UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Plaintiff,)) No.: 2:19-cv-231	
V.))) CIVIL COMPLAINT	
TRIDENT SEAFOODS CORP., Royal Viking, Inc., Golden Dawn, LLC) CIVIL COMI LAINT))	
Defendants.)	

Defendants Trident Seafoods Corporation ("Trident"), Royal Viking, Inc., and Golden Dawn, LLC (collectively, "Defendants") own and/or operate fishing and seafood processing vessels off the coast of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest, and Trident owns and operates seafood processing and cold storage facilities and vessels throughout Alaska and the continental United States. Defendant Trident's facilities and Defendants' vessels employ refrigeration appliances that use an ozone-depleting Refrigerant gas known as chlorodifluoromethane or HCFC-22, also known as R-22. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to comply with Title VI of the Clean Air Act ("Stratospheric Ozone Protection"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 7671-7671q, and the regulations set forth in 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart F, because they failed to repair and test leaking refrigeration appliances, failed to maintain adequate records and equipment, and used uncertified technicians to service refrigeration appliances.

NATURE OF THIS ACTION

The United States brings this civil action for injunctive relief and the imposition
 of civil penalties under Section 113(b) of the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), 42 U.S.C. § 7413(b), for

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 2 of 16

1	Defendants' violations of Section 608 of the CAA and the implementing regulations set forth at
2	40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart F. These violations occurred at Defendant Trident's seafood
3	processing facilities located in Alaska, and on board Defendants' vessels operating off the coast
4	of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.
5	JURISDICTION AND VENUE
6	2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to
7	Section 113(b) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(b), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1345, and 1355.
8	3. Venue is proper in the Western District of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
9	§§ 1391(b) and (c) and 1395(a), and Section 113(b) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(b), because
10	Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. reside and maintain corporate headquarters in this
11	judicial district and all Defendants are doing business in this judicial district.
12	NOTICE TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
13	4. The United States has notified the State of Washington of the commencement of
14	this action pursuant to Section 113(b) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(b).
15	PARTIES
16	5. Plaintiff is the United States of America, by authority of the Attorney General of
17	the United States and through the undersigned attorneys, acting at the request of the
18	Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA").
19	6. Defendant Trident is a seafood processing company. It is incorporated in the state
20	of Washington, and its corporate headquarters is in Seattle, Washington.
21	7. Defendant Trident operates a fleet of over thirty seafood processor, catcher, and
22	tender vessels off the coast of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest, as well as about twenty onshore
23	processing plants throughout Alaska and the continental United States.

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 3 of 16

1	8.	Defendant Royal Viking, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Trident,
2	incorporated	in the state of Washington. It owns, and Trident operates the catcher vessels the
3	Columbia, Po	acific Viking, Royal Viking, and the Viking Explorer.
4	9.	Defendant Golden Dawn, LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of Trident,
5	incorporated	in the state of Alaska and registered to do business in the state of Washington. It
6	owns, and Tr	ident operates the catcher vessel the Golden Dawn.
7		STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND
8		Clean Air Act
9	10.	Title VI of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7671-7671q, implements the Montreal
10	Protocol on S	Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Title VI mandates the elimination or
11	control of en	issions of substances, known as Class I and Class II ozone-depleting substances,
12	which are kn	own or reasonably anticipated to cause or significantly contribute to harmful effects
13	to the stratos	pheric ozone layer.
14	11.	Section 608(a) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671g(a), requires the EPA to promulgate
15	regulations e	stablishing standards and requirements regarding the use and disposal of Class I and
16	Class II ozon	e-depleting substances during the service, repair, or disposal of appliances and
17	industrial pro	ocess refrigeration. The regulations must include requirements that "reduce the use
18	and emission	of such substances to the lowest achievable level" and "maximize the recapture and
19	recycling of	such substances." 42 U.S.C. § 7671g(a)(3)(A) & (B). The EPA has promulgated
20	implementing	g regulations pursuant to this authority, which are codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 82,
21	Subpart F, 40	C.F.R. §§ 82.150-82.169("Recycling and Emissions Reduction"). ¹

¹ On November 18, 2016, the E.P.A. promulgated a Final Rule updating its 40 C.F.R. Part 82 regulations. 81 F.R. 82272 (Nov. 18, 2016). The updated rule became effective on January 1, 2017. Because this Complaint alleges violations through March 31, 2016, the prior (2016) version of the regulations applies to those violations. The applicable (2016) regulatory provisions are cited in this Complaint and are denoted with "(2016)" for clarity.

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 4 of 16

1	12. Refrigerant as used herein means "any substance consisting in part or whole of a
2	class I or class II ozone-depleting substance that is used for heat transfer purposes and provides a
3	cooling effect." 40 C.F.R. § 82.152 (2016).
4	Requirement to Repair Leaks Within Thirty Days – Commercial Refrigeration
5	Appliances
6	13. "Commercial refrigeration" appliances are refrigeration appliances utilized in the
7	retail food and cold storage warehouse sectors. 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.152 (2016).
8	14. 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(1) (2016) provides that owners and operators of commercial
9	refrigeration equipment normally containing more than fifty pounds of Refrigerant must have
10	leaks repaired if the leak rate of the appliance exceeds thirty-five percent on an annual basis (i.e.,
11	if the appliance is leaking at a rate such that it would lose more than thirty-five percent of its full
12	charge in a twelve-month period), except as described in 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(6) and (10)
13	(2016). The repairs must bring the leak rate to below thirty-five percent on an annual basis. 40
14	C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(1) (2016).
15	15. 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(9) (2016) requires that owners and operators must repair
16	leaks pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(1) (2016) within thirty days of when the leak is
17	discovered, or, if the owners intentionally shielded themselves from information which would
18	have revealed a leak, within thirty days after when the leaks should have been discovered, unless
19	granted additional time pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(6) and (10) (2016).
20	Requirement to Repair Leaks Within Thirty Days – Industrial Process Refrigeration
21	Appliances
22	16. "Industrial process refrigeration" appliances are, among other things, complex
23	customized appliances used in chemical, pharmaceutical, petrochemical and manufacturing

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 5 of 16

industries, including industrial ice machines. These appliances are directly linked to the
 industrial process. 40 C.F.R. § 82.152 (2016).

3	17. 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(2) (2016) provides that owners and operators of industrial
4	process refrigeration equipment normally containing more than fifty pounds of Refrigerant must
5	have leaks repaired if the leak rate of the appliance exceeds thirty-five percent on an annual basis
6	(i.e., if the appliance is leaking at a rate such that it would lose more than thirty-five percent of
7	its full charge in a twelve-month period), except as described in 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(6), (7),
8	and (10) (2016), and 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(2)(i) and (i)(2)(ii) (2016). The repairs must bring
9	the leak rate to below thirty-five percent on an annual basis.
10	18. 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(9) (2016) requires that owners and operators must repair
11	leaks pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(2) (2016) within thirty days of when the leak is
12	discovered, or, if the owners intentionally shielded themselves from information which would
13	have revealed a leak, within thirty days after when the leaks should have been discovered, unless
14	granted additional time pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(6), (7), and (10) (2016), and 40
15	C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(2)(i) and (i)(2)(ii) (2016).
16	Requirement to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial
17	Process Refrigeration Appliances
18	19. 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016) provides that if an industrial process refrigeration
19	appliance is leaking at a rate exceeding thirty-five percent on an annual basis, then the owner or
20	operator is required to repair the leak and verify the adequacy of the repair. An initial
21	verification test must be conducted at the conclusion of repairs, and a follow-up verification test
22	must be conducted within thirty days of the initial verification test, or no later than thirty days
23	after startup of the appliance.

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 6 of 16

1	20. Owners or operators of refrigeration appliances undergoing leak repair are
2	required to maintain records of initial and follow-up verification tests. The owner or operator is
3	required to record the date, method, and result of each verification test. 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(n)(3)
4	(2016).
5	Requirement to Maintain Adequate Service and Maintenance Records
6	21. 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k) (2016) requires that owners and operators of refrigeration
7	appliances normally containing fifty or more pounds of Refrigerant must keep records of any
8	service to the appliance. These records must document the date and type of service, as well as
9	the quantity of Refrigerant added.
10	Requirement to Have Certified Recovery or Recycling Equipment
11	22. 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(b) (2016) requires that all persons opening appliances except
12	for small appliances, motor-vehicle air conditioners ("MVACs") and MVAC-like appliances for
13	maintenance, service, or repair must have at least one piece of certified, self-contained recovery
14	or recycling equipment available at their place of business.
15	23. "Self-contained recovery equipment" means Refrigerant recovery or recycling
16	equipment that is capable of removing the Refrigerant from an appliance without the assistance
17	of components contained in the appliance. 40 C.F.R. § 82.152 (2016).
18	Requirement to Have Certified Technicians Perform Maintenance, Service, and Repairs
19	24. 40 C.F.R. § 82.161(a) (2016) requires that all Refrigerant technicians must be
20	certified by an approved technician certification program.
21	25. A "technician" is "any person who performs maintenance, service, or repair, that
22	could be reasonably expected to release refrigerants from appliances, except for MVACs, into
23	the atmosphere." 40 C.F.R. § 82.152 (2016). Technician includes "installers, contractor

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 7 of 16

employees, in-house service personnel, and in some cases owners and/or operators." Id. 1 Activities "could be reasonably expected to release refrigerants only if the activity is reasonably 2 expected to violate the integrity of the refrigerant circuit," such as "attaching and detaching 3 hoses and gauges to and from the appliance to add or remove refrigerant or to measure pressure 4 and adding refrigerant to and removing refrigerant from the appliance." Id. 5 6 **Enforcement and Penalties** 26. Section 113(b)(2) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(b)(2), authorizes the United 7 States to commence a civil action for a permanent or temporary injunction, and to assess civil 8 9 penalties of not more than \$25,000 per day for each violation, whenever a person has violated or 10 is in violation of any requirement or prohibition of Title VI of the CAA, including, but not limited to, a requirement or prohibition of any rule, order, waiver or permit promulgated, issued 11 12 or approved under the CAA. 27. Section 113(b) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(b), as modified by the Debt 13 Collection Improvements Act of 1996, 31 U.S.C. § 3701, as implemented by the Civil Monetary 14 Penalties Inflation Rule, 40 C.F.R. Part 19, establishes maximum civil penalties for violations of 15 the CAA. The maximum civil penalty per day per violation of the CAA is \$37,500 for violations 16 occurring after January 12, 2009 and on or before November 2, 2015, and effective January 16, 17 2018, \$97,229 per day per violation of the CAA for violations occurring after November 2, 2015. 18 42 U.S.C. § 7413(b) and 40 C.F.R. § 19.4. 19 20 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS** 28. Chlorodifluoromethane or HCFC-22, also known as R-22, is a Class II ozone-21 depleting substance within the meaning of Section 601(4) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7671(4), and 22 23 is listed at 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart A, Appendix B.

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 8 of 16

29. Pursuant to an Information Request issued under CAA Section 114, 42 U.S.C. 1 § 7414, EPA obtained information from Trident concerning its compliance with Subchapter VI 2 of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7671-7671q, at its vessels and facilities, through March 31, 2016. 3 4 Defendants' Vessels and Facilities 30. 5 Defendant Trident owns and operates at least ten seafood processing plants in 6 Alaska, and additional plants in the continental United States. These plants include facilities located in Kodiak, Petersburg, and Sand Point in Alaska, and a facility in Everett, Washington. 7 31. The Kodiak, Petersburg, and Sand Point facilities contain industrial process 8 9 refrigeration appliances that employ R-22 as a Refrigerant. The Petersburg industrial process 10 refrigeration appliance that uses R-22 normally contains a full charge of approximately 100 11 pounds of Refrigerant and is a closed refrigeration system, the operation of which does not 12 consume Refrigerant. 32. During all or most of the time period between March 1, 2009 and the present, 13 Defendant Trident owned and operated at least thirty-three vessels off the coast of Alaska and 14 the Pacific Northwest, including, as relevant here, the following twenty-seven vessels: the Alaska 15 16 Packer, the Arcturus, the Balaena, the Barbara J, the Billikin, the Brittany, the Cape Calm, the 17 *Cape St. John*, the *Eastern Wind*, the *Entrance Point*, the *Farwest Leader*, the *Four Daughters*, the Hallo Bay, the Independence, the Island Enterprise, the Kodiak Enterprise, the Last Frontier, 18 the Majesty, the Northern Ram, the Northern Patriot, the Pacific Ram, the Perseverance, the 19 20 Pribilof, the Seattle Enterprise, the Southern Wind, the Sovereignty, and the Wide Bay. 33. During all or most of the time period between March 1, 2009 and the present, 21 Defendant Royal Viking, Inc. owned, and Trident operated at least five vessels off the coast of 22 23 Alaska and the Pacific Northwest, including, as relevant here, the Columbia, the Pacific Viking,

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 9 of 16

1 the *Royal Viking*, and the *Viking Explorer*.

34. During all or most of the time period between March 1, 2009 and the present,
Defendant Golden Dawn, LLC. owned, and Trident operated the vessel *Golden Dawn* off the
coast of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

5 35. The *Alaska Packer* and *Pribilof* are no longer part of Defendant Trident's fleet;
6 the rest of the vessels listed in the preceding Paragraphs 32 through 34 remain in service.

7 36. During all or most of the time period between March 1, 2009, and the present, all 8 of the thirty-two vessels listed in Paragraph 32 through 34 carried one or more industrial process 9 refrigeration appliances, within the meaning of 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.152 and 82.156(j) (2016), that 10 were owned or operated by Defendants and that normally contained a full charge of at least fifty 11 pounds of R-22. In addition, the *Pribilof* vessel also carried a commercial refrigeration appliance 12 that normally contained at least fifty pounds of R-22.

37. On information and belief, subject to a reasonable opportunity for further
investigation and discovery, all of the industrial process refrigeration appliances in the preceding
Paragraphs 32 through 34 operated as closed refrigeration systems, the operation of which does
not consume Refrigerant.

38. On information and belief, subject to a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, during all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants did not submit plans to retrofit or retire any of the refrigeration appliances at any of the vessels or facilities described in the preceding paragraphs, and did not subject any of the appliances to an industrial process shutdown or mothballing, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 82.152 (2016). Therefore, during all times relevant to the Complaint each of the appliances referenced herein was thus subject to the regulations codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 82, Subpart F, 40 C.F.R. § 82.150-82.169

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 10 of 16

1 ("Recycling and Emissions Reduction").

- 2
- 3

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Failure to Repair Leaks on Commercial and Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances in Violation of 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(1), (i)(2), and (i)(9) (2016), against Defendant Trident 39. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. 40. On various occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, Defendant Trident added Refrigerant to the *Pribilof*'s commercial refrigeration appliance and should have

10 discovered that the appliance was leaking at a rate such that the loss of Refrigerant would exceed

- 11 35 percent of its total charge during a twelve-month period.
- 12 41. On numerous occasions between March 1, 2009, and the present, Defendant

13 Trident added Refrigerant to industrial process refrigeration appliances on board the Alaska

14 Packer, the Brittany, the Entrance Point, the Four Daughters, the Independence, the Island

15 Enterprise, the Kodiak Enterprise, the Last Frontier, the Seattle Enterprise, and the Wide Bay,

16 and should have discovered that the relevant appliance was leaking at a rate such that the loss of

- 17 Refrigerant would exceed thirty-five percent of its total charge during a twelve-month period.
- 42. On the occasions noted in Paragraphs 40 and 41, Defendant Trident did not repair the leaks in such a way as to bring the leak rate below thirty-five percent within thirty days of when the leak was or should have been discovered, as required by 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(1),
- 21 (i)(2), and (i)(9) (2016).
- 43. As a result of Defendant Trident's failure to repair the leaks as described above, the leak rate remained above thirty-five percent at the *Pribilof* vessel for at least fifty-eight days beyond the thirty-day repair period prescribed by 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(9) (2016), and the leak rate in the nine vessels listed in Paragraph 41 remained above thirty-five percent for a total of at

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 11 of 16

1	least 3,234 days beyond the thirty day repair period. Each day beyond the thirty day repair		
2	period that Defendant Trident failed to bring the annual leak rate of an appliance below thirty-		
3	five percent is a violation of 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(1) and (i)(9) (2016) (for commercial		
4	appliances) and 40 C.F.R. §§ 82.156(i)(2) and (i)(9) (2016) (for industrial process refrigeration		
5	appliances).		
6	44. Defendant Trident is liable for injunctive relief and the assessment of civil		
7	penalties in an amount up to the level set forth at 40 C.F.R. § 19.4 per day for each violation of		
8	Section 112(r)(7) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7412(r)(7). The maximum civil penalty per day per		
9	violation of the CAA is \$37,500 for violations occurring after January 12, 2009 and on or before		
10	November 2, 2015, and effective January 16, 2018, \$97,229 per day per violation of the CAA for		
11	violations occurring after November 2, 2015.		
12 13 14 15	<u>SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF</u> Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc.		
13 14	Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against		
13 14 15	Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc.		
13 14 15 16	 Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. 45. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully 		
13 14 15 16 17	 Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. 45. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. 		
13 14 15 16 17 18	 Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. 45. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. 46. On at least sixty-six occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, 		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. 45. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. 46. On at least sixty-six occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, Defendants Trident and/or Royal Viking, Inc. repaired a leak to an industrial process 		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. 45. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. 46. On at least sixty-six occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, Defendants Trident and/or Royal Viking, Inc. repaired a leak to an industrial process refrigeration appliance without conducting an initial verification test or without conducting a 		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. 45. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. 46. On at least sixty-six occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, Defendants Trident and/or Royal Viking, Inc. repaired a leak to an industrial process refrigeration appliance without conducting an initial verification test or without conducting a follow-up verification test. These failures to conduct verification tests occurred at the following 		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Failure to Perform Initial and Follow-up Verification Tests on Leaking Industrial Process Refrigeration Appliances, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) (2016), against Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. 45. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. 46. On at least sixty-six occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, Defendants Trident and/or Royal Viking, Inc. repaired a leak to an industrial process refrigeration appliance without conducting an initial verification test or without conducting a follow-up verification test. These failures to conduct verification tests occurred at the following facilities or vessels: the Alaska Packer, the Balaena, the Brittany, the Cape Calm, the Cape St 		

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 12 of 16

operated by Trident), and the *Viking Explorer* (owned by Royal Viking, Inc. and operated by
 Trident).

47. On each of the occasions alleged in Paragraph 46, at the time of the repair the 3 4 relevant appliance was leaking at a rate such that the loss of Refrigerant would exceed thirty-five 5 percent of the total charge during a twelve-month period. 48. 6 Each such failure by Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. to conduct an initial verification test or follow-up verification test is a violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(i)(3) 7 8 (2016). 49. 9 Defendants Trident and Royal Viking, Inc. are liable for injunctive relief and the assessment of civil penalties in an amount up to the level set forth at 40 C.F.R. § 19.4 per day for 10 each violation of Section 112(r)(7) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7412(r)(7). The maximum civil 11 12 penalty per day per violation of the CAA is \$37,500 for violations occurring after January 12, 2009 and on or before November 2, 2015, and effective January 16, 2018, \$97,229 per day per 13 violation of the CAA for violations occurring after November 2, 2015. 14 THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF 15 Failure to Maintain Servicing Records, in Violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k) (2016), against 16 all Defendants 17 50. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully 18 set forth herein. 19 20 51. On at least 289 occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, Defendants performed service on appliances normally containing fifty or more pounds of 21 22 Refrigerant and failed to maintain a complete record documenting the date and type of service, as well as the quantity of Refrigerant added. These failures to maintain complete records occurred 23 24 in the Everett facility, as well as on board the following vessels: the *Alaska Packer*, the *Arcturus*, the Balaena, the Barbara J, the Billikin, the Brittany, the Cape Calm, the Cape St John, the 25

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 13 of 16

1	Eastern Wind, the Entrance Point, the Farwest Leader, the Four Daughters,, the Hallo Bay, the		
2	Independence, the Island Enterprise, the Kodiak Enterprise, the Last Frontier, the Majesty, the		
3	Northern Patriot, the Northern Ram, the Pacific Ram, the Perseverance, the Pribilof, the Seattle		
4	Enterprise, the Southern Wind, the Sovereignty, and the Wide Bay (all owned and operated by		
5	Trident); the Columbia, the Pacific Viking, the Royal Viking, and the Viking Explorer (all owned		
6	by Royal Vik	ing, Inc. and operated by Trident); and the Golden Dawn (owned by Golden Dawn,	
7	LLC and ope	rated by Trident).	
8	52.	On each of the occasions alleged in Paragraph 51, Defendants' failure to maintain	
9	complete serv	vice records was a violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.166(k) (2016).	
10	53.	Defendants are liable for injunctive relief and the assessment of civil penalties in	
11	an amount up to the level set forth at 40 C.F.R. § 19.4 per day for each violation of Section		
12	112(r)(7) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § $7412(r)(7)$. The maximum civil penalty per day per violation of		
13	the CAA is \$37,500 for violations occurring after January 12, 2009 and on or before November		
14	2, 2015, and effective January 16, 2018, \$97,229 per day per violation of the CAA for violations		
15	occurring after November 2, 2015.		
16 17 18	7 Failure to Have Certified Recovery or Recycling Equipment, in Violation of 40 C.F.R.		
19	54.	Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully	
20	set forth here	in.	
21	55.	On at least one occasion between March 1, 2009 and March 31, 2016, Defendant	
22	Trident perfo	rmed repairs and service to the Alaska Packer's industrial refrigeration appliance	
23	while the vessel was not in port, and without at least one piece of certified, self-contained		
24	recovery equipment on board, and while its industrial refrigeration appliance was not equipped		
25	with a pump-	out unit, in violation of 40 C.F.R. § 82.156(b) (2016).	

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 14 of 16

1	56.	Defendant Trident is liable for injunctive relief and the assessment of civil	
2	penalties in an	amount up to the level set forth at 40 C.F.R. § 19.4 per day for each violation of	
3	Section 112(r)(7) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7412(r)(7). The maximum civil penalty per day per		
4	violation of the CAA is \$37,500 for violations occurring after January 12, 2009 and on or before		
5	November 2, 2015, and effective January 16, 2018, \$97,229 per day per violation of the CAA for		
6	violations occurring after November 2, 2015.		
7 8 9	8 Maintenance Services Performed by Uncertified Technicians, in Violation of 40 C.F.R.		
10	57.	Paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint are incorporated by reference as if fully	
11	set forth herein	n.	
12	58.	On information and belief, subject to a reasonable opportunity for further	
13	investigation a	and discovery, on numerous occasions between March 1, 2009 and March 31,	
14	2016, maintenance, service, and/or repair work was performed on industrial process refrigeration		
15	appliances on	board the Island Enterprise and the Kodiak Enterprise, and at the Kodiak and Sand	
16	Point facilities (all owned and operated by Defendant Trident) that could reasonably be expected		
17	to release Refrigerant from those appliances.		
18	59.	The maintenance, service, and/or repair work identified in Paragraph 58 was	
19	performed by at least nine individuals who were "technicians," as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 82.152		
20	(2016), and who were not certified by an approved technician certification program under the		
21	requirements of	of 40 C.F.R. § 82.161(a) (2016).	
22	60.	Each uncertified technician performing maintenance, service, and/or repair work	
23	that could reas	sonably be expected to release Refrigerant from appliances is a violation of 40	
24	C.F.R. § 82.16	51(a) (2016).	
25	61.	Defendant Trident is liable for injunctive relief and the assessment of civil	

Case 2:19-cv-00231 Document 1 Filed 02/19/19 Page 15 of 16

1	penalties in an amount up to the level set forth at 40 C.F.R. § 19.4 per day for each violation of		
2	Section 112(r)(7) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7412(r)(7). The maximum civil penalty per day per		
3	violation of the CAA is \$37,500 for violations occurring after January 12, 2009 and on or before		
4	November 2, 2015, and effective January 16, 2018, \$97,229 per day per violation of the CAA for		
5	violations occurring after November 2, 2015.		
6	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
7	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, the United States of America, prays that this Court will:		
8	A. Order Defendants Trident Seafoods Corporation, Royal Viking, Inc., and Golden		
9	Dawn, LLC to immediately comply with the CAA statutory and regulatory requirements cited in		
10	this Complaint;		
11	B. Assess civil penalties against Defendants for up to the maximum amounts		
12	provided in the applicable statutes;		
13	C. Impose such injunctive relief on Defendants as may be appropriate to mitigate the		
14	effects of Defendants' violations, and prevent any future violations of same;		
15	D. Award the United States its costs and expenses incurred in this action; and		
16	E. Grant such other relief and further relief as this Court may deem appropriate.		
17	Respectfully submitted,		
18	NATHANIEL DOUGLAS		
19 20	Deputy Chief		
20	Environmental Enforcement Section		
22	OR O		
23			
24	plan		
25	DANICA ANDERSON CLASER		
26	DANICA ANDERSON GLASER Trial Attorneys		
27	Environmental Enforcement Section		
28 29	Environment and Natural Resources Division		
29 30	United States Department of Justice		

Page 15 of 16

1		P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station
2		Washington, D.C. 20044-7611
3		Tel.: (202) 305-0302
4		Email: John.broderick@usdoj.gov
5		Email: Danica.glaser@usdoj.gov
6		
7		Annette L. Hayes
8		United States Attorney
9		Western District of Washington
10		
11		Brian Kipnis
12		Assistant United States Attorney
13		Western District of Washington
14		
15		
16	Of Counsel:	
17	Brett S. Dugan	
18	Assistant Regional Counsel	
19	Office of Regional Counsel	

20 United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10