

**APPENDIX VI**

**ATLANTIC RICHFIELD'S COMMENTS ON DRAFT CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT  
ORDER NO. R5-2014-YYYY**

---

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

—  
**CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT ORDER NO. R5-2014-XXXX**

**ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE**

**WALKER MINE TAILINGS  
PLUMAS COUNTY**

—  
**CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT ORDER NO. R5-2014-YYYY  
ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY**

**WALKER MINE  
PLUMAS COUNTY**

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

**CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT ORDER NO. R5-2014-YYYY  
FOR  
ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY**

**WALKER MINE  
PLUMAS COUNTY**

This Order is issued to Atlantic Richfield Company (Atlantic Richfield or ARCO or Discharger) pursuant to Water Code section 13304, which authorizes the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board or Board) to issue Cleanup and Abatement Orders, and Water Code section 13267, which authorizes the Board to issue Orders requiring the submittal of technical reports.

*Comment: Both federal and state law prevents the Regional Board from issuing either of the proposed CAOs to Atlantic Richfield. Please see Atlantic Richfield Motions for rulings in advance of the March 27-28 hearing. Each Motion is included in Appendix 1 to Atlantic Richfield's Brief. Atlantic Richfield's nine motions for which it requests written rulings prior to the hearing are listed below and included as Appendix 1 to Atlantic Richfield's Brief:*

1. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 1 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That CERCLA Prohibits The Regional Board From Issuing The CAOs*
2. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 2 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That The Regional Board Is A Discharger At The Sites*
3. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 3 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That The Doctrine Of Laches Precludes The Board From Issuing The Draft CAOs*
4. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 4 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That Due Process Requires The Board To Recuse Itself*
5. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 5 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That The Prosecution Team's Claim For Contribution Cannot Be Adjudicated In An Administrative Hearing*
6. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 6 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That The Prosecution Team Has The Burden To Prove Each Element Of Its Case Seeking Each Proposed Clean Up And Abatement Order By A Preponderance Of The Evidence*
7. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 7 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That Atlantic Richfield Cannot Be Jointly And Severally Liable For Clean Up And Abatement Of The Mine And/OR Mine Tailings Sites*

8. *Atlantic Richfield Company's Prehearing Motion No. 8 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That Past Costs Are Not Recoverable In This Proceeding*
9. *Atlantic Richfield Corporation's Prehearing Motion No. 9 Requesting A Regional Board Ruling That Certain Opinions Of Dr. Fredric Quivik Are Excluded And Stricken From The Record*

The Central Valley Water Board finds:

1. The Walker Mine (mine) is an abandoned underground copper mine located about 15 miles northeast of Quincy in Plumas County, California, on nearly 800 acres of private property within the Plumas National Forest. The site includes APNs 009-080-001, 009-090-001, 009-090-002 and 009-100-009, Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, T24N, R12E, and Sections 29, 30, 31 and 32, T25N, R12E Mount Diablo Base and Meridian as shown in Attachments A, B, and C.

*Comment: The Walker Mine Site is not "abandoned" in the sense that the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, pursuant to settlement with the owner/operator is **operating** an ongoing "remedy" consisting of an adt "plug" and associated equipment in place on site.*

2. Acid mine drainage and other pollutants (notably copper) from the mine discharge or threaten to discharge to Dolly Creek and other waters of the state within the Little Grizzly Creek watershed, impairing beneficial uses and creating a condition of pollution or nuisance.

*Comment: The Prosecution Team must prove each of these factual allegations, and each of the subsequent factual allegations, by a preponderance of the evidence. See Atlantic Richfield Hearing Brief and Motion at Appendix 1. Refer to Atlantic Richfield's Hearing Brief for citations to evidence which the Prosecution Team omits from calling to the Board's attention and to other evidence which, object to, contradict or provide alternate explanations for, the Prosecution Team's proposed evidence.*

3. The Walker Mining Company (Walker) acquired the mine around 1915 and began mining around 1916. International Smelting and Refining Company (International) acquired the controlling interest in Walker in approximately 1918. International was a wholly-owned subsidiary of, and later merged into, the Anaconda Copper Mining Company (Anaconda).
4. Anaconda, International and Walker concurrently operated the mine beginning in approximately 1918. They ceased production in approximately 1941 and ceased all operations in approximately 1943. Walker filed for bankruptcy in approximately 1944, and its assets were sold in approximately 1945. The mine has been a continuous source of pollutants to the watershed from at least the time production ceased.

*Comment: As detailed in the Motions and Brief, there is no evidence to support a finding that Anaconda and International "concurrently operated" the Walker Mine. Walker Mining Company was a publicly traded company and there is no evidence that corporate norms were not respected and followed by both WMC and its shareholder, International. There is no evidence that International and/or Anaconda directed or in any way participated in WMC's Walker Mine mining operations and pollution-causing activities.*

*Comment: At a 1945 bankruptcy hearing where parties raised the issue of whether Walker Mining Company was such an alter ego of Anaconda that Anaconda controlled the activities of WMC, and where witnesses having first-hand personal knowledge of the operations of WMC were alive and available to testify, the United States Bankruptcy Judge found no evidence that IS&R or ACM were the "alter ego" of Walker Mining Company. This ruling, in essence, rejects the Prosecution Team's unfounded allegation that IS&R "concurrently operated" the Walker Mine. Pros. Op. Br. at p.4.*

5. Atlantic Richfield is the successor by merger to Anaconda and is therefore properly named as Discharger and is legally responsible for complying with this Order.

*Comment: Atlantic Richfield disputes that it is properly named as a discharger in this proposed CAO and further disputes it has any responsibility for complying with this CAO or any other liabilities arising from its investor interest in Walker Mining Company. Atlantic Richfield acknowledges it is a successor to The Anaconda Company through a series of corporate transactions.*

## **BACKGROUND**

6. Most active exploration and mining took place during the 1920s and 1930s. In the late 1930s, the mine was the largest copper mine in California, with at times more than 600 employees. Between 1916 and 1941, the mine produced approximately 6 million tons of ore. (Steffen Robertson & Kirsten ["SRK"], November 1985 [Prosecution Team Exhibit 14]).
7. The mine had an on-site mill and about 13 miles of underground workings containing twelve working levels and 3,300 feet of vertical shafts. The 700 Level Adit (700 level adit) was the main haulage level to access ore, and the 700 level adit portal (portal) is the lowest point at which the underground workings reach the surface. Other openings and land disturbances related to the Central and Paiute workings of the mine are located elsewhere on the site. The total void volume of the underground workings is estimated to be 543 million gallons (SRK, November 1985).
8. The mine's mill and concentrator were located a short distance from the 700 level portal. The mill and concentrator initially discharged tailings into a small pond below the mill. By 1920, tailings discharged as slurry were conveyed by wooden chute or

trough about 0.75 miles to a tailings impoundment adjacent to the mine on land administered by the United States Forest Service (Forest Service) within the Plumas National Forest. The Walker Mine Tailings is the subject of separate but related proceedings involving Atlantic Richfield and the Forest Service.

*Comment: The on-going CERCLA cleanup to implement the Forest Service Record of Decision vests jurisdiction over both the Mine Site and Tailings Site with the federal court. As explained in Motion # 1, the actions described in the Draft CAOs may interfere with the on-going response actions at the Mine Tailings Site and are therefore barred under federal law.*

9. A hearing on this matter took place on 27/28 March 2014, in accordance with the Hearing Notice and Procedure and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 648-648.8. The Central Valley Regional Water Board heard relevant evidence and testimony to decide whether to adopt, modify, or reject the proposed order.

*Comment: Time constraints imposed by the Regional Board's Advisory Team deprived Atlantic Richfield from the opportunity to present all of the testimony, non-testimonial evidence and arguments, needed for its defenses at the hearing. These constraints denied Atlantic Richfield a fair hearing and due process of law.*

## WATER QUALITY ISSUES

10. The 700 level portal, mill and concentrator are located along Dolly Creek, which is a tributary to Little Grizzly Creek. The tailings impoundment is located at the confluence of Dolly Creek and Little Grizzly Creek. Other mine openings and mining waste from the Central and Paiute workings are located in the Nye Creek and Ward Creek drainages. Little Grizzly Creek, Nye Creek and Ward Creek are all tributary to Indian Creek, which is a tributary to the North Fork of the Feather River. All are waters of the state and of the United States.
11. "Mining Waste" is defined under Water Code section 13050, subdivision (q)(1), as "all solid, semisolid, and liquid waste materials from the extraction, beneficiation, and processing of ores and minerals. Mining waste includes, but is not limited to, soil, waste rock, and overburden, as defined in Public Resources Code section 2732, and tailings, slag, and other processed waste materials...."
12. The mining waste at the mine contains metals including copper, which oxidizes and become soluble when exposed to water. As such, mining waste at the mine is classified as Group B mining waste in accordance with Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 22480(b)(2)(B), "mining wastes that consist of or contain nonhazardous soluble pollutants of concentrations which exceed water quality objectives for, or could cause, degradation of waters of the state;"

*Comment: Certain of the mine wastes from WMC operations are mineralized and may impact water quality. WMC generated all such wastes during mining and processing of ores removed from the mine workings. These operations were exclusively managed by WMC's on-site managers and foremen, with WMC staff.*

13. The mine includes waste management units for the treatment, storage, or disposal of mining waste (*Mining Unit*) as defined in Title 27, section 22470.
14. The mine and tailings together have discharged metals and acid mine drainage (AMD) into Dolly Creek from at least the time production ceased in 1941, if not earlier. The mine and tailings discharged enough metals and AMD to eliminate aquatic life in Little Grizzly Creek to the confluence with Indian Creek 10 miles downstream. (Central Valley Water Board Resolution 58-180 [adopting waste discharge requirements for Walker Mine] see also L.E. Trumbull, Walker Mine Report, October 5, 1957 [Prosecution Exhibit 20; documenting fish mortality in Little Grizzly Creek caused by drainage from the mine and tailings].)

*Comment: the evidence shows contamination of surface water arose from subsequent owners and operators of the Mine Site and Mine Tailings Site, including the Regional Board, failing to maintain diversions and other control structures in place when the mine property was sold in the 1940s.*

15. Until 1987, the 700 level adit was the primary source of pollution in Dolly Creek and Little Grizzly Creek. The adit acted as a conduit for AMD and metals leached when groundwater or surface inflows from upper openings contacts mineralized areas of the worked out ore body and mining waste within the underground workings.<sup>1</sup>

*Comment: the Regional Board's actions to abate mine releases after its settlement with Barry, Calicopia Corp. and others were insufficient. The Board, having assumed the obligations of the former owner Barry and current owner Cedar Point Properties through settlement, is a "Discharger" with responsibility to take appropriate action to protect water quality if the adit plug and other response actions to date are deemed insufficient.*

*See Atlantic Richfield's Motion # 2 and #5, referenced above.*

16. In November 1987, pursuant to Resolution No. 86-057, the Central Valley Water Board installed an engineered concrete plug, or seal, 2,700 feet inside the 700 level adit in order to stop AMD discharges from the underground ore zone to surface waters of Dolly Creek.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1985, SRK estimated that AMD was discharging from the 700 level adit at 275 gallons per minute (gpm) (SRK, November 1985.) This flow rate compares well with a reported 300 gpm mine pumping rate referenced in Milling Methods at the Concentrator of the Walker Mining Company (U.S. Bureau of Mines, Information Circular 6555, March 1932 [Prosecution Exhibit 49]).

*Comment: This described actions were implemented by the Regional Board, but have failed to "stop AMD discharges." Moreover, other sources of AMD were not abated. The Regional Board has legal responsibility to operate, maintain and improve its remedy arising from the obligations assumed under settlements with prior owners and operators of the mine property.*

17. The seal impounds groundwater and surface inflows within the mine, flooding much of the underground workings. The impounded water is acidic and contains metals leached through contact with the mined out ore body and mining waste behind the seal. The Central Valley Water Board maintains access and regularly monitors the seal for effectiveness, leakage and hydrostatic pressure.

*Comment: Atlantic Richfield admits that the Board has access to and legal responsibility to monitor the seal for effectiveness, leakage and hydrostatic pressure.*

18. The seal has successfully eliminated most or all of the direct discharge of AMD and metals through the 700 level adit. Immediately after installation, there was no flow passing the mine seal. In subsequent years, a small seepage has been observed dripping from existing rock joints near the upper left hand corner of the seal. This seepage rate has been estimated at approximately 0.15 gpm at a hydraulic head of 140 feet. The seepage accumulates in a pool at the downstream toe of the seal which drains into a small ditch on the floor of the 700 level adit and then seeps into the floor within 200 feet of the seal.

*Comment: as explained in the Expert Disclosures submitted with Atlantic Richfield's materials, the Regional Board's actions to date are incomplete and insufficient to protect water quality in fulfillment of the Regional Board's assumed liability through settlements with prior owners and operators of the mine property.*

19. Hydrostatic pressure data indicates that the water level behind the seal varies seasonally, peaking after the spring snowmelt, and then gradually declining during the remainder of the year (see Figure 1, attached). Impounded water apparently seeps through joints, fractures, and faults into the deep groundwater system using the underground workings as a conduit. The fate of this subsurface release of AMD from the mine is not known but could pose a long term threat to groundwater or surface water.
20. There is an occasional discharge of approximately 2 to 5 gallons per minute at the portal which appears to be from shallow groundwater infiltration from the hillside directly above the timber supported section (first 900 feet) of the 700 level adit. This discharge is not acidic, but it does contain copper and other metals.
21. Since 1957, the Central Valley Water Board and others have regularly collected and analyzed surface water samples from the mine. Attachment D shows the current water quality sampling locations used by the Central Valley Water Board. Copper concentrations exceeding water quality objectives have been detected in the portal drainage, the settling pond, Dolly Creek, the tailings impoundment and Little Grizzly Creek. However, as illustrated in Figure 2 (attached), samples taken from Dolly Creek below the Walker Mine

access road (between the portal area and the tailings impoundment) show a significant drop in copper concentrations after the mine seal was installed in 1987.

22. However, copper related to exposed mining wastes continues to exceed water quality objectives. Figure 3 (attached) shows exceedances in copper in Dolly Creek after installation of the seal. Figure 4 (attached) compares water quality in Dolly Creek immediately upstream of the mine with that in Dolly Creek immediately downstream, and shows that the mine site causes exceedances in copper in Dolly Creek. The apparent source of the continuing elevated levels of copper is leachate being generated by surface water run-off from rainfall and/or snowmelt that comes in contact with the 700 level adit, the ruins of the mill and concentrator, exposed mining waste piles in and around the portal area, mining waste in the Dolly Creek drainage and mining waste in the tailings impoundment.

*Comment: a comprehensive integrated investigation of the Mine Site and Mine Tailings Site systems should be performed by the Regional Board and the USFS to determine and target sources of metals to groundwater and surface water. See Expert Disclosures submitted by Atlantic Richfield. The Regional Board is without jurisdiction to require such investigations under the Draft CAOs for the reasons explained in Atlantic Richfield's Motions and Hearing Brief.*

23. Mining waste associated with the Central and Piute ore bodies in the Nye Creek and Ward Creek drainages poses a potential threat to water quality. The Central and Piute workings also contain subsidence areas, waste piles and open shafts which pose safety hazards
24. Figure 5 (attached) shows copper levels and pH in the water seeping through and around the mine seal, as measured from the shallow pool at the base of the mine seal plug. Figure 5 shows that water impounded behind the seal is highly acidic, and contains extremely high levels of copper. Figure 6 (attached) shows copper levels in the settling pond below the portal several times higher than the water quality objective. Although the seal appears to be sound for the moment, the passage of time coupled with the exposure of the seal and surround rock to the highly acidic impounded water poses a threat to the integrity of the seal. Failure of the seal and/or settling pond could result in significant discharges of AMD and/or copper into Dolly Creek, with likely catastrophic harm to beneficial uses for many miles downstream.
25. The Walker Mine was an underground mining operation. The underground mine workings include access tunnels, drifts, cross-cuts and other openings where ore was accessed and removed for processing. The underground mine workings are the source of all mine waste at the surface of the mine and tailings. In addition, the underground mine workings are now conduits by which groundwater becomes AMD through contact with exposed ore and mine waste within the underground workings, and by which the AMD would reach the surface but for the mine seal.
26. Since 1984, the Central Valley Water Board has spent more than \$2.6 million on the Walker Mine acid mine drainage abatement project.



*Comment: The Board has settled with responsible parties and legally assumed their liabilities to abate nuisance conditions, to the extent such conditions persist. The Regional should make a finding of how much money it has left to spend on the sites as a result of settling with other responsible parties and reserves in its own budget.*

#### **OWNERSHIP AND REGIONAL BOARD ACTION AFTER 1945**

27. Safeway Signal Corporation purchased the mine property out of Walker's bankruptcy proceedings in April, 1945. Subsequent ownership of the property is listed in the Chain of Title Guarantee shown in Prosecution Exhibit 48. Central Valley Water Board staff has been unable to locate successors to the owners prior to Robert Barry, who took ownership in 1965 and may have been involved in the earlier ownership groups.
28. In 1991, the Central Valley Water Board obtained a \$1.5 million stipulated judgment against then-owners Robert Barry and Calicopia Corporation, and others, wherein the Board agreed to hold Calicopia and the other defendants harmless for pollution at the site. Money from the judgment was paid into the State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account. Money from this account has been used to maintain the mine seal and perform other work in accordance with the Walker Mine Acid Mine Drainage Abatement Project Operations and Maintenance Procedures (Central Valley Water Board, May 1997).

*Comment: Atlantic Richfield accepts this finding and acknowledgment that the Regional Board has assumed the liabilities of Robert Barry and Calicopia Corporation and others pursuant to settlement and hold harmless agreements. The Board should identify the "others" referred to in this proposed finding.*

29. In 1997, Cedar Point Properties (CPP) acquired most of the mine property at tax auction, and remains the title owner of most of the site.<sup>22</sup> Shortly after CPP purchased the site, the Central Valley Water Board issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 97-715 directing CPP to apply for an NPDES permit and to continue remedial efforts. CPP did not comply. In 1999, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) and the Central Valley Water Board reached a settlement with CPP over legal responsibility for cleanup, remediation, and abatement activities at the Walker Mine, wherein the Board agreed to hold the other defendants harmless for pollution at the site. That settlement agreement was later incorporated into a 2004 stipulated judgment. CPP remains potentially liable, but its corporate status has been suspended and it appears to be inactive and insolvent.

*Comment: Atlantic Richfield accepts this finding and acknowledgment that the Regional Board has assumed the liabilities of CPP and others pursuant to settlement and hold harmless agreements.*

---

<sup>2</sup> CPP acquired all of the private parcels except APN 009-090-002, a small parcel which was acquired by Clifford and Bunny Brown. In 1997, the Board determined that there was no evidence of pollution being discharged from the Brown parcel sufficient to trigger permitting requirements or enforcement action (see 24 September 1997 letter [Prosecution Exhibit 15]).

30. The Central Valley Water Board retains legal access to the site for remediation purposes through the 1991 and 2004 stipulated judgments. Pursuant to this right of access, the Board may authorize the Discharger to access the site for remediation purposes.
31. Atlantic Richfield was not a party to the 1991 or 2004 stipulated judgments.
32. The Central Valley Water Board sought to begin negotiations with Atlantic Richfield for past and future environmental remediation activities at the mine as early as 1997, but Atlantic Richfield resisted and nothing of substance came from those attempts.

*Comment: In fact the Board agreed in 1999 with the position that Atlantic Richfield should not be named as a discharger in any Board order. The only thing that has changed between those dates and today is (a) the Board has run low on (but not out off) money to further investigate and, if necessary, remediate the sites and (b) witnesses with first-hand personal knowledge of WMC operations have become unavailable and/or died.*

33. In December 1999, the Board proposed to name Atlantic Richfield as a discharger for the tailings impoundment (tentative order revising WDRs No. 91-017), but the new WDRs were never finalized against Atlantic Richfield based on Atlantic Richfield's resistance and the Board's then-understanding of Anaconda's involvement at the mine. The tailings WDRs were finalized against Forest Service in Order No. 5-00-028.

*Comment: It is untrue that Atlantic Richfield "resisted" to Board in 1999. Atlantic Richfield presented reasoned factual and legal arguments as to why it should not be named a discharger. The Board obviously agreed. The Prosecution Team's unsupported innuendo has no place in this proposed CAO. Certainly there is no new evidence germane to Atlantic Richfield's connections to the site since 1999.*

34. During a 2005 lawsuit, the Forest Service and Atlantic Richfield obtained a consent decree whereby Atlantic Richfield provided \$2.5 million for future response costs involved with federal CERCLA remedial activities at the tailings impoundment. That decree did not address the mine property, the mine property is not subject to any CERCLA action, and the Central Valley Water Board was not a party to the 2005 lawsuit or consent decree.

*Comment: The USFS and Atlantic Richfield gave the Regional Board notice of the proposed consent decree. It is misleading to say that "this decree did not address the mine property." Wastes from the mine property were deposited in the tailings. The mining site and the mine tailing site were once operated as a unified operation.*

#### **ATLANTIC RICHFIELD OPERATOR LIABILITY**

35. In 1987, Atlantic Richfield conveyed the Anaconda Geological Documents Collection to the University of Wyoming. The Anaconda Geological Documents Collection is a publicly accessible database containing hundreds of documents related to the Walker Mine and Tailings. The database became available online sometime after 1999. Central Valley Regional Board staff recently obtained and reviewed relevant documents from the Anaconda Geological Documents Collection and other sources.

*Comment: The Anaconda Geological Documents Collection may have become online in 1999 (when the Board, after consideration of the arguments and evidence decided not to name Atlantic Richfield as a responsible party/discharger for either the mine site or the mine tailings site), but those documents had already been available to any member of the public for 12 years – since 1987.*

36. Substantial evidence in the record shows that Anaconda, International and Walker concurrently operated the mine and tailings from 1918 through at least 1941. Anaconda and International staff acting on Anaconda and International's behalf regularly directed specific operation and exploration activities at the mine and tailings, particularly during critical periods. These activities included exploration, ore location, mine development work (e.g., placement of underground mine workings to access and remove ore) and removal of ore, all of which directly resulted in the condition of discharge and threatened discharge currently at the mine and tailings. Anaconda and International's involvement at the mine and tailings went well beyond what is normally expected of a responsible corporate parent. Evidence and findings describing Anaconda and International's direct operation of the mine and tailings are contained in Prosecution Exhibits 1 [archive documents] and 2 [Declaration of Dr. Quivik], and are incorporated here.

*Comment: This proposed finding is wholly dependent upon the cited opinions of a historian without mining or mining business operations experience – Fred Quivik. Quivik's opinions should in relevant part be excluded from this proceeding because they are irrelevant and based upon wholesale speculation. See Motion # 9, Appendix 1 to the Atlantic Richfield Hearing Brief.*

37. Anaconda and International directed specific pollution-causing activities at Walker Mine and Tailings. Atlantic Richfield is liable as Anaconda and International's successor.

*Comment: Please refer to previous comment; the allegation is not supported by the evidence before the Regional Board, and appears to arise solely from the opinions of Fred Quivik which are wholly unsupported and should be rejected for the reasons set forth in Motion #9 and as detailed in Atlantic Richfield's Hearing Brief.*

#### LEGAL PROVISIONS

38. Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires states to identify waters not attaining water quality standards (referred to as the 303(d) list). Dolly Creek and Little Grizzly Creek below the Walker Mine have been identified by the Central Valley Water Board as an impaired water bodies because of high aqueous concentrations of copper and zinc.
39. Once a water body is identified as impaired and added to the 303d list, the CWA requires the states to develop a Total Daily Maximum Load (TMDL) for the water body. The Central Valley Water Board will develop a TMDL for Dolly Creek and Little Grizzly Creek by 2020, unless the cleanup action proposed herein results in the attainment of the water quality objectives.

40. The Central Valley Water Board's *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition* (Basin Plan) designates beneficial uses of the waters of the State, establishes water quality objectives (WQ05) to protect these uses, and establishes implementation policies to implement WQOs. The designated beneficial uses of the North Fork of the Feather River and its tributaries are municipal and domestic supply; hydropower generation; water contact recreation; non-contact water recreation; cold freshwater habitat; spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; and wildlife habitat.
41. The beneficial uses of underlying groundwater, as stated in the Basin Plan, are municipal and domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial service supply, and industrial process supply.
42. Because the site contains mining waste as described in Water Code sections 13050, closure of the Mining Unit(s) must comply with the requirements of Title 27 California Code of Regulations, sections 22470 through 22510 and with such provisions of the other portions of Title 27 that are specifically referenced in that article.
43. Affecting the beneficial uses of waters of the state by exceeding applicable WQ05 constitutes a condition of pollution as defined in Water Code section 13050, subdivision (1)(1).
44. Water Code section 13304, subdivision (a) states in part that:

*"Any person who has discharged or discharges waste into the waters of this state in violation of any waste discharge requirement or other order or prohibition issued by a Regional Water Board or the state board, or who has caused or permitted, causes or permits, or threatens to cause or permit any waste to be discharged or deposited where it is, or probably will be, discharged into the waters of the state and creates, or threatens to create, a condition of pollution or nuisance, shall upon order of the Regional Water Board, clean up the waste or abate the effects of the waste, or, in the case of threatened pollution or nuisance, take other necessary remedial action, including, but not limited to, overseeing cleanup and abatement efforts. Upon failure of any person to comply with the cleanup or abatement order, the Attorney General, at the request of the board, shall petition the superior court for that county for the issuance of an injunction requiring the person to comply with the order. In the suit, the court shall have jurisdiction to grant a prohibitory or mandatory injunction, either preliminary or permanent, as the facts may warrant "*
45. Water Code section 13304, subdivision (b), authorizes the Central Valley Water Board to perform cleanup, abatement, or remedial work where necessary to prevent substantial pollution, nuisance, or injury to waters of the state. Water Code section 13304, subdivision (c), authorizes the Central Valley Water Board to seek reimbursement from the Discharger for the costs associated with such cleanup, abatement or remedial work.
46. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) has adopted Resolution No. 92- 49, *Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of*

*Discharges Under CWC Section 13304.* Resolution No. 92-49 sets forth the policies and procedures to be used during an investigation or cleanup of a polluted site and requires that cleanup levels be consistent with State Board Resolution No. 68-16, the *Statement of Policy With Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California*. Resolution No. 92-49 and the Basin Plan establish cleanup levels to be achieved. Resolution No. 92-49 requires waste to be cleaned up to background, or if that is not reasonable, to an alternative level that is the most stringent level that is economically and technologically feasible in accordance with Title 23, section 2550.4. Any alternative cleanup level to background must: (1) be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state; (2) not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of such water; and (3) not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the Basin Plan and applicable Water Quality Control Plans and Policies of the State Board.

47. Chapter IV of the Basin Plan contains the *Policy for Investigation and Cleanup of Contaminated Sites*, which describes the Central Valley Water Board's policy for managing contaminated sites. This policy is based on Water Code sections 13000 and 13304, California Code of Regulations, title 23, division 3, chapter 15; California Code of Regulations, title 23, division 2, subdivision 1; and State Board Resolution Nos. 68-16 and 92-49. The policy addresses site investigation, source removal or containment, information required to be submitted for consideration in establishing cleanup levels, and the basis for establishment of soil and groundwater cleanup levels.
48. The State Board's Water Quality Enforcement Policy states in part: *"At a minimum, cleanup levels must be sufficiently stringent to fully support beneficial uses, unless the Central Valley Water Board allows a containment zone. In the interim, and if restoration of background water quality cannot be achieved, the Order should require the discharger(s) to abate the effects of the discharge."* (Water Quality Enforcement Policy, p. 35).
49. Water Code section 13267 states, in part:

*"(b)(1) In conducting an investigation, the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or, discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region . . . shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports."*
50. The Discharger is named in this Order because through its actions and/or by virtue of its ownership of the site, it has caused or permitted waste to be discharged or deposited where it has discharged and threatens to discharge to waters of the state and has created and threatens to create a condition of pollution or nuisance.