Consent Decree

United States et al. v.

County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

1	BILL LOCKYER Attorney General of the State of California
2	MARY HACKENBRACHT
3	Senior Assistant Attorney General GAVIN G. McCABE, State Bar No. 130864 Deputy Attorney General
4	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
5	San Francisco, California 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 703-5605
6	Facsimile: (415) 703-5480 e-mail: gavin.mccabe@doj.ca.gov
7	Attorneys for State of California, by and through the California Department of Fish and Game and
8	California State Lands Commission
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	United States et al. v.

County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Consent Decree

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	I. INTRODUCTION
3	II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE4
4	III. APPLICABILITY OF DECREE
5	IV. DEFINITIONS
6	V. PAYMENTS
7	VI. PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK9
8	VII. COVENANT NOT TO SUE BY PLAINTIFFS
9	VIII. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS FOR NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGES 14
10	IX. COVENANTS BY SETTLING DEFENDANTS15
11	X. EFFECT OF SETTLEMENT/CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION16
12	XI. PENALTIES FOR LATE AND/OR INADEQUATE PERFORMANCE 18
13	XII. FORCE MAJEURE20
14	XIII. DISPUTE RESOLUTION21
15	XIV. RETENTION OF RECORDS22
16	XV. CERTIFICATE AND SIGNATURE24
17	XVI. ENTIRE AGREEMENT24
18	XVII. MODIFICATION24
19	XVIII. TERMINATION25
20	XIX. PUBLIC COMMENT25
21	XX. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION26
22	XXI. NOTICE26
23	XXII. JUDGMENT30
24	
25	
26	

27

28

This Consent Decree ("Decree") is made and entered into by and among the United States of America ("the United States"), on behalf of itself and the Department of the Interior ("DOI"), and the State of California ("State"), by and through the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") and the California State Lands Commission ("SLC"), as trustees for State Natural Resources (collectively, the "Plaintiffs"), and certain of the defendants in this action (collectively, the "Settling Defendants").

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. The United States, on behalf of DOI in its capacity as natural resource trustee, and the CDFG and SLC in their capacities as natural resource trustees for Natural Resources of the State of California (collectively, the "Trustees"), concurrently with the filing of this Consent Decree, have filed Complaints ("Complaints") in this action under Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. § 9607, and various State laws, seeking, *inter alia*, recovery of damages, including damage assessment costs, for injury to, destruction of, and loss of natural resources resulting from releases into the environment of inorganic and organic mercury and hazardous substances contained in mining waste (hereafter, collectively, "Hazardous Substances").
- B. The Complaints allege that the Defendants (i) are or were owners or operators of facilities in the Guadalupe River Watershed, as defined herein, or (ii) are or were persons who arranged for the disposal of Hazardous Substances at or from facilities in the Guadalupe River Watershed, or (iii) are persons who are successors to or otherwise legally responsible for the acts and omissions of persons who were owners or operators of facilities in the Guadalupe River Watershed or who arranged for disposal of Hazardous Substances at facilities in the Guadalupe River Watershed, from which Plaintiffs allege there have been releases of Hazardous Substances into the environment.
- C. In February 2000, DOI issued a Preassessment Screen Determination ("PSD") regarding injuries to natural resources arising from historical and continuing releases of mercury, and of other metals resulting from or associated with historic mining within the Guadalupe River Watershed. In that PSD, DOI determined that sufficient information existed for it to pursue a United States and State of California v.

 County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

X/2005

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

claim for Natural Resource Damages for such releases, including damages for injury to soil, surface water, and sediment in the Guadalupe River Watershed, as well as for injuries to biological resources using those resources, including vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, fish species, and piscivorous birds. DOI alleges that it took these actions pursuant to CERCLA, DOI's Natural Resource Damages regulations, 43 C.F.R. Part 11 (1998), and Executive Order 12580, as amended by Executive Order 13016.

- D. The Trustees (other than the SLC) and some of the Settling Defendants entered into a Cooperative Agreement, dated September 21, 2001, pursuant to which they reviewed available data and cooperatively assessed the nature and extent of injuries, if any, to natural resources arising from the alleged releases (the "Cooperative Process"). To expedite, and to otherwise reduce the cost of, performing the assessment, the parties to the Cooperative Process agreed to use the Resource and/or Habitat Equivalency (REA/HEA) methodology. The Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region ("Regional Board") participated in early meetings of the Trustees and PRPs, but it did not sign the Cooperative Agreement and is not asserting any rights as a trustee in connection with this action. The Regional Board staff are familiar with the conditions addressed by this Consent Decree, have reviewed the terms of this Consent Decree, and have notified the Office of the State Attorney General that the Regional Board will not file an action for natural resource damages with respect to the contamination alleged in this action. The letter of the Regional Board is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- E. Much of the data upon which the PSD was based was collected prior to 1997. In entering this Decree, Plaintiffs recognize that Santa Clara County has since conducted, with financial contribution from Myers Industries, Inc. and Buckhorn, Inc., substantial remediation (the "Remediation") of the mercury mining contamination at the New Almaden mining district, under the oversight of the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control ("DTSC") and with input from the Regional Board, as well as federal agencies including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Remediation addressed mining wastes containing mercury located within and around the original mining area. In the first phase of the Remediation, such mining wastes from several areas within the Hacienda Furnace Yard were excavated, consolidated, and capped United States and State of California v. 2

/2005

5

7

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

in the Hacienda Furnace Yard area. In the second phase, such mining wastes were excavated, consolidated, and capped in the Mine Hill Area. Similarly, the Santa Clara Valley Water District has carried out recent capital projects and maintenance activities in and along the Guadalupe River and its tributaries that have included the removal of substantial quantities of sediment and soil contaminated by mining wastes containing mercury and other Hazardous Substances.

- F. The Plaintiffs also recognize that there are multiple sources of Hazardous Substances in the Guadalupe River Watershed, including multiple sources for which the Settling Defendants allege they have no legal responsibility. In the Cooperative Process, certain participating Parties in a position to do so have sought to coordinate their assessment with other activities and processes addressing other sources of mercury in the Guadalupe River Watershed, including the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads ("TMDLs") under the Clean Water Act (see 33 USC § 1313(d)) through, inter alia, the San Francisco Bay and Guadalupe River Watershed Mercury Total Maximum Daily Load efforts and the Mercury Load Reduction Project ("Guadalupe Mercury TMDL"). Issues relating to the control and reduction of releases of Hazardous Substances and/or the enhancement of natural resources within the Guadalupe River Watershed are also being addressed through the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program and in other cooperative processes, including the Regional Board's Watershed Management Initiative for the Santa Clara Basin, the Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Collaborative Effort, and the Guadalupe River Flood Control Project Collaborative (collectively, "Other Processes").
- G. The projects described in Paragraph 7, below, will address all known significant mining waste deposits remaining within and about the Almaden Quicksilver County Park and are actions principally to be undertaken to restore or rehabilitate the injured resources that are the subject of the Complaints. The balance of the Work that will be undertaken by the Settling Defendants constitutes the replacement or acquisition of equivalent resources providing the same or substantially equivalent services as those that had been provided by the injured natural resources (consistent with 43 C.F.R. § 11.82).
- CERCLA and its implementing regulations require that the Trustees seek input H. United States and State of California v. 3 Consent Decree County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Z/2005

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

26 27

28

County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

from the public before implementing a restoration plan to address injured natural resources. Consequently, the Parties acknowledge that entry of the Decree after lodging will be deferred to allow the time necessary for the Trustees to obtain public comment on this Decree and on a draft restoration plan that proposes the Work described in Section VI of this Decree, as further provided in Section XIX of this Consent Decree. A copy of the draft restoration plan is attached as Exhibit B to this Consent Decree.

- I. The Trustees have undertaken a restoration planning process to determine the restoration projects that will most effectively restore or compensate for the lost use of the injured resources. The details for specific projects are contained in the draft restoration plan at Sections 4.3.1.1 through 4.3.2.3 and are summarized in Section VI of this Consent Decree. A final restoration plan will be adopted by the Trustees after final approval of this Consent Decree by the Court, after provision of notice, opportunity for public input, and consideration of public comments on the Decree and attached draft restoration plan.
- J. This settlement is made in good faith after arm's-length negotiations. The Parties agree, and the Court by entering this Consent Decree finds, that this Consent Decree has been negotiated by the Parties in good faith, that settlement of this matter and entry of this Decree will avoid complicated and potentially costly litigation between the Parties, is the most appropriate means to resolve the matters covered herein, and is fair, reasonable, consistent with the purposes of CERCLA, and in the public interest.

NOW, THEREFORE, with the consent of the Parties to this Decree, it is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The Plaintiffs have alleged that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1345, and 1367; Sections 107 and 113(b) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9607, 9613(b); California Fish and Game Code sections 2104, 5650, and 5650.1; and the common law of nuisance; that the Court has personal jurisdiction over the Settling Defendants; and that venue lies in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c) and 1395(a) and Section 113(b) of CERCLA. For purposes of this Consent Decree, only, the Settling United States and State of California v. 4 Consent Decree

V2005

4

8

15

13

Defendants waive all objections and defenses that they may have to jurisdiction of the Court or to venue in this District.

III. APPLICABILITY OF DECREE

The obligations of this Consent Decree apply to and are binding upon the Plaintiffs 2. and their departments, agencies and instrumentalities, and upon the Settling Defendants and their respective successors and assigns.

IV. DEFINITIONS

- 3. This Decree incorporates the definitions set forth in Section 101 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601, and in Section 11.14 of the Natural Resource Damages ("NRD") regulations, 43 CFR § 11.14. In addition, whenever the following terms are used in this Decree, they shall have the following meanings:
- "Damage Assessment Costs" shall mean all costs associated with the planning, Α. design, implementation, and oversight of the Trustees' damage assessment process, which addresses the extent and quantification of the injury to, destruction of, or loss of Natural Resources and the services provided by these resources resulting from the alleged releases of Hazardous Substances, and with the planning of restoration or replacement of such Natural Resources and the services provided by those resources, or the planning of the acquisition of equivalent resources or services, and any other costs necessary to carry out the Trustees' responsibilities with respect to those Natural Resources injuries resulting directly or indirectly from the alleged releases of Hazardous Substances, including all related enforcement costs.
- В. "Date of Entry of this Decree" shall mean the date on which the District Court has approved and entered this Decree as a judgment.
- C. "Date of Final Approval of this Decree" shall mean (1) the Date of Entry of this Decree, or (2) if an appeal is taken after entry, the date on which the District Court's judgment is affirmed and there is no further right to appellate review.
- "Date of Lodging of this Decree" shall mean the date that this Decree is lodged D. with the Court, subject to the public comment period referred to in Section XIX of this Decree.
- "Natural Resource Damages" shall mean all damages, including loss of use, E. United States and State of California v. 5 Consent Decree County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

V2005

restoration costs, resource replacement costs, or equivalent resource values, Damage Assessment Costs, and any other costs or losses that have been incurred in the past or will be incurred in the future by the United States, the State of California, or any other person pursuant to Trustee approval, authorization, or direction, with respect to injury to, destruction of, or loss of any and all natural resources resulting either directly or indirectly from the releases of Hazardous Substances in the Guadalupe River Watershed, including any continuing releases.

- F. "Natural Resources" shall have that meaning set forth in Section 101(16) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(16).
- G. "Guadalupe River Watershed" for purposes of this Decree shall mean (i) the Guadalupe River and all its tributary streams, including without limitation Alamitos Creek, Guadalupe Creek, and Arroyo Calero, and the associated tributaries, reservoirs, impoundments, banks and sediments of each of the foregoing; (ii) all areas that drain water or sediment into the waters described in (i); and (iii) that area of San Francisco Bay south of the Dumbarton Bridge.
- H. "Interest" shall mean interest at the rate specified for interest on investments of the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund established by 26 U.S.C. § 9507, compounded annually on October 1 of each year, in accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a). The applicable rate of interest shall be the rate in effect at the time the interest accrues. The rate of interest is subject to change on October 1 of each year.
- I. "Parties" shall mean the United States; the State of California, by and through the CDFG and SLC; and the Settling Defendants.
- J. "Settling Defendants" shall mean the Defendants who have signed this Consent Decree as described below:
 - (1) The County of Santa Clara ("County") shall mean the County of Santa Clara, located in the State of California, and its departments, agencies and instrumentalities;
 - (2) Santa Clara Valley Water District ("SCVWD") shall mean the Santa Clara Valley Water District, located in the State of California, and its departments, agencies and instrumentalities;

Document 32-1

Filed 114

2005

Page 10 of 45

Case 5:05-cv-0307

	Case 5:05-cv-0307 PVT Document 32-1 Filed 11 2005 Page 11 of 45					
1	analas and					
1	such; and					
2	(8) Sunoco, Inc. ("Sunoco").					
3	K. "United States" shall mean the United States of America, including its					
4	departments, agencies, and instrumentalities.					
5	L. "State of California" shall mean the CDFG and SLC.					
6	M. "Work" shall mean implementation by the Settling Defendants of (i) those					
7	activities that are generally described in Section VI, Paragraphs 6-11, of this Consent Decree and					
8	more particularly described in Exhibit B to this Consent Decree, at Sections 4.3.1.1. through					
9	4.3.2.3, which Sections are hereby incorporated as a part of this Decree, or (ii) any project or in					
10	lieu payment authorized by Paragraph 7.e of this Decree.					
11	V. PAYMENTS					
12	4. Sunoco shall pay Plaintiffs \$85,000 within ten (10) business days of the Date of					
13	Entry of this Consent Decree, such payment to be made to DOI pursuant to the provisions of					
14	Paragraph 5 of this Decree.					
15	5. Sunoco shall make payment to DOI by electronic fund transfer ("EFT") to the U.S.					
16	Department of Justice in accordance with instructions to be provided to Sunoco following lodging					
17	of the Decree by the Financial Litigation Unit of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern					
18	District of California. At the time of payment, Sunoco shall send written notice of payment and a					
19	copy of any transmittal documentation (which should reference DOJ case number 90-11-2-07048)					
20	to the Parties in accordance with Section XXI of this Decree and to:					
21	Charles McKinley, Esq.					
22	Office of the Solicitor U.S. Department of the Interior					
23	1111 Jackson Street, Suite 735 Oakland, California 94607					
24	and					
25	Bruce Nesslage					
26	DOI Restoration Fund Manager 1849 "C" Street, N.W.					
27	Mail Stop 4449 Washington, D.C. 20240					
28						
ĺ	United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV 8 Consent Decree					

8

14

16

23

24 25

26

27

28

County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

The EFT and transmittal letters shall reflect that the payment is being made to the "Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Fund, Account No. 14X5198." DOI will assign those funds a special project number to allow the funds to be maintained as a segregated account (the "Guadalupe River Watershed NRD Account") within the DOI Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Fund.

VI. PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK

6. The Settling Defendants having responsibilities relating to each project in the Work described below (Responsible Settling Defendants) shall finance and, as specified in more detail below, commence and complete performance of the Work in accordance with the terms and schedules contained in Sections 4.3.1.1 through 4.3.2.3 of Exhibit B, and any design and work plans approved by the Trustees, which terms, schedules, and design and work plans are incorporated in and shall be enforceable under this Decree.

7. Hacienda Furnace Yard and Jacques Gulch Projects

- To restore or rehabilitate allegedly injured natural resources, the Responsible Settling Defendants, as identified more specifically in Subparagraph c, below, shall properly consolidate and cap onsite those calcine tailings piles identified at or near the Hacienda Furnace Yard along Alamitos Creek, as more specifically described in Section 4.3.1.1 of Exhibit B, and further shall remove non-native plants, revegetate with native plants, and otherwise enhance the riparian habitat in the areas described in that Section ("Hacienda Project"),
- b. To restore or rehabilitate the allegedly injured natural resources, the Responsible Settling Defendant(s), as identified more specifically in Subparagraph d, below, shall properly consolidate and cap onsite those calcine tailings piles identified in the area below Mine Hill known as Jacques Gulch, as more specifically described in Section 4.3.1.2 of Exhibit B, and further shall remove non-native plants, revegetate with native plants, and otherwise enhance the riparian habitat in the areas as described in that Section ("Jacques Gulch Project").
- The County shall implement the Hacienda Project. The obligations of c. Myers and Buckhorn under Section VI of this Decree shall consist of making financial contributions to the County's implementation of the Hacienda Project as has been agreed to in a United States and State of California v. Consent Decree

11

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

separate agreement between the County and Myers and Buckhorn. The implementation of the Hacienda Project is contingent on the issuance of permits and approvals for both the Hacienda and Jacques Gulch Projects as provided in Par. 7.e below. The County, at its option, may schedule its work on the Hacienda Project to begin only after SCVWD's commencement of onsite work on the Jacques Gulch Project.

- d. SCVWD shall implement the Jacques Gulch Project. The obligations of the County for the Jacques Gulch Project under this Decree shall be to permit the SCVWD access to those project areas on County property, to permit the consolidation of the subject materials within the Almaden Quicksilver Park, to maintain and monitor the area of consolidation, without charge, and as otherwise agreed to between the SCVWD and the County in a separate agreement. The obligations of Guadalupe Rubbish for the Jacques Gulch Project under this Decree shall consist of making financial or in-kind contributions to the SCVWD's implementation of the Jacques Gulch Project, pursuant to a separate agreement between the SCVWD and Guadalupe Rubbish.
- e. All Work required under this Paragraph 7 is contingent on approval by the appropriate State of California and federal agencies of the consolidation and capping of any excavated material at an appropriate location within the Almaden Quicksilver County Park, and the issuance of any permits, certifications, and approvals necessary to perform the Work (including, without limitation, approval of work within the streambed of Alamitos Creek, including temporary diversion of that stream) without mitigation obligations ("Approvals"). If such Approvals are not obtained for both the Hacienda and Jacques Gulch Projects, the Responsible Settling Defendants will meet and confer with Plaintiffs to consider (1) alternate means of implementing the Projects subject to the additional Approval requirements, (2) alternative projects of comparable cost to the Responsible Settling Defendants and comparable benefit to the resources in question, or (3) payment of monetary Natural Resource Damages in lieu of project performance. If the Parties agree that there are comparable alternatives, the Responsible Settling Defendants shall have the right to select the alternative to be implemented from among those alternatives. The Responsible Settling Defendants will be entitled to relief United States and State of California v.

4

8

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

25

24

27

26

28

under Section XII of this Consent Decree (Force Majeure) for any delay in performance resulting from a failure to obtain, or a delay in obtaining, any Approval required for the Hacienda or Jacques Gulch Projects, provided that they have timely submitted applications and other materials needed to obtain such Approvals as provided in Paragraph 11, below, and provided that the other requirements of Section XII of this Consent Decree are met.

8. <u>Hillsdale Bridge Project</u>. To replace, in part, those lost services resulting from the alleged injuries to Natural Resources, the City of San Jose ("City") has implemented this project, as more fully described in Section 4.3.2 of Exhibit B, by removing or having caused to be removed the concrete barrier to fish passage located at the Hillsdale bridge on the Guadalupe River and planting the adjacent areas with appropriate native plants.

9. Coyote Creek Project

- To further replace, in part, those lost services resulting from the alleged injuries to Natural Resources, the Responsible Settling Defendant(s), as identified more specifically in Subparagraph b, below, shall undertake a project to enhance the riparian habitat along Coyote Creek downstream of Anderson Reservoir, by removing Arundo along a portion of that stream and re-planting appropriate native plants, as more specifically described in Section 4.3.2.1 of Exhibit B.
- b. The SCVWD shall implement the Coyote Creek Project. The obligation of the County for the Coyote Creek Project under this Decree shall be to permit the SCVWD to access the project area, without charge, and as may otherwise be agreed to pursuant to a separate agreement between the SCVWD and the County. The obligation of Guadalupe Rubbish and the City for the Coyote Creek Project under this Decree shall be as otherwise agreed to in separate agreements between those Parties and the SCVWD.
- 10. Ravenswood Marsh Project. To further replace, in part, those lost services resulting from the alleged injuries to natural resources, the MROSD shall, for five (5) years, pay for a predator control program at the Ravenswood Marsh, as more fully described in Section 4.3.2.3 of Exhibit B, for the benefit of the Clapper Rail, a species listed as threatened under Section 4(c) of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1533(c). In addition, the MROSD shall United States and State of California v. 11 Consent Decree

8

6

10

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

maintain the Ravenswood Marsh, in perpetuity, as open space and habitat for the Clapper Rail. Within thirty (30) days of the Date of Final Approval of this Decree, the MROSD shall record a memorandum of this Decree in the appropriate land title records for San Mateo County and shall provide the Trustees with a conformed copy of the recorded memorandum. The memorandum shall contain a statement that "the referenced Decree requires that Ravenswood Marsh shall be maintained, in perpetuity, as open space and habitat for the Clapper Rail."

11. All Work undertaken by the Settling Defendants pursuant to this Decree shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of all applicable federal and State of California laws and regulations. Where any portion of the Work requires a federal, State, or local permit, certification, or approval, the responsible Settling Defendants shall submit timely and complete applications and take all other actions necessary to obtain all such permits, certifications, or approvals, where required. The Trustees will cooperate with the Settling Defendants, as necessary and to the extent permitted by law, in undertaking actions to obtain and/or process such permits, certifications, and approvals in a timely manner. This Decree is not, and shall not be construed to be, a permit issued pursuant to any federal or State of California statute or regulation, nor shall it be construed in any way to affect any past, current, or future obligation of the Settling Defendants or any other person or entity to comply with any federal, State of California, or local law.

VII. COVENANT NOT TO SUE BY PLAINTIFFS

12. Except as specifically provided in Paragraph 15 of this Decree, the United States and the State of California, by and through the CDFG and SLC as trustees for the State of California's Natural Resources, covenant not to sue or to take administrative action against the Settling Defendants for Natural Resource Damages under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act ("Clean Water Act"), 33 U.S.C. § 1321(f), or other federal, State or common law, for injuries to soil, surface water, or sediment, as well as for injuries to biological resources using those resources, including vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, fish species, and piscivorous birds, resulting from releases of Hazardous Substances into the environment in the Guadalupe River Watershed, including any continuing releases. These United States and State of California v. 12 Consent Decree County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

covenants take effect upon the Entry of this Decree and are contingent upon satisfactory completion of the Work and the payment of the amount required in Section V; should any portion of the Work not be completed satisfactorily, or any amount required by Section V not be paid, the Plaintiffs shall be excused from this covenant only with respect to Settling Defendants having responsibilities relating to that portion of the Work or any amount unpaid. Nothing in this Paragraph is intended to preclude or limit the United States or the State of California, through the Regional Board, from exercising authorities that may be available to them under the Clean Water Act or the Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, as applicable, including but not limited to permitting and enforcement under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program, adoption and implementation of TMDLs, including but not limited to TMDLs for mercury in the Guadalupe Watershed and the San Francisco Bay, and issuance of cleanup orders, waste discharge requirements, and water quality certifications. Nor is anything in this Paragraph intended to preclude or limit the United States or DTSC, or any other State agency, as appropriate, from taking any response actions pursuant to their authority under CERCLA or other applicable law.

- 13. The United States covenants not to sue or to take administrative action against CDFG, SLC, or the California Department of Transportation ("CalTrans") for Natural Resource Damages under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607, the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1321(f), or other federal law, for injuries to soil, surface water, or sediment, as well as for injuries to biological resources using those resources, including vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, fish species, and piscivorous birds, resulting from releases of Hazardous Substances into the environment in the Guadalupe River Watershed, including any continuing releases. These covenants take effect upon the Entry of this Decree.
- 14. The State of California, by and through the CDFG and SLC as trustees for the State of California's Natural Resources, and CalTrans covenant not to sue or to take administrative action against the United States for Natural Resource Damages under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607, the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1321(f), or other federal, State or common law, for injuries to soil, surface water, or sediment, as well as for injuries to biological resources United States and State of California v. 13 Consent Decree

K2005

12

10

14

using those resources, including vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, fish species, and piscivorous birds, resulting from releases of Hazardous Substances into the environment in the Guadalupe River Watershed, including any continuing releases. These covenants take effect upon the Entry of this Decree.

VIII. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS FOR NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGES

- 15. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Decree, the United States and the State of California reserve the right to institute proceedings against the Settling Defendants in this action or in a new action seeking recovery of Natural Resource Damages (1) based on injury to, destruction of, or loss of Natural Resources resulting from conditions that were unknown to the Trustees as of the Date of Lodging of this Decree ("Unknown Conditions"), or (2) based on information received by the Trustees after the Date of Lodging of this Decree that indicates that there is injury to, destruction of, or loss of Natural Resources of a type unknown to the Trustees as of the Date of Lodging of this Decree ("New Information").
- 16. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Decree, the covenants not to sue in Paragraph 12 shall apply only to matters addressed in that Paragraph and specifically shall not apply to the following claims:
 - claims based on a failure by a Settling Defendant to satisfy any a. requirement imposed upon it by this Decree;
 - b. claims for criminal liability; and
 - claims arising from the past, present or future disposal, release, or threat of c. release of hazardous substances not addressed in this Decree. Releases of hazardous substances or Natural Resource Damages resulting from activities undertaken by or at the direction of Plaintiffs, including pursuant to the terms of this Decree, shall be deemed not to be included in this Subparagraph c.

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Paragraph 7 will directly address the objective of the Guadalupe Mercury TMDL and the TMDL for mercury in the San Francisco Bay, and the Settling Defendants shall not be precluded from claiming credit for their activities pursuant to this Decree with respect to the establishment of requirements pursuant to the TMDLs, Other Processes, or other legal proceedings by application of the pre-existing duty rule with respect to the obligations made pursuant to this Decree or otherwise.

- 17. For purposes of Paragraph 15, "Unknown Conditions" or "New Information" shall not include or pertain to (i) a change only in Plaintiffs' quantification of Natural Resource Damages arising out of the past and/or continuing releases of Hazardous Substances alleged by Plaintiffs in this action; and/or (ii) damages based on releases of hazardous substances other than Hazardous Substances as defined herein, unless Plaintiffs can demonstrate that such releases resulted in an injury different in type than those alleged in this action.
- 18. No information shall be deemed "new," and no condition shall be deemed "unknown," if the information or condition is contained or identified in, or could be reasonably determined from, documents and data in the possession of CDFG, DTSC, the Regional Board, DOI, or Region IX of the U.S. EPA, on or before the Date of Entry of this Decree.

IX. COVENANTS BY SETTLING DEFENDANTS

- 19. Subject to Paragraph 20, the Settling Defendants hereby covenant not to sue or to assert any administrative claims or causes of action against the United States or against the State of California with respect to the Work set forth in, or payments required by, this Decree or in connection with the Cooperative Process ("Settling Defendant Claims"), including, but not limited to:
- a. any direct or indirect Settling Defendant Claim for reimbursement from the Hazardous Substance Superfund (established pursuant to the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. § 9507) through CERCLA Sections 106(b)(2), 107, 111, 112, 113 or any other provision of law;
- b. any Settling Defendant Claims against the United States or the State of California, including any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States or the State of California, under CERCLA Sections 107 or 113;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- any Settling Defendant Claims against the Guadalupe River Watershed NRD Account; or
- d. any Settling Defendant Claims under the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, the Tucker Act. 28 U.S.C. § 1491, the Equal Access to Justice Act. 28 U.S.C. § 2412, as amended, or at common law.
- 20. The Settling Defendants reserve their right to contest any claims alleged to be reserved by Section VIII of this Decree, and the Settling Defendants do not by consenting to this Decree waive any defenses to such claims, except that the Settling Defendants covenant not to assert, and may not maintain, any defense based upon principles of waiver, res judicata, collateral estoppel, issue preclusion, claim-splitting, or other defense based upon the contention that the claims that are allowed by Section VIII of this Decree were or should have been brought in the instant case. In the event that either the United States or the State of California brings any claim not settled by this Decree, or pursuant to Section VIII of this Decree, the Settling Defendants reserve the right to assert all potential counterclaims, cross-claims, or third-party claims against the United States or the State of California arising from such claim. Nothing in this Decree shall be deemed to constitute preauthorization of a claim within the meaning of Section 111 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9611.

X. EFFECT OF SETTLEMENT/CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION

- 21. The Settling Defendants do not admit any of Plaintiffs' allegations or claims set forth herein and deny any liability for Plaintiffs' claims against the Defendants set forth in the Complaint.
- 22. Nothing in this Consent Decree shall be construed to create any rights in, or grant any cause of action to, any person not a Party to this Consent Decree. The preceding sentence shall not be construed to waive or nullify any rights that any person not a signatory to this Decree may have under applicable law. Each of the Parties expressly reserves any and all rights (including, but not limited to, any right to contribution), defenses, claims, demands, and causes of action that each Party may have against any person not a Party hereto.
- The Parties agree, and the Court hereby finds, adjudges and decrees, that (1) the 23. United States and State of California v. 16 Consent Decree County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Case 5:05-cv-0307

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

2.2 23

24 25

26

27 28

> United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Parties have fully negotiated the terms of this Consent Decree at arms length with the assistance
and advice of competent, independent counsel; (2) the consideration exchanged and commitments
made herein are reasonable in the context of the rights and responsibilities of the Parties and their
potential liabilities; (3) public notice (including a properly noticed public comment period) of the
opportunity for submitting comments on the terms and conditions of this settlement has been
provided; and (4) the settlement reflected herein is made in good faith and is neither fraudulent
nor collusive, nor affected by any fraud or collusion. Accordingly, the Parties agree, and the
Court hereby finds, orders, adjudges, and decrees, that this Consent Decree represents a fair,
adequate, reasonable, equitable, and good-faith settlement, and that therefore the Settling
Defendants are entitled to contribution protection provided by CERCLA Section 113(f)(2), 42
U.S.C. § 9613(f)(2), or otherwise provided by State or common law, for matters addressed by this
Consent Decree. "Matters addressed" in this Consent Decree include all Natural Resource
Damages with respect to releases of Hazardous Substances within the Guadalupe River
Watershed, as defined herein, including continuing releases. The "Matters Addressed" in this
Consent Decree do not include those claims as to which any Party has reserved its rights under
this Consent Decree (except for claims for failure to comply with this Decree), in the event that
any Party asserts rights against another coming within the scope of such reservations.

- 24. The Settling Defendants agree that, with respect to any suit or claim for contribution brought by them for matters related to this Consent Decree, they will notify the United States and the State of California in writing no later than sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of such suit or claim, unless the giving of such advance notice would subject such suit or claim to a defense that it is barred by the statute or limitations or other time-related defense.
- 25. The Settling Defendants also agree that, with respect to any suit or claim for contribution brought against them for matters related to this Consent Decree, they will notify in writing the United States and the State of California within ten (10) days of service of the complaint on them. In addition, Settling Defendants shall notify the United States and the State of California within ten (10) days of service or receipt of any Motion for Summary Judgment with respect to such a claim, and within ten (10) days of receipt of any order from a court setting

such a case for trial.

XI. PENALTIES FOR LATE AND/OR INADEQUATE PERFORMANCE (INCLUDING PAYMENTS)

26. If the payment required of Sunoco by Paragraph 4 is not made by the date specified in that Paragraph, or the Work required of the Settling Defendants responsible for implementation of the Work described in Section VI of this Decree is not performed in accordance with this Decree, Sections 4.3.1.1 through 4.3.2.3 of Exhibit B hereto, or any approved work plans, unless excused by a Force Majeure in accordance with Section XII of this Decree, those Settling Defendants responsible for implementing the particular Work obligation, making the payment, or submitting the report in question shall be jointly and severally liable for the following amounts for, respectively, each day of delay in performance, payment, or late/deficient report:

Days of Delay	Payment Per Day of Delay:	Late Payment	Late/Deficient Report
1-14	\$ 500/day	\$ 2000/day	\$ 500/day
15-60	\$ 1000/day	\$ 3000/day	\$ 750/day
Beyond 60 Days	\$ 2500/day	\$ 4000/day	\$ 1000/day

27. Payments due under the preceding Paragraph shall be paid by certified check and disbursed 50 percent to the United States and 50 percent to CDFG. Subject to Paragraph 29, below, stipulated penalties are due within thirty (30) days following receipt by a Settling Defendant of a written demand by Plaintiffs for payment of such stipulated penalties. Stipulated penalties owing to the United States shall, as directed by the United States, be paid by certified or cashier's check in the amount due payable to the "U.S. Department of Justice," referencing DOJ No. 90-11-2-07048, and shall be delivered to the office of the United States Attorney, Northern District of California, Financial Litigation Unit, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055, San Francisco, California 94102. Notice of such payment shall be sent to the Plaintiffs as provided in Section XXI of this Decree.

28. Stipulated penalties owing to the State of California shall be payable to the Department of Fish and Game and delivered to

John A. Holland Office of Spill Prevention and Response Department of Fish and Game P.O. Box 160362 Sacramento, California 95816-0362

Or, if by courier or overnight mail, to

John A. Holland
Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Department of Fish and Game
1700 K Street, Suite 250
Sacramento, California 95814

- 29. Except as provided in Paragraph 34 below, stipulated penalties shall begin to accrue on the day after the performance or payment is due and shall continue to accrue until performance is satisfactorily completed or payment is made. Except as provided in Paragraph 34 below, penalties shall continue to accrue during any dispute resolution under Section XIII of this Decree, with interest on accrued penalties payable and calculated at the rate established by the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961, but need not be paid until fifteen (15) days after final resolution of the dispute, in the amount determined by such resolution.
- 30. Nothing herein shall prevent the simultaneous accrual of separate penalties for separate violations of this Consent Decree. The payment of stipulated penalties shall not alter in any way a Settling Defendant's obligation to complete the performance of the Work required of it under this Consent Decree. In addition to the remedy provided for in Paragraph 26, if the payment required of Sunoco by Paragraph 4 of this Decree is not made by the date specified in that Paragraph, Sunoco shall be liable for, in addition to the payment specified in that Paragraph, Interest on the amount due.
- 31. In addition to the remedies provided for in Paragraphs 26 and 30, if the payment required of Sunoco by Paragraph 4 of this Decree or the stipulated penalties provided for by this Section are not made, the defaulting Settling Defendant(s) in question shall be liable for any costs and attorneys fees incurred by Plaintiffs in enforcing the terms of this Decree.
- 32. Payments due under this Section shall be in addition to any other remedies or United States and State of California v.
 County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

 19 Consent Decree

V2005

XII. FORCE MAJEURE

33. "Force Majeure," for purposes of this Consent Decree, is defined as any event arising from causes beyond the control of the responsible Settling Defendants, their contractors, or any entity controlled by Settling Defendants that delays the performance of any Work obligation under this Consent Decree despite Settling Defendants' best efforts to fulfill the obligation. "Best efforts" include using best efforts to anticipate any potential force majeure event and to address the effects of any such event (a) as it is occurring and (b) after it has occurred, such that the delay is minimized to the extent reasonably possible. "Force Majeure" does not include the Settling Defendants' financial inability to perform any obligation under this Consent Decree. "Force Majeure" shall otherwise be deemed to include a delay in performance of the Work required pursuant to Section VI provided that the requirements of Paragraph 34 are addressed.

- 34. If any event occurs or has occurred that may delay the performance of any Work obligation under this Decree, as to which a Settling Defendant intends to assert a claim of Force Majeure, the Settling Defendant shall provide notice in writing, as provided in Section XXI of this Decree (Notice), within fourteen (14) days from the time a responsible representative of the Settling Defendant first knew of, or by the exercise of due diligence should have known of, the event. Such notification shall include an explanation and description of the reasons for the delay; the anticipated duration of the delay; a description of all actions taken or to be taken to prevent or minimize the delay; a schedule for implementation of any measures to be taken to prevent or mitigate the delay or the effect of the delay; and the Settling Defendant's rationale as to why the implementation plan is adequate. Unless otherwise agreed to by the Plaintiffs, failure to comply with the above requirements shall preclude a Settling Defendant from asserting any claim of Force Majeure.
- 35. A Settling Defendant shall have the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence that the Settling Defendant gave timely Notice as required by the preceding Paragraph;

36.

of any other obligation.

1

5

8

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27 28

If the Trustees agree that any delay or anticipated delay has been justified under the provisions of this Section, the Trustees shall stipulate to an extension of time for a Settling Defendant's performance of the affected requirement pursuant to the implementation plan

modification shall be deemed to have been made pursuant to Section XVII of this Consent Decree

presented with the Notice or as otherwise agreed upon. In such circumstances, the appropriate

(Modification) and shall be deemed to have been incorporated into Sections 4.3.1.1 through

that the Settling Defendant used best efforts to prevent or minimize any delay attributable to the

event; and that any period of delay was attributable to that event. Delays "attributable" to a Force

interfere with the implementation of any requirement following the initial Force Majeure event.

Majeure include further delays resulting from the passing of construction seasons that may

Filed 114

2/2005

4.3,2.3 of Exhibit B. In the event the affected Parties cannot agree, the matter shall be resolved in accordance with Section XIII of this Consent Decree (Dispute Resolution). The penalties

provided for by Section XI shall not accrue during the period between provision of Notice pursuant to Paragraph 34 and the resolution of any dispute under Section XIII of this Decree.

provided that the Notice is substantially justified. An extension of time for performance of the obligations affected by a Force Majeure event shall not, of itself, extend the time for performance

XIII. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- 37. This Section provides the exclusive mechanism for resolution of disputes arising under this Consent Decree, subject to the provisions of Section XVII of this Decree (Modification). However, except as otherwise provided in Section XII, such procedures shall not apply to actions by the Plaintiffs to enforce obligations of a Settling Defendant that have not been disputed in accordance with this Section.
- Any dispute shall be, in the first instance, the subject of informal negotiations 38. between the Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendant(s) invoking Dispute Resolution. Such period of informal negotiations shall not extend beyond twenty (20) days after date that notice of a dispute is given by a Settling Defendant, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Plaintiffs.
- If informal negotiations do not result in resolution of the dispute, then the 39. United States and State of California v. 21 Consent Decree County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

5

6 7

9 10

8

12 13

11

15 16

14

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

Plaintiffs' position shall prevail, unless the Settling Defendant exercises its right to petition the Court in accordance with this Section. The Settling Defendant may petition the Court within thirty (30) calendar days of the end of the informal negotiations period for resolution of the dispute. The petition shall set forth the nature of the dispute and a proposal for its resolution. Further briefing and argument on the petition will comply with the requirements of the Local Rules for the Northern District of California, subject to such modifications as may be sought from the Court.

- 40. In all disputes under this Section, the Settling Defendant(s) shall bear the burden of proof/persuasion.
- 41. Except as otherwise provided in Section XII, the invocation of dispute resolution under this Section shall not extend, postpone, or affect in any way any obligation of a Settling Defendant under this Consent Decree, not directly in dispute, unless the Plaintiffs or the Court agrees otherwise.

XIV. RETENTION OF RECORDS

- 42. Until three years after completion of the Work required by this Decree, each Settling Defendant shall preserve and retain all records and documents now in its possession or control or that come into its possession or control, that relate to the identification, nature, and quantity of mercury in the Guadalupe River Watershed, the nature and extent of alleged releases of Hazardous Substances from the Guadalupe River Watershed, or the pathway of any alleged release of any mercury to or from the Guadalupe River Watershed. This obligation does not apply to records or documents previously exchanged between the Settling Defendants and the Plaintiffs prior to the Date of Lodging of this Decree. Within ninety (90) days of the conclusion of this document-retention period, upon request by either Plaintiff, the Settling Defendants shall produce or make available for inspection any non-privileged records or documents at a mutually convenient time and place, before destroying any such records or documents.
- 43. In addition to the opportunity to obtain documents at the conclusion of the document-retention period set forth in the preceding Paragraph, either Plaintiff may request, at any time during the document-retention period, that a Settling Defendant make available for

9

10

13

12

15

16

14

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27 28 inspection or, at the Settling Defendant's option, produce, any non-privileged documents retained pursuant to the preceding Paragraph. The Settling Defendant receiving such request shall produce or make available for inspection non-privileged documents at a mutually convenient time and place after such request is made.

- 44. With respect to the obligation to retain, produce, or make available records as set forth in this Section, the Settling Defendants may assert that certain documents or records are privileged under the attorney/client privilege or any other privilege recognized under applicable law. If any Settling Defendant asserts any such privilege, it shall provide the Plaintiffs with the following information relating to any documents or records that are requested and withheld as privileged: (1) title of document or record; (2) date of document or record; (3) name and position of the author of the document or record; (4) description of the subject of the document or record; and (5) the specific basis for the privilege asserted. The privilege log relating to the subject documents must be produced to the Plaintiffs at a mutually convenient time and place after Plaintiffs request the documents that are withheld. Settling Defendants shall retain the documents that are withheld as privileged, until any privilege disputes relating to those documents are resolved. However, no final documents, reports created, or data generated pursuant to the requirements of this Consent Decree shall be withheld on grounds of privilege.
- 45. This Section in no way affects or limits any obligation of the Settling Defendants to retain records under any other administrative or judicial order or agreement, whether such order or agreement is currently extant or created in the future. Further, this Section in no way affects or limits any obligation of the Settling Defendants to retain records under any other judicial, statutory, or common law doctrine that would otherwise require retention of records, nor does this Paragraph limit the information-gathering authorities of the Plaintiffs under any applicable federal or state laws or regulations.
- 46. Each Settling Defendant hereby certifies individually that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, after thorough inquiry, it has not altered, mutilated, discarded, destroyed, or otherwise disposed of any records, documents, or other information (other than identical copies) relating to its potential liability regarding Natural Resource Damages with respect to the United States and State of California v.

Guadalupe River Watershed since notification of potential liability by the Plaintiffs and that it has fully complied with any and all of Plaintiffs' prior requests for information with respect to this site, pursuant to Section 104(e) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9604(e), or other applicable federal or state laws or regulations.

XV. CERTIFICATE AND SIGNATURE

- 47. Each Defendant certifies by affixing its signature to this Decree that the Work that it has agreed to perform under the Decree is not an activity that it is legally obligated to perform by any other permit, lawsuit, administrative proceeding, or other process. The certification provided by the preceding sentence shall not be deemed to be invalid where Work performed pursuant to this Decree complements obligations undertaken pursuant to other permits, lawsuits, administrative proceedings, the TMDL, or Other Processes, including by more precisely specifying the time, place, and/or manner of performance, or by requiring the performance of Work that is only encouraged or contemplated, but not legally guaranteed, by another agreement.
- 48. The undersigned representatives of each Settling Defendant certifies that he or she is fully authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this Decree and to legally execute and bind that party to this Decree.
- 49. This Consent Decree may be signed in counterparts, and such counterpart signature pages shall be given full force and effect.

XVI. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

50. This Consent Decree and Sections 4.3.1.1. through 4.3.2.3 of Exhibit B constitute the final, complete, and exclusive agreement and understanding between the Trustees and the Settling Defendants with respect to the settlement embodied in the Decree and supersede all prior agreements and understandings, whether oral or written. Other than Exhibit B, which is attached to and incorporated in this Decree, no other document, nor any representation, inducement, agreement, understanding, or promise, constitutes any part of this Decree or the settlement it represents, nor shall it be used in construing the terms of this Decree.

XVII. MODIFICATION

51. The terms of this Consent Decree may be modified only by a subsequent written
United States and State of California v.
County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Consent Decree

26

27

28

agreement signed by all the Parties or as ordered by the Court upon the noticed motion of any Party. The terms and schedules contained in Sections 4.3.1.1 through 4.3.2.3 of Exhibit B of this Decree may be modified upon written agreement of the affected Parties without Court approval. Where any other modification constitutes a material change to any term of this Decree, it shall be effective only upon approval by the Court.

XVIII. TERMINATION

52. This Consent Decree shall terminate as to each Settling Defendant upon granting of a motion duly filed by that Settling Defendant, demonstrating that such Settling Defendant has. as applicable, paid the amount required by Section V of this Decree, performed the Work required by Section VI of this Decree, and paid any outstanding stipulated penalties under Section XI of this Decree, except that the provisions and effect of Sections VII, VIII, IX, X, XIV; the County's obligation to monitor and maintain the consolidated and encapsulated materials, in accordance with Sections 4.3.1.1 and 4.3.1.2 of Exhibit B; and MROSD's obligation, set forth in Paragraph 10. to maintain Ravenswood Marsh, in perpetuity, as open space and habitat for the Clapper Rail shall survive termination of the Decree.

XIX. PUBLIC COMMENT

- 53. The Trustees have preliminarily determined that the Work to be performed and the payments to be made pursuant to this Decree constitute appropriate action to protect and restore the natural resources damaged as alleged in the Complaint and satisfy the requirements of Section 122(j)(2) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9622(j)(2), with respect to each Settling Defendant.
- 54. The Parties acknowledge that this Consent Decree and the draft restoration plan set forth in Exhibit B to this Decree will be subject to a public comment period of not less than thirty (30) days, as provided by 43 C.F.R. § 11.81. Consequently, entry of the Decree after lodging shall be deferred to allow the time necessary for the United States and the State to obtain and evaluate public comment on this Decree and on Exhibit B hereto. The United States and the State of California reserve the right to withdraw their consent to this Decree if comments received disclose facts or considerations that show that this Decree or the draft restoration plan is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Settling Defendants consent to the entry of this United States and State of California v. 25 Consent Decree

Decree by the Court without further notice. The Settling Defendants further agree not to oppose entry of this Consent Decree by the Court or to challenge any provision of the Decree, unless either the United States or CDFG has notified Settling Defendants in writing that it no longer supports entry of the Decree.

55. In the event that there is no Date of Final Approval of this Decree, this Decree and the settlement embodied herein is voidable at the discretion of any Party, and the terms hereof may not be used as evidence in any litigation or other proceeding.

XX. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

56. The Court shall retain jurisdiction of this case until termination of this Consent Decree, for the purpose of enabling any of the Parties to apply to the Court for such further order, direction, or relief as may be necessary or appropriate for the construction or modification of this Consent Decree, or to effectuate or enforce compliance with its terms, or to resolve disputes in accordance with Section XIII of this Decree (Dispute Resolution).

XXI. NOTICE

57. Any notice required hereunder shall be in writing and shall be delivered by hand, facsimile or overnight mail as follows:

As to the United States:

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section Environment and Natural Resources Division DOI Case #90-11-2-07048 U.S. Department of Justice P.O. Box 7611 Washington, D.C. 20044-7611

and

David B. Glazer United States Department of Justice 301 Howard Street, Suite 1050 San Francisco, California 94105 Tel.: (415) 744-6477

Fax: (415) 744-6477

And

2728

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Page 30 of 45

Document 32-1

Filed 11

Z/2005

Page 31 of 45

Case 5:05-cv-030

County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Document 32-1

Filed 1247/2005

Page 32 of 45

Case 5:05-cv-03023-PVT

- 58. Each Party to this Decree may change the person(s) it has designated to receive notice for that Party, or the addresses for such notice, by filing a written notice of such change with the Court and serving said notice on each of the other Parties to this Decree.
- 59. Each Settling Defendant hereby agrees to accept service of process by mail with respect to all matters arising under or relating to this Consent Decree and to waive the formal service requirements set forth in Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and any applicable Local Rules of this Court including, but not limited to, service of a summons.

XXII. JUDGMENT

60. Upon approval and entry of this Consent Decree by the Court, this Consent Decree shall constitute a final judgment between the Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendants. The Court finds that there is no just reason for delay and therefore enters this judgment as a final judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54 and 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED: 11/16/05

Dapicia V. Irenbull

INITED STATES PHOTOLOGY HIDOR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Consent Decree

FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION

WE HEREBY CONSENT to the entry of the Consent Decree in <u>United States</u>, <u>et al.</u> v. <u>County of Santa Clara</u>, <u>et al.</u>, subject to the public notice and comment requirements of Section XIX of this Consent Decree:

Dated: 6// ,200/5 feel Thayer

Executive Officer
State Lands Commission

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California GAVIN G. McCABE, Deputy Attorney General

By: GAVIN G. McCABE

Attorneys for Plaintiff California State Lands Commission

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

FOR THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

WE HEREBY CONSENT to the entry of the Consent Decree in <u>United States</u>, <u>et al.</u> v. <u>County of Santa Clara</u>, <u>et al.</u>, subject to the public notice and comment requirements of Section XIX of this Consent Decree:

Dated: December 6, , 2004

GARY R. WINTERS

Chief

Division of Environmental Analysis California Department of Transportation

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

Consent Decree

FOR SETTLING DEFENDANTS:

WE HEREBY CONSENT to the entry of the Consent Decree in <u>United Stated</u>, <u>et al. v.</u> County of Santa Clara, <u>et al.</u>:

Dated: 5/11/05
NAME

Title: CEO
Address: 5750 Almaden Expressway
Stan Williams
Santa Clara Valley Water District

Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party:

Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party:

Name (print): Debra Cauble
Title: District Counsel
Address: Santa Clara Valley Water District
5750 Almaden Expressway
San Jose, California 95118-3686
Ph. Number: (408) 265-2600

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

28

	Case 5:05-cv-03079 PVT Document 32-1 Filed 11/47/2005 Page 42 of 45
1	FOR SETTLING DEFENDANTS:
2	WE HEREBY CONSENT to the entry of the Consent Decree in <u>United Stated</u> , et al. v. County of Santa Clara, et al.:
3	1
4	Dated: February 2, 2007 Ishomas James THOMPS J. HAINES
5	Title: <u>Senior Counsel</u> Address: <u>Sunoco, Inc. Law Department</u>
6	1801 MARKET STREET Philadelphia, PA 19103
7 8	
9	Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party:
10	
11	Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party: Name (print):SAME AS Above
12	Title:Address:
13	
14	Ph. Number: (215) 977-6273
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
2728	
28	United States and State of California v

1	FOR SETTLING DEFENDANTS:
2	WE HEREBY CONSENT to the entry of the Consent Decree in <u>United Stated</u> , et al. v. County of Santa Clara, et al.:
3	
4	Dated: February 8, 2007 NAME Duane C. Woods Title: President Guodelyse Address: Office of the control of th
5	Duane C. Woods Title: President Gudzlupe Address: President Brispirel In
6	
7	
8	
9	Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party:
10	·
11	Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party: Name (print): Andrew W. Kenefick
12	Title: Senior Legal Counsel Address: 801 2nd Avenue, Suite 614
13	Seattle, WA 98104
14	Ph. Number: 206-264-3062
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	1
27	* 40° · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
28	
	United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV 35 Consent Decree

United States and State of California v. County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

25

26

27

28

36

Consent Decree

1	FOR SETTLING DEFENDANTS:
2	WE HEREBY CONSENT to the entry of the Consent Decree in <u>United States</u> , <u>et al.</u> v. <u>County of Santa Clara</u> , <u>et al.</u> :
4	Dated: June 3 , 2005 BUCKHORN, INC.
5	by: Vein C. O'heil
6	Title: Assistant Secretary
7	Address: 1293 South Main Street Akron, OH 44301
8	
9	
10	Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party:
1	
12	Agent Authorized to Accept Service on Behalf of Above-Signed Party: Name (print): Kevin C. O'Neil
13	Title: Assistant Secretary Address: 1293 S. Main Street
14	Akron, OH 44301
1	Ph. Number: (330) 253-5592
15	-AND-
16	David D. Cooke
17	Allen Matkins Leck Gamble & Mallory LLP Three Embarcadero Center, 12th Floor
18	San Francisco, CA 94111 (415) 837-1515
19	(415) 637 1313
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	United States and State of California v. 35 Consent Decree County of Santa Clara, et al., No. CV

·PVT Filed 11 Document 32-2 *L*2005 Page 2 of 3 Kegional Water Qualit ontrol Board

San Francisco Bay Region

Terry Tamminen Secretary for Environmental Protection

V17VJ76VVJ

1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94672 (510) 622-2300 • Fax (510) 622-2460 http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2



January 9, 2004

Gavin Ci. McCabe Deputy Attorney General State of California Department of Justice 455 Golden Gate Avenue Suite 1100 San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Mr. McCabe:

As you know, the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board ("Water Board") is a designated Natural Resource Trustee for natural resources within its purview for purposes of Section 107(f)(2)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1990 ("CERCLA"), as amended, and is entitled to recover natural resource damage restoration or replacement costs under Section 311(f)(3) of the Clean Water Act ("CWA").1

We understand from the California Department of Fish and Game ("DFG") that you have inquired as to whether the Water Board will pursue a Natural Resources Damages action for Natural Resources Damages caused by discharges of mercury in the Guadalupe River watershed. We fur her understand that DFG and the U.S. Department of Interior are pursuing Natural Resource Damages claims for those natural resources that are within their purview against the County of Santa Clara, Myers Industries, Inc., Buckhorn, Inc. (an Ohio Corporation), the Guadalupe Rubbish Disposal Company, Inc., the City of San Jose, the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (collectively, the "Potentially Responsible Parties" or "PRPs"), and that a settlement of such action with the PRPs is imminent.

The Water Board is aware of the mercury problem in the Guadalupe watershed and its impact to waters of the State, and has made it a top priority to address this problem. The Board's current strategy is to address the mercury problem through the adoption of Total Daily Maximum Loads ("TMD's") and implementation actions, including but not limited to requiring cleanup and remova: actions and permit requirements, and through such other available remedies available to

¹ Collectively these statutory authorities give rise to particular types of claims for "natural resources damages." To avoid confusion with other statutory authorities that may be used to address environmental contamination, including discharges of waste to the waters of the State, we refer to these as "Natural Resources Damages" herein.

Gavin McCabe January 9, 2004 Page 2

it under the CWA and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act ("Porter-Cologne") (i.e., remedies other than CERCLA and CWA Natural Resources Damages claims). Given this strategy, the Water Board's current understanding of the mercury problem in the Guadalupe River watershed, and the fact that other trustee agencies are pursuing Natural Resources Damages claims against the PRPs, the Water Board will not file or ask the California Attorney General's office to file on its behalf a complaint against the PRPs for CERCLA or CWA Natural Resource; Damages caused by discharges of mercury in the Guadalupe River watershed, except insofar as DFG has reserved the right to do so in the future. The preceding statement shall in no way be construed to preclude or limit in any way the Water Board from exercising its other authorities under the CWA and Porter-Cologne, including but not limited to permitting and enforcement under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program, adoption and implementation of TMDLs, and issuance of cleanup and abatement orders, waste discharge requirements and water quality certifications.

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please contact Yuri Won or Thomas Mumley at (510) 622-2491 or (510) 622-2395, respectively.

Sincerely,

Executive: Officer

cc: John Holland, California Department of Fish and Game

Charles McKinley, U.S. Department of Interior