San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors

Resolution No. 16-133

RESOLVED, That on recommendation of the Director of Transportation and the City Attorney, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors approves the settlement listed below:

California Air Resources Board vs. CCSF, CityLaw #170245 for \$220,500

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its meeting of September 20, 2016.

1

Soomer

Secretary, Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors

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 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (hereinafter "SFMTA"), 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor, San Francisco, California 94103-5417.

- I. RECITALS
- (1) California Health and Safety Code section 44011.6 (HSC § 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 HDVIP, chapter 3.5, California Code of Regulations, title 13, sections 2180-2188 (13 CCR §§ 2180-2188).

A . . F

(2) HSC § 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.

e "-

- (3) 13 CCR § 2190 et seq. were adopted under the authority of HSC § 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) 13 CCR § 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 equipped with engines that are four years old or older.
- (5) 13 CCR § 2192(a) requires inter alia that the owner of the vehicle "[[]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 § 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 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) ARB considers testing, measuring, recording, and recordkeeping to be critical components in reducing excessive smoke emissions from these heavy-duty vehicles.
- (8) ARB contends SFMTA failed to test, measure, record, and maintain records of smoke emissions from its fleet of heavy-duty diesel vehicles for years 2013 and 2014 in violation of 13 CCR § 2190 *et seq*.
- (9) 13 CCR § 2183(c) states that "No 1974 or newer diesel powered heavy-duty commercial vehicle shall operate in California without evidence that, at the time of manufacture, the installed engine met emission standards at least as stringent as applicable federal emission standards for the model year of the engine". ARB shall base its determination on whether an engine meets the above requirements by inspecting the Emission Control Label (ECL) affixed to the vehicle's engine.
- (10) ARB has documented that SFMTA failed to provide evidence that their vehicles have ECLs attached to the engines of heavy-duty diesel vehicles in its fleet in violation of HSC § 44011.6, and 13 CCR § 2183, et seq. Civil penalties for violation of the regulation covering ECLs have been set per 13 CCR § 2185(a)(2)(B) at \$300 per vehicle per violation.
- (11) SFMTA provides urban and transit services to its residents who would otherwise drive in single-occupant vehicles. The public transit vehicles are generally less polluting than multiple single-occupant vehicles and reduce traffic congestion and the consumption and combustion of fuels.
- (12) 13 CCR § 2023.4(e)(1) Each transit agency shall submit an annual report of the number, manufacturer, make, and model year of engines and fuel used for each transit fleet vehicle it currently owns, leases, or operates as of January 1st of each year, beginning in 2006. The first report was required to be submitted by January 31, 2006, and subsequent reports submitted annually by January 31st through the year 2016.
- (13) ARB has documented that SFMTA failed to submit annual reports as required under 13 CCR §2023.4(k)(1). A transit agency that fails to submit a complete report in accordance with this section is subject to civil penalties of not less than \$100.00 per day for every day past January 31 of each reporting year through 2016.
- (14) In order to resolve these alleged violations, SFMTA has taken, or agreed to take, the actions enumerated below under "RELEASE". Further, ARB accepts this Agreement in termination and settlement of this matter.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE ARB and SFMTA Page 3 of 8

(15) 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, ARB and SFMTA agree as follows:

II. TERMS AND RELEASE

In consideration of ARB not filing a legal action against SFMTA for the alleged violations referred to above, and SFMTA's payment of the penalties set forth in Section 1 below, ARB and SFMTA agree as follows:

- (1) Upon execution of this Agreement, the sum of two hundred twenty thousand five hundred dollars (\$220,500,00) shall be paid on behalf of SFMTA no later than September 30, 2016, as follows:
 - \$165,375.00 payable to the Air Pollution Control Fund

· .,

\$ 55,125:00 payable to the Reralta Colleges Foundation

Please send the signed Settlement Agreement and any future mailings or documents required per the terms of this Settlement Agreement to:

Т К.

| | Ann, M. Stacy | , ⁻ |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| | Air Pollution Specialist | · 1. |
| 1 1 | California Air Resources Board | |
| • • | P.O. Port 2945 | · , |
| | | |

Sacramento, California 95812

Please send the payment along with the attached "<u>Settlement Agreement</u> Payment Transmittal Form" (Attachment A) to:

| | ·** r- | <u>California Air</u> | Resource | s Hoard | | ۰. | , |
|---|---------|---|-------------------|-----------|-----------------|----|-----|
| 1 | 1 F | California Air Accounting C P.O. Box 143 Sacramento, | MICe | • | ,1 [*] | | ! |
| | . A. 14 | P.U. BOX 143 | D Deliveration | | | 4 | Ļ |
| | 1 | Saciaüreuro. | Califolu | 9001X-144 | D • | ، | • 4 |

- (2) If the Attomey General files a civil action to enforce this settlement agreement, SFMTA shall pay all costs of investigating and prosecuting the action, including expert fees, reasonable attorney's costs, and costs.
- (3) It is further agreed that the penalties described in "Terms and Release", paragraph 1 are publicle in nature, rather than compensatory. Furthermore, the penalty is intended to deter and punish SFMTA 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 SFMTA by ARB arising from the facts described in recital paragraphs (1) through (13) 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.

- (4) SFMTA shall not violate HSC §§ 43701 *et seq.*, 44011.6 *et seq.*, and 13 CCR §§ 2180 *et seq.*, 2190 *et seq.*, and 2485 *et seq.*
- (5) SFMTA shall comply with one or both of the following options to attend the California Council on Diesel Education and Technology (CCDET I) class, (SAE J1667 Snap Acceleration Smoke Test Procedure for Heavy-Duty Diesel Powered Vehicles) as described on the ARB webpage at <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/enf/hdvip/ccdet/ccdet.htm</u>. This class is conducted by various California Community Colleges and instructs attendees on compliance with the PSIP, ECL and the HDVIP.
 - (a) SFMTA shall have the fleet maintenance manager (or equivalent) and all staff performing opacity tests for compliance with PSIP and the HDVIP attend the CCDET I class. Proof of CCDET I completion shall be provided to ARB within six months of the date of this Agreement and be maintained in each applicable employee's file for the term of his or her employment.
 - (b) If SFMTA uses a contractor to perform the annual smoke opacity testing required under the PSIP, in addition to having the fleet maintenance manager (or equivalent) attend the CCDET I course, SFMTA shall obtain proof that the contractor's staff conducting the smoke opacity tests completed the CCDET I course within the past four years. This proof of CCDET I completion shall be provided to ARB with PSIP records as required by this Agreement and be maintained with the annual PSIP records.
- (6) SFMTA shall submit copies of all PSIP compliance records for the years 2016 and 2017 to ARB by September 30 of the following year. Copies shall be addressed to the attention of Ann Stacy at the California Air Resources Board, Enforcement Division, P.O. Box 2815, Sacramento, California 95812. ARB reserves the right to visit any SFMTA fleet location at any time to conduct compliance audits for the HDVIP and PSIP, or any other applicable ARB program.
- (7) SFMTA shall complete Low NOx Software Upgrades (reflash) on all applicable heavy-duty diesel engines operating in California and report to ARB within 45 days of this agreement.
- (8) SFMTA shall comply with the ECL regulation as codified in 13 CCR § 2183. Within 45 days of the execution of this Agreement, SFMTA shall submit the proof of compliance to Ann Stacy, Air Pollution Specialist, California Air

Resources Board, Enforcement Division, P.O. Box 2815, Sacramento, California 95812.

- (9) SFMTA shall instruct all employees who operate diesel-fueled vehicles to comply with the idling regulations set forth in 13 CCR § 2485, within 45 days of this Agreement.
- (10) SFMTA shall not violate the Fleet Rule For Transit Agencies including the reporting requirements.
- (11) This Agreement shall apply to and be binding upon SFMTA, 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.
- (12) This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement and understanding between ARB and SFMTA concerning the subject matter hereof, and supersedes and replaces all prior negotiations and agreements between ARB and SFMTA concerning the subject matter hereof.
- (13) 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.
- (14) Severability. Each provision of this Agreement is severable, and in the event that any provision of this Agreement is held to be invalid of unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement remains in full force and effect.
- (15) 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 fulles.
- (16) 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.
- (17) Senate Bill 1402 (Dutton, Chapter 413, statutes of 2010) requires ARB to provide information on the basis for the penalties it seeks (HSC § 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 perunit or per vehicle penalty.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE ARB and SFMTA Page 6 of 8

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 §§ 42403 and 43024.

PSIP Violations

The per vehicle penalty for the PSIP violations involved in this case is a maximum of \$375.00 per vehicle per violation per year. The penalty obtained for the PSIP violations involved in this case is \$138,000.00 for 368 violations involving 329 vehicles, or \$375.00 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.

Fleet Rule For Transit Agencies Violations

The per day penalty for the Fleet Rule for Transit Agencies reporting violations involved in this case is a maximum of \$100.00 per day. The penalty obtained for the Fleet Rule for Transit Agencies is \$82,500.00 for 1641 days between January 1, 2011 to July 1, 2015 or \$50.00 per day.

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 § 43016 because SFMTA failed to test, measure, record, and maintain records of smoke emissions from its fleet of heavy-duty diesel vehicles for the years 2013 and 2014 in violation of the PSIP regulation in 13 CCR § 2190 *et seq.*, for 150 vehicles, 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 § 43016 is the applicable penalty provision.

Fleet Rule for Transit Agencies

The penalty provision being applied to the Fleet Rule for Transit Agencies violation is 13 CCR § 2023.4.(k)(1) because SFMTA failed to submit annual reports between January 2011 to July 2015.

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.

PSIP Violations

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

Fleet Rule For Transit Agencies

The penalty is not being assessed under a provision of law that prohibits the emission of pollution at a specified level.

- (18) SFMTA 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 § 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. '.'
- (19) 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.
- (20) The penalty was based on confidential settlement communications between ARB and SFMTA that ARB does not retain in the ordinary course of business. The penalty is the product of an arms length negotiation between ARB and SFMTA and reflects ARB's assessment of the relative strength of its case against SFMTA, the desire to avoid the uncertainty, burden and expense of litigation, obtain swift compliance with the law and remove any unfair advantage that SFMTA may have secured from its actions.
- (21) Now therefore, in consideration of the payment on behalf of SFMTA to the Air Pollution Control Fund and the Peralta Colleges Foundation, ARB hereby releases SFMTA and their principals, officers, agents, predecessors and successors from any and all claims, ARB may have or have in the future based on the circumstances described in paragraphs (1) through (13) of the Recitals. The undersigned represent that they have the authority to enter into this Agreement.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE ARB and SFMTA Page 8 of 8

| California / | Air Resources Board | SEMTA | 4 |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Signature: | 1 wil | Signature: _ | 2501 |
| Print Name | Richard W. Corey | Print Name:_ | Edward D. Reiskin |
| Title: | Executive Officer | Title: | Director of Transportation |
| Date: | 10/24/2011 | Date: _ | 9:29:16 |

-

APPROVED AS TO FORM

DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney

Stuart

Stephanie Stuart Deputy City Attorney