

---

## Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

**TO:** Gayleen Perreira, Senior  
Sacramento Valley NPDES Unit, Central Valley Water Board

**FROM:** Elizabeth Thayer, WRCE  
Sacramento Valley NPDES Unit, Central Valley Water Board

**DATE:** 21 October 2014

**SUBJECT:** 21 OCTOBER 2014 TELECONFERENCE WITH MICHAEL MILLER,  
PRESIDENT, ORIGINAL SIXTEEN TO ONE MINE, INC., SIXTEEN TO ONE  
MINE, SIERRA COUNTY

### **ATTENDANCE LIST:**

Gayleen Perreira  
Elizabeth Thayer  
Michael M. Miller

On 21 October 2014, Central Valley Water Board staff met with Mr. Michael M. Miller, President, Original Sixteen to One Mine, Inc. to discuss the Tentative NPDES permit for Sixteen to One Mine, Alleghany, Sierra County. Board staff requested the meeting with Mr. Miller in order to ensure that he is fully aware of the Board Meeting process and the benefits of submitting an Infeasibility Analysis. Following is a summary of my notes from the meeting.

Mr. Miller stated that he has reviewed the tentative permit and it is lengthy. Board staff recommended that Mr. Miller focus on the findings section at the beginning of the permit and on Attachment E, the monitoring and reporting program in order to focus his attention and save time. Mr. Miller was assured that he may comment on any portion of the tentative permit.

Mr. Miller was reminded by Board staff that comments are due 3 November 2014, the proposed Meeting date is in February 2015, and the effective date of the tentative permit would be 1 April 2015.

Mr. Miller conceded that Sixteen to One Mine needs an NPDES Permit. However, he still objects to the current Threat and Complexity ranking of 2C. Board staff explained that the regulations and our attorney directed us to the rank of 2C for Sixteen to One Mine. Mr. Miller was assured that he may raise this issue before the Board at the meeting in February.

Board staff explained to Mr. Miller that it would be to his benefit to submit an Infeasibility Analysis for the constituents with new effluent limits and for arsenic. The infeasibility Analysis would lead to a Cease and Desist Order with a compliance schedule and interim limitations, which would provide some protection from MMPs. Board staff explained that the Infeasibility Analysis must include a proposal for a treatment system and a performance schedule. Board

staff also explained that Sixteen to One Mine is eligible for an additional five years under a new CDO for arsenic, however, he must demonstrate due diligence to receive protection from MMPs. Mr. Miller believed that the past placement of iron filings within the effluent flow qualified as due diligence. Board staff stated that due diligence would be determined by our attorney. Board staff explained that the Infeasibility Analysis should be submitted as soon as possible, so that we can draft the CDO and put it out for public comment in time for the February 2015 Board Meeting.

Mr. Miller stated that he was interested in doing more testing in order to receive the benefit of a dilution factor. Board staff stated that the tentative permit contains a comprehensive description of what is required for a dilution study.

We also had a conversation about Designated Party status versus Interested Party status. Mr. Miller was reminded that anyone requesting Designated Party status must do so by 3 November 2014. Those wishing to be interested parties can go to the Board Meeting and fill out a card to speak. Interested parties can also be on the mailing list, if Mr. Miller or someone submits their name and address. Board staff reported that our office has recently instituted an electronic filing system, so we now prefer that all submittals be electronic. The new email address for electronic submittal is [RB5S-NPDES-Comments@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:RB5S-NPDES-Comments@waterboards.ca.gov).