

LATE REVISIONS

AGENDA ITEM 16.b

April 27-28, 2023 Board Meeting

LATE REVISIONS – 19 April 2023

Item 16.b Homestake Mining Company of California, McLaughlin Mine, Lake, Napa and Yolo Counties – Consideration of Revised Waste Discharge Requirements R5-2023-XXXX, Uncontested

In response to our Response to Comments, we received an e-mail from the Discharger on 17 April 2023 requesting the following late revisions:

DISCHARGER COMMENT #1:

In response to Comment 1.b. regarding Finding 46, the Water Board stated that it would change all references to the Updated Closure Plan for the TIF as a technical report to an Updated TIF Closure Plan. However, Finding 46 states, "This Order requires submittal of technical report with an evaluation demonstrating the proposed infiltration gallery will not impair surface or groundwater quality (See Sections E.1 and I.2)." Instead, the proper revision should read as "This Order requires submittal of an Updated TIF Closure Plan with an evaluation demonstrating the proposed infiltration gallery will not impair surface or groundwater quality (See Sections E.1 and I.2)."

RESPONSE TO COMMENT:

Comment accepted. In the last sentence of Finding 46, "technical report" was replaced by "an Updated TIF Closure Plan".

DISCHARGER COMMENT #2:

In response to Comment 1.b. regarding Finding 61, the Water Board stated that it would change all references to the Updated Closure Plan for the TIF as a technical report to an Updated TIF Closure Plan. However, Finding 61 states, "This Order requires that the Discharger submits an updated TIF closure technical report addressing the coverage of the remaining TIF surface areas and the feasibility of directing Pump-back liquids to an infiltration gallery (Sections E.2 and I.2)." Instead, that proper revision should remove the reference to "technical report" and replaced with "Plan."

RESPONSE TO COMMENT:

Comment accepted. In Finding 61, "updated TIF closure technical report" was replaced by "Updated TIF Closure Plan".

DISCHARGER COMMENT #3:

In response to Comment 3 regarding Finding ?, the Water Board stated that it would remove the following four duplicative Yolo County APNs since they were already in Table 2: 018-280-003, 018-310-001, 018-310-021, and 018-310-023. However, the Water

Board's revision completely removed the four APNs from the document. It appears that a proper revision would have only removed the APNs from Finding 2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT:

Comment rejected. The four APN numbers appear in the top four rows of Yolo County column of Table 1 in Finding 2. Our Response to Comments Comment 3 should refer to Table 1 and not to Table 2. No changes were made to the document.

DISCHARGER COMMENT #4:

In response to Comment 20 regarding Finding 91, the Water Board stated that "Reference to section I.5 has been changed to I.4." However, the Water Board's revision now only references "I" and fails to reference "1.4," thus, a proper revision must include subsection 4 after I.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT:

Comment accepted. A reference to section I.4 was added to Finding 91.