-duty diesel motor vehicles to perform regular inspections of their vehicles for excessive smoke emissions.
- (3) Title 13 CCR, section 2190 *et seq.* was adopted under the authority of HSC section 43701 and, with limited exceptions, which are not applicable here, apply to all heavy-duty diesel powered vehicles with gross vehicle weight ratings greater than 6,000 pounds that operate on the streets or highways within the State of California.
- (4) Title 13 CCR, section 2190 *et seq.* authorize the Periodic Smoke Inspection Program (PSIP) which requires the owners and operators of California based vehicle fleets of two or more heavy duty diesel motor vehicles with gross vehicle weight ratings greater than 6,000 pounds that operate on the streets or highways within the State of California to conduct annual smoke opacity inspections of their vehicles that are four years older than the model year of the vehicle's engine.
- (5) Title 13 CCR, section 2192(a) requires inter alia that the owner of the vehicle "[t]est the vehicle for excessive smoke emissions periodically according to the inspection intervals specified in section 2193(a), (b), and (c)", "[m]easure the smoke emissions for each test...", "[r]ecord the smoke test opacity levels and other required test information as specified in section 2194..." and "[k]eep the records specified in section 2194 for two years after the date of inspection."
- (6) HSC section 43016 states, "Any person who violates any provision of this part, or any order, rule, or regulation of the state board adopted pursuant

to this part, and for which violation there is not provided in this part any other specific civil penalty or fine, shall be subject to a civil penalty of not to exceed five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per vehicle.”

- (7) The ARB considers testing, measuring, recording, and recordkeeping to be critical components in reducing excessive smoke emissions from these heavy-duty vehicles.
- (8) ARB contends White Arrow failed to test, measure, record, and maintain records of smoke emissions from its fleet of heavy-duty diesel vehicles for years 2010 and 2011 in violation of title 13 CCR, sections 2190 *et seq.*
- (9) The ARB, has documented that White Arrow failed to provide evidence that their vehicles have emission control labels (ECL) attached to the engines of heavy-duty diesel vehicles in its fleet in violation of HSC, section 44011.6, and title 13 CCR section 2183, *et seq.* Civil penalties for violation of the regulation covering emission control labels have been set per title 13 CCR, section 2185 (a)(2)(B) at \$300 per vehicle per violation.
- (10) HSC section 39650-39675 mandates the reduction of the emission of substances that have been determined to be toxic air contaminants (TACs). In 1998, following an exhaustive 10-year scientific assessment process, the ARB identified particulate matter (PM) from diesel-fueled engines as a toxic air contaminant. Drayage trucks are controlled under the Drayage Truck Regulation as codified in title 13 CCR, section 2027.
- (11) Title 13 CCR, section 2027 (d)(3)(A) requires drayage truck owners meet all applicable emission requirements and deadlines set forth in Phases 1 and 2 detailed in Section 2027 (d).
- (12) Title 13 CCR, section 2027 (d)(5)(A)(2) requires drayage truck motor carriers only dispatch drayage trucks that meet emission standards and compliance deadlines set forth in Phases 1 and 2 in Section 2027 (d). Section 2027 (d)(5)(A)(3) requires motor carriers only dispatch drayage trucks that are registered and in good standing with the Drayage Truck Registry (DTR).
- (13) The ARB Enforcement Division has documented that White Arrow, as a drayage truck owner, failed to bring all drayage trucks in its fleet into compliance by the deadlines set forth in the Drayage Truck Regulation. The ARB Enforcement Division has also documented that White Arrow, as a motor carrier, dispatched drayage trucks that are either not compliant with the emissions standards set forth in the Drayage Truck Regulation or not registered with the DTR.

- (14) Failure to comply with title 13 CCR, section 2027(d)(5)(A)(2) is a violation of state law resulting in penalties. HSC, section 39674, authorize civil or administrative penalties not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) or ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) for each day that the violation occurs.
- (15) In order to resolve these alleged violations, White Arrow has taken, or agreed to take, the actions enumerated below under "TERMS AND RELEASE". Further, the ARB accepts this Agreement in termination and settlement of this matter.
- (16) In consideration of the foregoing, and of the promises and facts set forth herein, the parties desire to settle and resolve all claims, disputes, and obligations relating to the above-listed violations, and voluntarily agree to resolve this matter by means of this Agreement. Specifically, the ARB and White Arrow agree as follows:

## II. TERMS AND RELEASE

In consideration of the ARB not filing a legal action against White Arrow for the alleged violations referred to above, ARB not seeking a registration hold on the audited vehicles, and White Arrow's payment of the penalties set forth in Section 1 below, the ARB and White Arrow agree as follows:

- (1) Upon execution of this Agreement, White Arrow shall pay a civil penalty of \$50,700. Payment shall be made in check form as described below, and payments shall be made in 12 monthly payments beginning on **March 21, 2013**.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE - ARB AND WHITE ARROW LLC.

Payment Due Date:		In the Amount of and Paid to:
(1)	3/21/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>Peralta College Foundation</b>
(2)	4/22/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>Peralta College Foundation</b>
(3)	5/21/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>Peralta College Foundation</b>
(4)	6/21/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>
(5)	7/22/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>
(6)	8/21/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>
(7)	9/23/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>
(8)	10/21/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>

(9)	11/21/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>
(10)	12/23/13	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>
(11)	1/20/14	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>
(12)	2/21/14	<b>\$4,225</b> paid to <b>California Air Pollution Control Fund</b>

Please submit the signed settlement agreement and checks to:

Ms. Debbi Klossing/Air Pollution Specialist  
Air Resources Board, Enforcement Division  
9480 Telstar Avenue No. 4  
El Monte, CA 91731

- (2) Effect of Untimely Payment. If any payment is more than 15 days late, the entire remaining balance becomes immediately due and payable. In addition, if the Attorney General files a civil action to enforce this settlement agreement, White Arrow shall pay all costs of investigating and prosecuting the action, including expert fees, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs.
- (3) It is agreed that if White Arrow, including its subsidiary or parent company, at any time becomes insolvent, or makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors or similar action adversely involving White Arrow, its subsidiary, or parent company, or a proceeding or petition under any bankruptcy, reorganization, arrangement of debt, insolvency, readjustment of debt, or receivership law or statute is filed by or against White Arrow, its subsidiary, or parent company, or a trustee in bankruptcy, custodian, receiver or agent is appointed or authorized to take charge of any of White Arrow, its subsidiary, or parent company's properties, or if any deposit account or other property of White Arrow, its subsidiary, or parent company be attempted to be obtained or held by writ of execution, garnishment, attachment, condemnation, levy, forfeiture or other legal process, or White Arrow, its subsidiary, or parent company takes any action to authorize any of the foregoing, the entire remaining balance becomes immediately due and payable without notice or demand.
- (4) It is further agreed that the penalties described in "Terms and Release", paragraph 1 are punitive in nature, rather than compensatory. Furthermore, the penalty is intended to deter and punish White Arrow for violations of state environmental statutes, and these penalties are payable to and for the benefit of ARB, a governmental unit. Therefore, it is agreed that these penalties imposed on White Arrow by ARB arising from the facts described in recital paragraphs 1 – 14 are non-dischargeable under

11 United States Code § 523 (a)(7), which provides an exception from discharge for any debt to the extent such debt is for a fine, penalty or forfeiture payable to and for benefit of governmental unit, and is not compensation for actual pecuniary loss, other than certain types of tax penalties.

- (5) White Arrow shall not violate HSC sections 43701 *et seq.*, 44011.6 *et seq.*, and title 13 CCR, sections 2190 *et seq.*, 13 CCR section 2183, *et seq.*, and, Title 13 CCR, section 2027, *et seq.* or any other provision of law under the jurisdiction of the ARB.
- (6) White Arrow shall complete Low NOx Software Upgrades (reflash) on all applicable heavy-duty diesel engines operating in California and report to the ARB within 45 days of this agreement.
- (7) Each 1974 or newer diesel powered heavy-duty vehicle in the White Arrow fleet shall comply with the emission control label (ECL) requirements set forth in the title 13 CCR section 2183(c). White Arrow shall provide a photograph of each ECL on the engines within 45 days of executing this agreement.
- (8) White Arrow shall instruct all employees who operate diesel-fueled vehicles to comply with the idling regulations set forth in title 13 CCR section 2485, within 45 days of this Agreement.
- (9) White Arrow shall not violate the Drayage Truck Regulation, as codified in title 13 CCR, section 2027.
- (10) White Arrow shall not dispatch drayage trucks that are not compliant with the emission standards set forth in the Drayage Truck Regulation or trucks that are not registered with the DTR. The ARB reserves the right to audit The dispatch records of White Arrow for compliance with title 13 CCR, Section 2027 (d)(5) any time in the future.
- (11) White Arrow shall not violate the Truck and Bus regulation as codified in title 13 CCR, section 2025.
- (12) This Agreement shall apply to and be binding upon White Arrow and its officers, directors, receivers, trustees, employees, successors and assignees, subsidiary and parent corporations and upon ARB and any successor agency that may have responsibility for and jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Agreement.
- (13) This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement and understanding between ARB and White Arrow concerning the subject matter hereof, and

supersedes and replaces all prior negotiations and agreements between ARB and White Arrow concerning the subject matter hereof.

- (14) No agreement to modify, amend, extend, supersede, terminate, or discharge this Agreement, or any portion thereof, is valid or enforceable unless it is in writing and signed by all parties to this Agreement.
- (15) Severability. Each provision of this Agreement is severable, and in the event that any provision of this Agreement is held to be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement remains in full force and effect.
- (16) This Agreement shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of California, without regard to California's choice-of-law rules.
- (17) This Agreement is deemed to have been drafted equally by the Parties; it will not be interpreted for or against either party on the ground that said party drafted it.
- (18) Senate Bill 1402 (Dutton, Chapter 413, statutes of 2010) requires the ARB to provide information on the basis for the penalties it seeks (see Health and Safety Code section 39619.7). This information, which is provided throughout this settlement agreement, is summarized here:

**The manner in which the penalty amount was determined, including a per unit or per vehicle penalty.**

Penalties must be set at levels sufficient to discourage violations. The penalties in this matter were determined in consideration of all relevant circumstances, including the eight factors specified in HSC sections 42403 and 43024.

PSIP Violations

The per vehicle penalty for the PSIP violations involved in this case is a maximum of \$500 per vehicle per violation per year. The penalty obtained for the PSIP violations involved in this case is \$7,125.00 for 19 vehicles, or \$375 per vehicle per violation.

The penalty was discounted based on the fact that this was a first time violation and the violator made diligent efforts to comply and to cooperate with the investigation.

### ECL Violations

The per vehicle penalty for the labeling violations involved in this case is a maximum of \$300 per vehicle per violation. The penalty obtained for the ECL violations involved in this case is \$225 for 4 vehicles, or \$900.

The penalty was discounted based on the fact that this was a first time violation and the violator made diligent efforts to comply and to cooperate with the investigation.

### Drayage Violations

The per vehicle penalty for the drayage violations involved in this case is a maximum of \$1,000 per vehicle per day for strict liability violations or \$10,000 per vehicle per day for negligent or intentional violations pursuant to HSC section 39674. The penalty obtained for the drayage motor carrier violations involved in this case is \$42,675 for years 2011 and 2012. The penalty obtained is as follows: \$20,925 for dispatching 279 noncompliant trucks or \$75 per noncompliant dispatch and \$21,750 for dispatching 580 vehicles not registered in the drayage truck registry or approximately \$37.50/dispatch.

The penalty was discounted based on the fact that this was a first time violation and the violator made diligent efforts to comply and to cooperate with the investigation.

**The provision of law the penalty is being assessed under and why that provision is most appropriate for that violation.**

### PSIP Violations

The penalty provision being applied to the PSIP violations is HSC section 43016 because White Arrow failed to test, measure, record, and maintain records of smoke emissions from its fleet of heavy duty diesel vehicles for the years 2010 and 2011 in violation of the PSIP regulation in title 13 CCR sections 2190 *et seq*, for 19 violations. Since the PSIP regulation was adopted pursuant to authority granted in Part 5 of Division 26 of the HSC and since there is no specific penalty or fine provided for PSIP violations in Part 5, HSC section 43016 is the applicable penalty provision.

### ECL Violations

The penalty provision being applied to the ECL requirements set forth in title 13 CCR, section 2185(a)(2) because White Arrow failed to provide evidence that 4 of their vehicles have ECL labels attached as required. The penalty provision being applied for the ECL (title 13 CCR, section 2183) violations is HSC section 39674 because the ECL Regulation adopted pursuant to authority contained in HSC Section 39660, et seq. and because White Arrow failed to provide evidence that their vehicles have emission control labels (ECL) attached to the engines of heavy-duty diesel vehicles in 4 vehicles in their fleet.

### Drayage Violations

The penalty provision being applied for the Drayage Truck Regulation (title 13 CCR, section 2027) violations in this case is HSC section 39674 because the Drayage Truck Regulation is a Toxic Air Contaminant Control Measure adopted pursuant to authority contained in H&SC sections 39650 - 39675.

**Is the penalty being assessed under a provision of law that prohibits the emission of pollution at a specified level, and if so, a quantification of excess emissions, if it is practicable to do so.**


The PSIP, ECL, and drayage provisions cited above do prohibit emissions above a specified opacity or level of g/hp-hr. However, since the hours of operation of the non-compliant units involved and their individual emission rate are not known, it is not practicable to quantify the excess emissions.

- (19) White Arrow acknowledges that ARB has complied with Senate Bill 1402 in prosecuting or settling this case. Specifically, ARB has considered all relevant facts, including those listed at HSC section 43024, has explained the manner in which the penalty amount was calculated, has identified the provision of law under which the penalty is being assessed and has considered and determined that this penalty is being assessed under a provision of law that prohibits the emission of pollutants at a specified level.
- (20) Penalties were determined based on the unique circumstances of this matter, considered together with the need to remove any economic benefit from noncompliance, the goal of deterring future violations and obtaining swift compliance, the consideration of past penalties in similar cases, and the potential costs and risk associated with litigating these particular violations. Penalties in future cases might be smaller or larger on a per unit basis.




- (21) The penalty was based on confidential settlement communications between ARB and White Arrow that ARB does not retain in the ordinary course of business either. The penalty is the product of an arms length negotiation between ARB and White Arrow and reflects ARB's assessment of the relative strength of its case against White Arrow, the desire to avoid the uncertainty, burden and expense of litigation, obtain swift compliance with the law and remove any unfair advantage that White Arrow may have secured from its actions.
- (22) Now therefore, in consideration of the payment on behalf of White Arrow to the California Air Pollution Control Fund and the Peralta College Foundation, the ARB hereby releases White Arrow and their principals, officers, agents, predecessors and successors from any and all claims, the ARB may have or have in the future based on the circumstances described in paragraph (1) through (14) of the Recitals. The undersigned represent that they have the authority to enter into this Agreement.

**California Air Resources Board**

By:   
Name: Ellen M. Peter  
Title: Chief Counsel  
Date: 3/15/2013

**White Arrow LLC**

By:   
Name: Chris Casey  
Title: Managing Member  
Date: 3/6/13