

1 CHARLES M. TEBBUTT, *pro hac vice*
2 DANIEL C. SNYDER, *pro hac vice*
3 Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt, P.C.
4 941 Lawrence St.
5 Eugene, OR 97401
6 Tel. 541.344.3505

7 BRAD J. MOORE, WSBA #21802
8 Stritmatter Kessler Whelan Coluccio
9 200 Second Avenue West
10 Seattle, WA 98119
11 Tel. 206.448.1777

12 *Additional Plaintiffs' counsel on signature page*

13 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

15 COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION FOR
16 RESTORATION OF THE
17 ENVIRONMENT, INC., a Washington
18 Non-Profit Corporation
19 *and*
20 CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY, INC.,
a Washington, D.C. Non-Profit
Corporation,

Case No. CV-13-3016-TOR
SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs,

v.

COW PALACE, LLC, a Washington
Limited Liability Company,

Defendant.

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. This is a citizen suit for declaratory and injunctive relief against Defendant
3 Cow Palace, LLC for violations of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, also known as
4 the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6901 *et seq.* (“RCRA”),
5 at Defendant’s two dairy facilities, respectively called Cow Palace I and Cow
6 Palace II (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Cow Palace Dairy” or
7 “Defendant”).

8 2. This civil action is brought pursuant to the citizen suit provisions of RCRA,
9 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a)(1) (A) and (B).

10 3. As detailed below, Plaintiffs allege that Cow Palace Dairy has violated and
11 continues to violate Section 7002(a) of RCRA by contributing to the past and
12 present handling, storage, treatment, transportation, and/or disposal of solid and
13 hazardous waste in such a manner that may present an imminent and substantial
14 endangerment to health and the environment. 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a).

15 4. Plaintiffs further allege that Cow Palace Dairy employs improper manure
16 management practices that constitute the “open dumping” of solid waste in
17 violation of Section 4005(a) of RCRA. 42 U.S.C. § 6945(a).

18 5. Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief establishing that Cow Palace Dairy has
19 violated RCRA. Plaintiffs also seek injunctive relief directing Cow Palace Dairy
20 to modify its handling, storage, treatment, transportation, and disposal of solid and

1 hazardous waste such that these practices no longer present an imminent and
2 substantial endangerment to health and the environment. Additionally, Plaintiffs
3 seek injunctive relief obligating Cow Palace Dairy to remediate the environmental
4 contamination it has caused and/or contributed to, including widespread soil and
5 groundwater contamination. Finally, Plaintiffs request that the Court award
6 Plaintiffs reasonable attorneys and expert witness fees and costs incurred in
7 bringing this action.

8
9 **JURISDICTION**

10 6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this lawsuit pursuant to
11 Section 7002(a) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a).

12 7. The Court also has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
13 1331 because this action arises under RCRA and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28
14 U.S.C. § 2201, *et seq.*

15 8. On October 17, 2012, Plaintiffs gave notice of the violations and their intent
16 to file suit to the Defendant, Defendant's registered agent, United States Attorney
17 General, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), EPA Region X,
18 Washington State Office of the Governor, Washington State Office of the Attorney
19 General, and Washington State Department of Ecology as required by Section
20 7002(a) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a).

1 9. On July 3, 2013, Plaintiffs gave supplemental notice of the violations and
2 their intent to file suit to the Defendant, Defendant's registered agent, the United
3 States Attorney General, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),
4 EPA Region X, Washington State Office of the Governor, Washington State Office
5 of the Attorney General, and Washington State Department of Ecology as required
6 by Section 7002(a) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a).

7 10. More than ninety days have passed since these notices, including the July 3
8 supplemental notice, were served, and the violations complained of in the notice
9 are continuing at this time, or Defendant is reasonably likely to continue to remain
10 in violation of RCRA. Neither the EPA nor the State of Washington has
11 commenced or is diligently prosecuting a civil or criminal action to redress the
12 violations. Any administrative action undertaken by EPA does not address the
13 relief requested by Plaintiffs that is necessary to abate the imminent and substantial
14 endangerment caused by Defendant's practices.

15 **VENUE**

16 11. Venue properly vests in this Court pursuant to Section 7002(a) of RCRA, 42
17 U.S.C. § 6972(a), because the alleged violations of the aforementioned statutes
18 occurred and continue to occur within the Eastern District of Washington.

19 **PARTIES**

20 12. Upon information and belief, Cow Palace, LLC is a Washington limited

1 liability company that owns and operates the dairies known as Cow Palace I and
2 Cow Palace II. The dairies are located at or near 1631 North Liberty Road,
3 Granger, WA 98932.

4 13. Upon information and belief, Cow Palace I and Cow Palace II are jointly
5 owned and controlled by Cow Palace, LLC. The dairies share common manure
6 and other waste management practices.

7 14. Cow Palace, LLC is a “person” within the meaning of Section 1004(15) of
8 RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(15).

9 15. Plaintiff CARE is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the
10 State of Washington. CARE’s principal office is located in Outlook, Washington.

11 16. CARE is a grassroots organization composed of concerned community
12 members. Its mission is to inform Washington state residents about activities that
13 endanger the health, welfare, and quality of life for current and future
14 Washingtonians through education and citizen empowerment. CARE also acts as
15 an advocate to protect and restore the economic, social, and environmental
16 resources of the region. In carrying out its mission, CARE has appeared in
17 numerous local, state, and federal proceedings.

18 17. CARE’s organizational purposes are adversely affected by Cow Palace
19 Dairy’s violations of RCRA. These violations have caused significant
20 environmental contamination of the soil and groundwater. Furthermore, but for

1 Cow Palace Dairy's unlawful actions, CARE would not have to spend as much of
2 its resources on the environmental problems created by illegal discharges from
3 individual large-scale industrial farming operations, and could direct these
4 resources to other priorities.

5 18. CARE has individual members that reside in Yakima County and in
6 proximity to the Cow Palace Dairy. The environmental, health, aesthetic,
7 economic, and recreational interests of CARE's members have been and will
8 continue to be adversely affected by Cow Palace Dairy's violations of RCRA. For
9 instance:

- 10 a. Members of CARE obtain their drinking water from aquifers that have
11 been contaminated with nitrates, phosphorus, and other pollutants,
12 including hormones and antibiotics, by Cow Palace Dairy's improper
13 handling, storage, treatment, transportation, and disposal of solid and
14 hazardous waste. As a result, drinking water that CARE's members
15 rely upon has been rendered unsafe for human consumption.
16 Consequently, CARE's members have been forced to obtain, or
17 should be obtaining but may not be able to afford, alternative sources
18 of drinking water. CARE's members are concerned that consuming
19 this water is harming or could harm them and their families' health, as
20 well as other community members' health.

1 b. Members of CARE also make domestic and agricultural use of
2 groundwater that has been contaminated with nitrates, phosphorus,
3 and other pollutants as a result of Cow Palace Dairy's improper
4 handling, storage, treatment, transportation, and disposal of solid and
5 hazardous waste. As a result, water that CARE's members' rely upon
6 has been rendered unsafe for domestic and agricultural use.
7 Consequently, CARE's members have been forced to obtain, or
8 should be obtaining but may not be able to afford, alternative sources
9 of water for these uses. CARE's members are concerned that the
10 water used in their homes is harming them and their families' health.
11 CARE's members are concerned that the food they produce and rely
12 upon for sustenance using this water is not safe to consume.

13 c. Members of CARE also live, work, and recreate in the environment
14 that has been negatively impacted by Cow Palace Dairy's improper
15 handling, storage, treatment, transportation, and disposal of solid and
16 hazardous waste. This has lessened CARE's members' enjoyment of
17 their environment. CARE's members' are concerned that their
18 environment has been irreparably injured by Cow Palace Dairy's
19 improper practices.

20 19. Plaintiff Center for Food Safety (CFS) is a public interest non-profit,

1 membership organization that works to protect human health and the environment
2 by curbing the proliferation of harmful food production technologies and by
3 promoting organic and other forms of sustainable agriculture. CFS's
4 organizational purposes are adversely affected by Cow Palace Dairy's violations of
5 RCRA. These violations have caused significant environmental contamination of
6 the soil and groundwater. Furthermore, but for Cow Palace Dairy's unlawful
7 actions, CFS would not have to spend as much of its resources on the problems
8 created by illegal discharges from individual large-scale industrial farming
9 operations, and could direct these resources to other priorities.

10 20. CFS represents nearly 245,000 members throughout the country that support
11 safe, sustainable and organic agriculture and regularly purchase organic products.
12 CFS has approximately 10,000 members in the state of Washington. CFS
13 members live, work, recreate, and grow food in, and consume food and water
14 from, the Yakima Valley. The environmental, health, aesthetic, economic, and
15 recreational interests of CFS's members have been and will continue to be
16 adversely affected by Cow Palace Dairy's violations of RCRA. CFS members
17 support the public's right to choose food and crops not sourced from or by
18 industrial farming practices, such as CAFOs. CFS's members are impacted by
19 CAFOs through destructive discharges of CAFO pollution into groundwater, air
20 and public waterways, which affects the suitability of drinking water and fish in

1 these waterways for consumption.

2 21. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were and are “persons” within the meaning
3 of Section 1004(15) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(15).

4 **STATUTORY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

5 22. Section 7002(a)(1)(B) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a)(1)(B), provides that
6 citizens may commence a citizen suit against “any person,” “including any past or
7 present generator, past or present transporter, or past or present owner or operator
8 of a treatment, storage, or disposal facility who has contributed or who is
9 contributing to the past or present handling, storage, treatment, transportation, or
10 disposal of any solid or hazardous waste which may present an imminent and
11 substantial endangerment to health or the environment.”

12 23. Section 1002(b) of RCRA states that “disposal of solid waste... in or on the
13 land without careful planning and management can present a danger to human
14 health and the environment;” and that “open dumping is particularly harmful to
15 health, contaminates drinking water from underground and surface supplies, and
16 pollutes the air and the land....” 42 U.S.C. § 6901(b).

17 24. As required by statute, EPA has promulgated criteria under RCRA §
18 6907(a)(3) defining solid waste management practices that constitute open
19 dumping. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 6944(a); 40 C.F.R. Parts 257 and 258. These
20 regulations outline certain solid waste disposal practices which, if violated, pose a

1 reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment. 40 C.F.R. §
2 257.3.

3 25. The purpose of RCRA is “to promote the protection of health and the
4 environment.” RCRA seeks to accomplish this by “prohibiting future open
5 dumping on the land and requiring the conversion of existing open dumps to
6 facilities which do not pose a danger to the environment or to health....” 42 U.S.C.
7 § 6902(a).

8 26. Section 4005(a) of RCRA prohibits “any solid waste management practice
9 or disposal of solid waste... which constitutes the open dumping of solid waste....”
10 42 U.S.C. § 6945(a).

11 27. Under section 1004(3), “The term ‘disposal’ means the discharge, deposit,
12 injection, dumping, spilling, leaking, or placing of any solid waste... into or on any
13 land or water so that such solid waste or hazardous waste or any constituent thereof
14 may enter the environment or be emitted into the air or discharged into any waters,
15 including ground-waters.” 42 U.S.C. § 6903(3).

16 28. RCRA defines “solid waste” as “any garbage, refuse, sludge from a waste
17 treatment plant... and other discarded material, including solid, liquid, semisolid,
18 or contained gaseous material resulting from... *agricultural operations*....” 42
19 U.S.C. § 6903(27) (emphasis added).

1 29. EPA criteria for solid waste disposal practices prohibit the contamination of
2 any underground drinking water source beyond the solid waste boundary of a
3 disposal site. 40 C.F.R. § 257.3-4(a).

4 30. An “underground drinking water source” includes (1) an aquifer supplying
5 drinking water for human consumption or (2) any aquifer in which the ground-
6 water contains less than 10,000 milligrams per liter of total dissolved solids. 40
7 C.F.R. § 257.3-4(c)(4).

8 31. “Contaminate” an underground drinking water source means to cause the
9 groundwater concentration of a listed substance to exceed its corresponding
10 maximum contaminant level specified in Appendix I to 40 C.F.R. Part 257, or
11 cause an increase in the concentration of that substance where the existing
12 concentration already exceeds the maximum contaminant level in Appendix I.

13 **FACTS**

14 32. Cow Palace Dairy was founded by Bob and Bill Dolsen and commenced
15 operations in 1972. The Dolsens are the owners of The Dolsen Companies, a
16 Washington Limited Liability Company. The Dolsen Companies is the only
17 member of Cow Palace, LLC. Cow Palace Dairy is presently managed by Jeff
18 Boivon.

19 33. Cow Palace Dairy is a large dairy CAFO under federal and state law. 40
20 C.F.R. § 412.2; WAC 173-224-030.

1 34. As of January 19, 2011, Cow Palace Dairy has over 6840 milking cows and
2 between 700-1699 dry cows, 300-999 heifers, and 2000-2999 calves housed at the
3 facility. In total, Cow Palace Dairy had a herd size of at least 9,840 animals as of
4 January, 2011. These animals are confined 365 days per year.

5 35. Despite due diligence on the Plaintiffs' part to obtain these documents, Cow
6 Palace Dairy's Nutrient Management Plan ("DNMP") and related documents have
7 either not been provided or been partially redacted by various Washington State
8 agencies, thereby preventing citizens from having access to information critical to
9 determining the adequacy of the DNMP itself.

10 36. Upon information and belief, there are two main aquifers underlying Cow
11 Palace Dairy and the surrounding area. These aquifers include a surficial
12 unconfined to semi-confined alluvial aquifer and an extensive basalt aquifer of
13 great thickness underlying sedimentary deposits. Groundwater flows through the
14 surficial aquifer in a manner that generally follows surface topography.
15 Groundwater flows through the upper portions of the underlying basalt aquifer also
16 generally follow surface topography.

17 37. Plaintiffs' members obtain groundwater from one or both of these aquifers.

18 38. The manure generated at Cow Palace Dairy contains numerous organic and
19 inorganic compounds, including phosphorus, veterinary pharmaceuticals,
20 hormones, pathogens (including bacteria, viruses, and protozoa), and steroids.

1 These contaminants are hereinafter collectively referred to as “Other
2 Contaminants.” A list of the possible contaminants is located in Plaintiffs’ July 3,
3 2013 protective supplemental notice of intent to sue, incorporated by reference
4 herein. Attachment 2, pp. 2-3 & pp. 5-6.

5 *Manure Storage Practices*

6 39. Like all large dairy CAFOs, Cow Palace Dairy generates significant
7 quantities of solid and liquid wastes, including manure wastes.

8 40. It is estimated that Cow Palace Dairy produces more than 188,570 tons of
9 manure annually.

10 41. Cow Palace Dairy composts the solid manure wastes generated by its herd
11 on-site. Composted manure is then used as bedding at the facility or sold off-site.

12 42. Solid manure that is not composted by Cow Palace Dairy is land-applied to
13 agricultural fields.

14 43. Solid manure is stored and/or composted at Cow Palace Dairy on permeable
15 surfaces.

16 44. Cow Palace Dairy stores the liquid manure wastes generated by its herd in
17 one of at least nine manure storage lagoons. Wastes are held in these lagoons until
18 such time they are applied to fields through various land-application techniques.

19 45. Cow Palace Dairy’s nine manure storage lagoons are impoundments
20 containing no synthetic liner or other artificial barrier.

1 46. These lagoons have an estimated holding capacity of approximately 40.8
2 million gallons.

3 47. According to National Resource Conservation Service (“NRCS”) standards,
4 manure lagoons should not be constructed above an aquifer that serves as a
5 domestic water supply. If no reasonable alternative exists, however, NRCS
6 recommends that manure lagoons be built with either (1) a clay liner with a
7 permeability less than 1×10^{-6} centimeters per second; (2) a flexible membrane
8 liner over a clay liner; (3) a geosynthetic clay liner; or (4) a concrete liner designed
9 in accordance with slab on grade criteria for fabricated structures requiring water
10 tightness.

11 48. Cow Palace Dairy’s manure lagoons are constructed above an aquifer that
12 serves as a domestic water supply. Upon information and belief, Cow Palace
13 Dairy’s manure storage lagoons do not meet NRCS standards. Under any
14 circumstances, Cow Palace Dairy’s manure storage lagoons leak to groundwater.

15 49. The NRCS standards for manure lagoons are not designed to protect, nor are
16 capable of protecting, human health or the environment. The standards are not
17 scientifically established to protect groundwater.

18 50. Upon information and belief, the NRCS standards for municipal wastewater
19 treatment plant lagoons are more protective of groundwater than those for manure
20 lagoons. Municipal lagoons are required to be lined with, at the very least,

1 synthetic, geomembrane liners. This is true even though municipal waste has far
2 less concentrated effluent than the effluent generated by dairies such as Cow
3 Palace Dairy.

4 51. Upon information and belief, Cow Palace Dairy's nine manure storage
5 lagoons are leaking at least 720,000 gallons of manure into groundwater per year,
6 but potentially as high as 8,600,000 gallons, or more, per year.

7 52. Upon information and belief, seepage from the manure waste storage areas
8 has been ongoing since the date these storage areas were brought into operation,
9 some more than 20 years ago, and has been continuous since put into operation.

10 53. The seepage of manure waste from the lagoons has contributed and is
11 contributing to the excessive contamination of the groundwater, which is posing, or
12 may pose, an imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment.

13 54. Cow Palace Dairy's storage and/or composting of solid manure on
14 permeable surfaces causes runoff and leachate from the solid manure to enter
15 groundwater, further contributing to the contamination of the groundwater.

16 55. Cow Palace Dairy's storage of solid and/or liquid manure in lagoons and
17 other permeable surfaces has caused and is continuing to cause the discharge of
18 manure contaminated water into surface water and groundwater.

19 56. Manure that has been permitted to leach, leak, or otherwise discharge into
20 groundwater, such as from a leaking lagoon, solid manure storage area, compost

1 storage area, confinement pen, or other permeable surface, is a “discarded
2 material” from an “agricultural operation,” and is therefore a “solid waste” under
3 Section 1004(27) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27).

4 57. Cow Palace Dairy’s improper manure storage practices have caused
5 irreparable injury to the environment, contaminating soils, groundwater, and
6 surface waters with excessively high levels of nitrates and related nitrogen
7 compounds and, possibly, Other Contaminants.

8 ***Manure Application Practices***

9 58. Upon information and belief, Cow Palace Dairy and/or its agents have
10 applied, continue to apply, and are reasonably likely to continue to apply liquid and
11 solid manure wastes to nearby agricultural fields in amounts that exceed agronomic
12 rates.

13 59. The surface soils to which Cow Palace Dairy applies manure have a high
14 saturated hydraulic conductivity.

15 60. The EPA has conducted a study entitled “Relation Between Nitrate in Water
16 Wells and Potential Sources in the Lower Yakima Valley, Washington,” EPA-910-
17 R-12-003 (September 27, 2012). The purpose of that study was to investigate the
18 contribution from various land uses to the high nitrate levels in groundwater and
19 residential drinking water wells, the predominant source of drinking water for
20 many residents in the Lower Yakima Valley. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by

1 reference the content of the EPA study into this Complaint. The EPA study may
2 be accessed at
3 <[http://www.epa.gov/region10/pdf/sites/yakimagw/nitrate_in_water_wells_study_](http://www.epa.gov/region10/pdf/sites/yakimagw/nitrate_in_water_wells_study_9-27-2012.pdf)
4 [9-27-2012.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/region10/pdf/sites/yakimagw/nitrate_in_water_wells_study_9-27-2012.pdf)>.

5 61. The EPA study found that within the approximate property boundary of the
6 Cow Palace Dairy, six soil units have been mapped by the NRCS. All six soil
7 units have a silt loam texture with a “well-drained” classification. Three of the soil
8 units (Esquatzel, Shano, and Warden) represent approximately 81 percent of the
9 surface area. These units have a saturated hydraulic conductivity in the range of
10 1.1 to 4.0 feet per day, which is characterized as “moderately high to high” in their
11 capacity to transmit water. Two of the soil units (Burke and Scoon) represent
12 approximately 19 percent of the surface area and have a saturated hydraulic
13 conductivity in the range of 0.0 to 0.12 feet per day, which is characterized as
14 “very low to moderately low.” One of the soil units (Finlay) represents less than 1
15 percent of the surface area and has a saturated hydraulic conductivity of 4 to 11.9
16 feet per day, which is characterized as “high.”

17 62. The well drained nature of these soils along with high hydraulic conductivity
18 make for highly susceptible soil conditions for groundwater contamination and
19 very low potential for any denitrification to decrease nitrate contamination of
20 groundwater.

1 63. Dairy effluent concentrations of ammonia and nitrate can be considerable, as
2 ammonia is produced by hydrolysis of waste fluids. Ammonia is rapidly converted
3 to nitrate when the manure encounters aerobic soils or groundwater. Due to their
4 high solubility, ammonia and nitrate can readily leach into groundwater. Other
5 Contaminants may also bind to soil and leach through soils and into groundwater
6 when manure is applied above agronomic rates.

7 64. Plants can uptake nitrate and nitrite only in limited quantities. Quantities of
8 nitrate and nitrite in the soil in excess of concentrations which can be used by the
9 currently active crop migrate into the vadose zone and the water table, where they
10 adversely impact ground water quality and its use as a drinking water source.

11 Migration to the vadose zone and water table may also occur where well-drained
12 soils cannot hold the nitrate and nitrite in the root zone for a sufficient amount of
13 time to allow for the crops' natural uptake process.

14 65. Elevated nutrient levels found in soils receiving manure are evidence of
15 manure applications in excess of agronomic rates.

16 66. Washington Department of Agriculture inspection reports from November
17 22, 2005 documented elevated phosphorus levels in soils receiving Cow Palace
18 Dairy manure, indicating that the Dairy had applied manure in excess of agronomic
19 rates. The report also cautioned the Dairy to "watch crop uptake rates" for nitrate,
20

1 indicating that there were also elevated nitrate levels in fields receiving the Dairy's
2 manure.

3 67. Washington Department of Agriculture inspection reports from July 3, 2007
4 have documented elevated nitrogen and phosphorus levels in soils receiving Cow
5 Palace Dairy manure, indicating that the Dairy has applied manure in excess of
6 agronomic rates.

7 68. Washington Department of Agriculture inspection reports from January 19,
8 2011 have documented elevated phosphorus levels in soils receiving Cow Palace
9 Dairy's manure, indicating that the Dairy has applied manure in excess of
10 agronomic rates.

11 69. Upon information and belief, Washington Department of Agriculture
12 inspection reports from 2012 have documented elevated nitrate levels in soils
13 receiving Cow Palace Dairy's manure, indicating that the Dairy has applied
14 manure in excess of agronomic rates.

15 70. Upon information and belief, the elevated nutrients found in Cow Palace
16 Dairy's fields are evidence of applications of manure in excess of agronomic rates.

17 71. According to Washington Department of Ecology records, Cow Palace
18 Dairy was applying manure to a field on the NW corner of N Arms Road and
19 Knowles Road on or about January 2, 2013. At the time, the field to which Cow
20 Palace Dairy was applying manure was frozen and/or snow covered. According to

1 an unidentified eyewitness of the application, manure had been applied in such
2 quantities so as to create a “lake” of ponded manure.

3 72. According to Washington Department of Ecology records, inspectors did not
4 visit Cow Palace Dairy until nearly one month later, on February 3, 2013. At that
5 time, Cow Palace Dairy was still applying manure to fields that were frozen and/or
6 snow covered.

7 73. According to records obtained from the Washington Department of
8 Agriculture, on or about April 9, 2009, Greg Schuler, a former dairy inspector,
9 filed a complaint alleging that Cow Palace Dairy was applying manure through a
10 “big gun” to “Field #4A” in such quantities that the ponding of manure occurred.
11 Field #4A is between 26-65 acres in size. The ponded area was approximately 10-
12 20 feet wide and at least 12 inches deep.

13 74. According to a Washington Department of Agriculture Inspection Report
14 from January 5, 2006, Cow Palace Dairy had been applying manure to “fields 1
15 and 2,” in such quantities that there was ponding in a low spot of a field adjacent to
16 the Dairy. The Report indicates that the ponding and size of application caused
17 runoff from the fields to occur.

18 75. Upon information and belief, Cow Palace Dairy’s DNMP prohibits
19 applications on frozen and/or snow covered fields.

20

1 76. Applications of manure to frozen and/or snow covered fields creates
2 pathways for manure to be discharged to surface and/or groundwater.

3 77. Applications of manure to frozen and/or snow covered fields are not
4 agronomic.

5 78. Upon information and belief, Cow Palace Dairy's DNMP prohibits
6 applications when there is a potential for ponding to occur.

7 79. Applications of manure which cause ponding to occur create pathways for
8 manure to be discharged to surface and/or groundwater.

9 80. Applications of manure which cause ponding to occur are not agronomic.

10 81. Applications of manure waste above agronomic rates cause manure
11 nutrients, including but not limited to nitrates, to leach through soil and into
12 groundwater.

13 82. Once nitrates enter the vadose zone, the area below the soil surface from the
14 end of the vegetative root zone to the beginning of a groundwater table, they
15 migrate down to the nearest groundwater. Other Contaminants, depending upon
16 their responsive characteristics in soil, may also migrate down to the nearest
17 groundwater.

18 83. Once nitrates and Other Contaminants enter the water table, they migrate
19 away from the Cow Palace Dairy and into the wells of nearby residents or into
20

1 nearby surface waters depending upon the depth and flow direction of the initial
2 receiving groundwater.

3 84. The contaminated shallow groundwater that likely discharges to surface
4 waters include discharges into the Roza-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control Drains
5 26.6, 27.2 and 28.0 and the Sunnyside Canal. The Joint Drains converge and
6 discharge into the Granger Drain, which in turn then discharges to the Yakima
7 River. The Sunnyside Canal discharges into the Yakima River. These waters are
8 used by members of CARE and CFS and the general public for multiple purposes,
9 including but not limited to recreation, human consumption, irrigation, and
10 sustenance.

11 85. Upon information and belief, the over-application of liquid manure above
12 agronomic rates has been ongoing since the date Cow Palace Dairy was brought
13 into operation and has been continuous for at least the past five years.

14 86. Cow Palace Dairy knows or should know that applications of manure above
15 agronomic rates – that is, applications above that which the current or planned crop
16 can effectively utilize – will cause manure nutrients, including but not limited to
17 nitrate and phosphorus, along with nutrients that comprise some of the Other
18 Contaminants, to pass through soils before they can be utilized by the planned or
19 active crop and into groundwater. This renders the manure incapable of serving its
20 intended purpose as a fertilizer. The presence of Other Contaminants that are not

1 plant nutrients also indicate that discarded manure is the source of the groundwater
2 contaminants.

3 87. Cow Palace Dairy knows or should know that applications of manure to
4 frozen and/or snow covered fields or applications of manure which result in
5 ponding will cause manure nutrients, including but not limited to nitrate,
6 phosphorus, and Other Contaminants to pass through soils before they can be
7 utilized by the planned or active crop and into groundwater. This renders the
8 manure incapable of serving its intended purpose as a fertilizer.

9 88. Manure that has been over-applied on fields and permitted to leach, leak, or
10 otherwise discharge into groundwater is a “discarded material” from an
11 “agricultural operation,” and is therefore a “solid waste” under Section 1004(27) of
12 RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27).

13 89. Manure that has been applied to frozen and/or snow covered fields, or
14 manure that has been applied in such a manner that ponding occurs, causes manure
15 to leach, leak, or otherwise discharge into groundwater. This renders the manure a
16 “discarded material” from an “agricultural operation,” and is therefore a “solid
17 waste” under Section 1004(27) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27).

18 90. Washington State regulators have proposed that soil samples containing
19 greater than 45 parts per million (ppm) nitrate constitute “excessive” levels of
20 nitrate within soils.

1 91. The 45 ppm proposal used in drafting the 2006 Washington General CAFO
2 National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) Permit was the
3 result of political machinations between the dairy and cattle industry and
4 Washington regulators, including the Washington Departments of Ecology and
5 Agriculture.

6 92. The 45 ppm soil number is not scientifically based to be protective of human
7 health or the environment. Soil samples containing less than 45 ppm nitrate may
8 still allow nitrates to leach through soils and into groundwater at levels above the
9 10 mg/l federal Maximum Contaminant Level or “MCL.” A concentration of 45
10 ppm nitrate in the upper two feet of soil would amount to 360 pounds of available
11 nitrogen per acre. This amount of nitrogen is far in excess of the most demanding
12 crop needs.

13 93. Accurately measuring quantities of nitrate in soil that can cause groundwater
14 contamination requires more than simply measuring the amount of nitrate in soil at
15 certain levels below the surface. Other factors, including but not limited to,
16 moisture content, irrigation practices, and amount of nitrate contained in the soil
17 solution must also be accounted for. Soil sample results (from below the root
18 zone) that have greater than 10 mg/l nitrate contained in the soil solution are
19 excessive and will likely cause groundwater contamination, which correspond to
20 the metric of the MCL for nitrates, which is also 10 mg/l.

1 94. Cow Palace Dairy's improper manure application practices have caused
2 irreparable injury to the environment, contaminating soils and groundwater with
3 excessively high levels of nitrates and other pollutants.

4 ***Contamination of Groundwater in Excess of MCLs***

5 95. The practices mentioned in paragraphs 39-94 are causing or contributing to
6 groundwater contamination beyond the federal MCL for nitrates.

7 96. The EPA has determined that nitrates pose an acute health concern at certain
8 levels of exposure. Nitrates contained in drinking water are colorless and odorless.
9 Ingestion of nitrates, converted to nitrite in the body, interferes with the oxygen
10 carrying capacity of blood, potentially resulting in cyanosis and, at higher levels,
11 asphyxia.

12 97. High levels of nitrate in water can also cause a blood disorder in infants
13 known as methemoglobinemia ("blue baby syndrome") that can be fatal if left
14 untreated.

15 98. Methemoglobinemia is a blood disorder in which an abnormal amount of
16 methemoglobin -- a form of hemoglobin -- is produced. Hemoglobin is the
17 molecule in red blood cells that distributes oxygen to the body. Methemoglobin
18 cannot release oxygen. In methemoglobinemia, the hemoglobin is unable to
19 release oxygen effectively to body tissues.

20

1 99. High nitrate levels may also affect pregnant women and adults with
2 hereditary cytochrome b5 reductase deficiency.

3 100. In addition, nitrate and nitrite ingestion in humans has been linked to
4 goitrogenic (anti-thyroid) actions on the thyroid gland (similar to perchlorate),
5 fatigue and reduced cognitive functioning due to chronic hypoxia, and maternal
6 reproductive complications including spontaneous abortion.

7 101. Ingestion of nitrates in excess of the MCL is also suspected of causing
8 various forms of cancer in the general exposed population, including a variety of
9 carcinogenic outcomes deriving from N-nitrosamines formed via gastric nitrate
10 conversion in the presence of amines, and compromises the health of immuno-
11 compromised individuals and the elderly.

12 102. The MCLs are health-based standards that specify contaminants known to
13 have an adverse effect on human health at levels beyond the parameters set forth
14 by regulations.

15 103. The EPA has established that the MCL for nitrate in groundwater is 10
16 milligrams per liter (mg/l) or 10 parts per million (ppm). Samples taken by the
17 EPA as part of its study indicate elevated levels of nitrate, potassium, magnesium,
18 calcium, sodium, chloride, sulfate, barium, zinc, and industry-standard bovine
19 pharmaceuticals in nearby residential wells downgradient from the “Dairy
20 Cluster,” which includes Cow Palace Dairy.

1 104. The October 17, 2012 notice of intent to sue Cow Palace Dairy, attached
2 hereto as Attachment 1 and incorporated herein by reference, cited to the EPA
3 study, which shows the specific location of the wells and other areas that were
4 sampled at the Dairy Cluster sampling area, including areas on and near Cow
5 Palace Dairy, as well as a summary of the results obtained for nitrate.

6 105. The July 3, 2013 protective supplemental notice of intent to sue, attached
7 hereto as Attachment 2 and incorporated herein by reference, also cited to the EPA
8 study. That study showed where wells in the Dairy Cluster area were
9 contaminated with nitrates and Other Contaminants originating from Cow Palace
10 Dairy and its manure, including phosphorus, trace and inorganic elements, a
11 variety of veterinary pharmaceuticals, hormones, steroids, and organic compounds.

12 106. Observed levels of nitrate in seven wells located downgradient of the Dairy
13 Cluster, which includes Cow Palace Dairy (identified as WW-11 through WW-17),
14 are all in excess of the 10 mg/l MCL and are as follows: Wells WW-11 through
15 WW-17 yielded results of 23 mg/l, 46.7 mg/l, 44 mg/l, 43.4 mg/l, 30.2 mg/l, 23.4
16 mg/l, and 22.7 mg/l, respectively. *See* T. 20 in "Relation Between Nitrate in Water
17 Wells and Potential Sources in the Lower Yakima Valley, Washington," EPA-910-
18 R-12-003 (September 27, 2012).

19 107. The results exceed the MCL for nitrate, and in one instance by nearly 5
20 times. *See* 40 C.F.R. Part 141 and Appendix I. The results were also substantially

1 higher than the nitrate results obtained from WW-06, the sampled well located
2 upgradient of Cow Palace Dairy, which had a reported value of 0.73 mg/l nitrate.

3 These samples were taken between February and April, 2010.

4 108. EPA took additional groundwater samples on property adjacent to Cow
5 Palace Dairy, both upgradient and downgradient, in December 2012. The results
6 of that sampling revealed that wells located downgradient of Cow Palace Dairy
7 had observed nitrate levels many times greater than the MCL. For instance,
8 downgradient well DC-03 had a nitrate level of 190 mg/l, which is 19 times greater
9 than the MCL. Results of 26 mg/l, 32 mg/l, and 26 mg/l nitrate were also observed
10 in monitoring wells DC-04, DC-05, and DC-14, respectively, all of which exceed
11 the MCL for nitrate. EPA's December, 2012 sampling information is hereby
12 incorporated herein, and is attached hereto as Attachment 3.

13 109. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs assert that Cow Palace Dairy refused
14 entry to EPA to conduct sampling on the Dairy's property during the fall of 2012
15 and winter of 2012-13.

16 110. On or about March 31, 2010, EPA sent Cow Palace Dairy a letter requesting
17 access to the facility to collect soil and other environmental samples on the Dairy's
18 property. The letter also requested Cow Palace Dairy to respond to a questionnaire
19 about the Dairy's practices and management. Upon information and belief, Cow
20 Palace Dairy refused access to EPA and did not respond to the questionnaire.

1 111. Upon information and belief, the highest levels of nitrates generally occur in
2 the shallow alluvial aquifer. Plaintiffs' members and other residents have installed
3 domestic wells for drinking water that intersect or utilize this shallow aquifer.

4 112. Cow Palace Dairy's storage and application of manure has caused nitrate
5 contamination of these residential wells, forcing Plaintiffs' members and other
6 residents to either consume unsafe drinking water or to obtain alternative sources
7 of drinking water.

8 113. Cow Palace Dairy's manure storage and application practices, described in
9 the preceding paragraphs, have caused irreparable injury to the environment,
10 contaminating groundwater with excessively high levels of nitrates and Other
11 Contaminants.

12 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

13 **COUNT I**
14 **RCRA Imminent and Substantial Endangerment**

15 114. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations of the preceding
16 paragraphs of this Complaint.

17 115. Since at least February 1, 2008, Cow Palace Dairy has been discarding
18 manure, and pharmaceutical by-products in the manure, which are "solid wastes"
19 under section 1004 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27), because the manure is, either
20

1 when over-applied or leaked through holding areas, a discarded solid, liquid,
2 and/or semisolid material resulting from an agricultural operation.

3 116. Cow Palace Dairy is the past and present owner or operator of a storage or
4 disposal facility. As indicated above, manure is stored and disposed of in massive
5 earthen pits and other holding structures. As a result, Defendant contributes to the
6 past or present handling, storage, and disposal of a solid waste. RCRA, 42 U.S.C.
7 § 6972(a)(1)(B).

8 117. Cow Palace Dairy is a past and present generator of manure and other by-
9 product wastes. Manure is “handled” and “transported” by the Defendant, as well
10 as disposed of on land owned or leased by the Defendant. *Id.*

11 118. Defendant’s handling, transportation, storage, and disposal of manure may
12 present an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health and/or the
13 environment.

14 119. Specifically, as alleged above, ground and surface water contamination
15 levels on the Defendant’s land, and down-gradient and downstream from
16 Defendant’s land and facilities, have contamination levels that exceed the
17 maximum safe consumption limits established under state and federal law,
18 establishing a case of imminent and substantial endangerment to public health
19 and/or the environment.

1 120. The National Primary Drinking Water Standards (“NPDWS”) are
2 established under the Safe Drinking Water Act (“SDWA”), 42 U.S.C. § 300f, *et*
3 *seq.* The NPDWS are health-based standards that specify contaminants known to
4 have an adverse effect on the health of persons at levels beyond the parameters set
5 forth in the regulations. 42 U.S.C. § 300f(1)(B).

6 121. The Washington Water Quality standards were promulgated to protect
7 groundwater and human health pursuant to the Washington Water Pollution
8 Control Act, RCW 90.48.

9 122. Promulgated pursuant to this statute, WAC 173-200-040(2)(a)
10 provides: Groundwater concentrations shall not exceed the criteria listed in Table
11 1, except as described in WAC 173-200-050 (3)(b). The ground-water protection
12 standard for nitrate is the same as the federal MCL of 10 mg/l.

13 123. 40 C.F.R. § 257.3-4(a) prohibits a facility or practice from contaminating an
14 underground drinking water source. “Contamination” occurs when a facility or
15 practice introduces a toxic substance that causes the concentration of that substance
16 in groundwater to exceed certain parameters listed in Appendix I to 40 C.F.R. §
17 257.3-4(a).

18 124. The past and continuing practices of the Cow Palace Dairy have
19 contaminated and continue to contaminate groundwater and surface water to levels
20 that exceed the maximum limits for safety established under state and federal law.

1 These practices present an imminent and substantial endangerment to the
2 environment and/or public health. Specifically, Cow Palace Dairy is polluting
3 groundwater to the extent that it is hazardous to health and the environment and the
4 shallow contaminated groundwater feeds nearby surface waters including, but not
5 limited to, Roza-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control Drains 26.6, 27.2 and 28.0, the
6 Sunnyside Canal, and the Granger Drain, which discharges into the Yakima River.

7 125. Pursuant to RCRA Section 7003, Cow Palace Dairy may be subject to an
8 injunction under RCRA ordering it to cease and abate any past or present handling,
9 storage, treatment, and/or transportation of any solid waste or hazardous waste that
10 may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health and/or the
11 environment.

12 126. Plaintiffs' interests are harmed and will continue to be harmed by this
13 imminent and substantial endangerment and by Defendant's failure to abate the
14 endangerment unless the Court grants the relief sought herein.

15 **COUNT II**
16 **RCRA Illegal Open Dumping**

17 127. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations of the preceding
18 paragraphs of this Complaint.

19 128. Cow Palace Dairy constitutes an "open dump" under RCRA Section
20 1004(14). 42 U.S.C. § 6903(14).

1 129. Cow Palace Dairy's solid waste disposal practices cause groundwater
2 concentration levels of nitrates and other pollutants to exceed the limits set forth in
3 Appendix I to 40 C.F.R. Part 257, which constitutes illegal open dumping, and is
4 considered to pose a reasonable probability of causing adverse effects to health and
5 the environment.

6 130. Defendant stores and disposes of manure at the facilities. The manure
7 constitutes an agricultural waste and a "solid waste" under section 1004 of RCRA
8 because it is over applied and/or improperly stored, and therefore constitutes a
9 "discarded material" under the statute. 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27).

10 131. Groundwater monitoring data indicates that the disposal of solid wastes at
11 the Cow Palace Dairy, including the fields Cow Palace Dairy uses to apply
12 manure, are causing the contamination of groundwater to exceed the limits set
13 forth in Appendix I to 40 C.F.R. Part 257. Concentrations of nitrate, identified
14 herein, have repeatedly exceeded the maximum contaminant levels, as documented
15 by the EPA study. This practice constitutes illegal open dumping.

16 132. Groundwater monitoring data, including as documented by the EPA study,
17 also indicates that the disposal of solid wastes at the Cow Palace Dairy, including
18 the fields Cow Palace Dairy uses to apply manure, are causing Other Contaminants
19 to contaminate groundwater. This practice is also indicative of illegal open
20 dumping.

1 133. Solid waste disposal practices prohibit the contamination of any surface
2 water source in violation of NPDES requirements or water quality standards. 40
3 C.F.R. § 257.3-3(a). Cow Palace Dairy is operating without a NPDES permit.

4 134. Pursuant to Section 3008, 42 U.S.C. § 6928, Cow Palace Dairy may be
5 subject to an injunction under RCRA ordering them to cease open dumping and
6 remediate the environmental contamination they have caused and/or contributed to,
7 including widespread soil and groundwater contamination. *Id.*

8 135. Plaintiffs' interests are harmed and will continue to be harmed by
9 Defendant's open dumping unless the Court grants the relief sought herein.

10 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs CARE and CFS respectfully request that the Court enter
12 a judgment:

13 A. Declaring that Defendant's past and/or present generation, handling, storage,
14 treatment, transportation, and/or disposal of solid waste presents, or may present,
15 an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health or to the environment.

16 B. Declaring that Defendant's storage and disposal of manure and its
17 incorporated by-products constitutes disposal and illegal open dumping.

18 C. Issuing a compliance order that requires Defendant to cease and desist from
19 storing manure on any portion of Defendant's land that the Defendant has not first
20 lined adequately with synthetic liners to prevent seepage of pollutants into surface

1 water or groundwater that may, whether by flow or diffusion, transmit such
2 pollutants outside Defendant's property boundaries.

3 D. Issuing a compliance order that requires Defendant to capture, adequately
4 treat, and sequester as necessary all surface water or groundwater on or within its
5 land, except surface water that flows as the direct result of snowmelt or a
6 precipitation event, so that discharges of such water do not cause or contribute to
7 violation of any applicable water quality standards in any water resource that
8 receives such discharge.

9 E. Issuing temporary and/or permanent injunctive relief against Defendant,
10 ordering Defendant to cease all activities constituting the imminent and substantial
11 endangerment to the public health and environment, and to cease all activities
12 constituting illegal open dumping.

13 F. Issuing temporary and/or permanent injunctive relief against Defendant,
14 ordering Defendant to design and implement a program which evaluates the actual
15 amount of manure necessary to provide a specific crop with its anticipated nutrient
16 needs, and to have sufficient land available, as documented in an approved
17 Nutrient Management Plan, to handle the amount of manure produced by
18 Defendant.

19 G. Issuing temporary and/or permanent injunctive relief against Defendant,
20 ordering Defendant to design and implement a regular soil sampling protocol, such

1 protocol to require sampling at one-foot intervals down to at least a four-foot
2 depth, in order to prevent the ongoing migration of nitrate (and other pollutants
3 including Other Contaminants) to the vadose zone and groundwater. Such soil
4 sampling protocol must include soil moisture concentrations to be able to convert
5 the soil nitrate data to concentration in the soil solution.

6 H. Issuing temporary and/or permanent injunctive relief against Defendant,
7 ordering Defendant to design and implement a groundwater monitoring program
8 designed to detect the transport of dairy manure nutrients and Other Contaminants
9 into groundwater.

10 I. Issuing temporary and/or permanent injunctive relief against Defendant,
11 ordering Defendant to supply clean, safe drinking water to residents located within
12 at least three (3) miles of Cow Palace Dairy who rely upon well water for
13 consumption.

14 J. Issuing temporary and/or permanent injunctive relief against Defendant,
15 ordering Defendant to sample all surface waters running through or adjacent to
16 Defendant's property to determine whether discharges from the Defendant's
17 operations are impacting surface water.

18 K. Ordering Defendant to take all such actions as may be necessary to eliminate
19 any present and future endangerment and open dumping practices, including but
20 not limited to:

1 (a) funding an independent, comprehensive, scientific study to determine the
2 precise nature and extent of the endangerment and harm caused by open
3 dumping, including a detailed examination of the fate and transport of solid
4 waste from the facility to the waters and soils of the surrounding area, and
5 from the water and soils to biological receptors;

6 (b) funding an independent, comprehensive, scientific study, based on the
7 results of the study described in subparagraph (a) above, of appropriate,
8 effective, environmentally-sound means to eliminate the endangerment and
9 harm caused by open dumping;

10 (c) developing and implementing an appropriate and effective remediation
11 plan, based on the studies described in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above,
12 which will remediate the soil and groundwater contamination caused by or
13 contributed to by Cow Palace Dairy's past and present manure handling,
14 storage, and application practices;

15 (d) developing and implementing manure disposal and storage techniques in
16 accordance to the scientific studies described in subparagraphs (a) and (b)
17 above;

18 (e) providing Plaintiffs with complete copies of records from the past twenty
19 years concerning Defendant's soil sampling, manure sampling, groundwater
20 sampling, lagoon construction and sampling, manure applications, third-

1 party manure transfers, and composting operations; and
2 (f) providing Plaintiffs with complete copies of all future records created by
3 Defendant concerning Defendant's soil sampling, manure sampling,
4 groundwater sampling, lagoon construction and sampling, manure
5 applications, third-party manure transfers, and composting operations.

- 6 L. Ordering Defendant to pay Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys' fees, expert
7 witness fees, and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §
8 6972(e) and 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d); and
9 M. Ordering such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper, including
10 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a)(1).

11 Dated: February 4, 2014.

12 Respectfully Submitted,

13 s/ Brad J. Moore
14 BRAD J. MOORE, WSBA #21802
15 Stritmatter Kessler Whelan Coluccio
16 200 Second Ave. W.
Seattle, WA 98119
Tel. 206.448.1777
E-mail: Brad@stritmatter.com

17 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

s/ Charles M. Tebbutt
CHARLES M. TEBBUTT, *pro hac vice*
DANIEL C. SNYDER, *pro hac vice*
Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt, P.C.
941 Lawrence St.
Eugene, OR 97401
Tel. 541.344.3505
E-mails: charlie.tebbuttlaw@gmail.com
dan.tebbuttlaw@gmail.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

19 s/ Elisabeth A. Holmes
20 ELISABETH A. HOLMES,
pro hac vice

s/ Jessica L. Culpepper
JESSICA L. CULPEPPER, *pro hac vice*

1 GEORGE KIMBRELL, Washington
State Bar No. 36050
2 Center for Food Safety, 2nd Floor
303 Sacramento Street
3 San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel. 415.826.2770

4 E-mails:
eholmes@centerforfoodsafety.org
5 gkimbrell@centerforfoodsafety.org

6 *Counsel for Plaintiff Center for Food
Safety*

Public Justice
1825 K Street NW, Ste. 200
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. 202.797.8600
E-mail: jculpepper@publicjustice.net

Counsel for Plaintiffs

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 4, 2014, I served the foregoing document on the Defendant by electronically filing it with the CM/ECF system for the Eastern District of Washington, which will automatically send notification of such filing to the following:

Debora K. Kristensen	dkk@givenspursley.com
Brendan V. Monahan	bvm@stokeslaw.com
Mathew L. Harrington	MLH@stokeslaw.com
Sean A. Russel	sean.russel@stokeslaw.com
Jeffrey C. Fereday	jeffereday@givenspursley.com
Preston N. Carter	prestoncarter@givenspursley.com
Olivia E. Gonzalez	Olivia.Gonzalez@stokeslaw.com

/s/ Sarah A. Matsumoto
Sarah A. Matsumoto
Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt, P.C.