

37

OC Print-Mail Center

From: Catherine Hagan (George) [CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 12:59 PM
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Philip Wyels
Cc: Garrett, Christopher (SD); Singarella, Paul (OC); pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com
Subject: Re: Revisions to Chapter 6

Amanda,
 I had a chance to follow-up with Tom Luster at the Coastal Commission regarding the additional revisions to Chapter 6 discussed below. Tom Luster indicated that all of the changes are acceptable, with one exception. In item (2), below, Poseidon proposed adding the language "in a consolidated hearing" to the phrase on p. 6-10 of Chapter 6 (March 9 Plan) that now reads: "Upon determining that the goals or standards are not achieved, the Executive Director or the Executive Officer shall prescribe remedial measures, after consultation with each other and the permittee, which shall be.. If the permittee does not agree that remediation is necessary, the matter may be set for hearing and disposition by the Commission or the Regional Board or both in a consolidated hearing, as determined by the Executive Director and the Executive Officer. ~~The Regional Board shall act consistently with any such remedial measures.~~"

Tom Luster has asked that the phrase "in a consolidated hearing" be removed from this phrase. He does not object to the Regional Board's role, but points out that holding a consolidated hearing would be difficult, if not impossible, due to the agencies' different hearing procedures, ex parte requirements, timelines and noticing requirements. He does point out that the agencies can still coordinate review and hearings by, for example, developing similar findings, and holding the hearings close in time.

We therefore request that this revision be made to the March 9 Plan. It would seem easiest to include the revision with revised Chapter 6 that reflects corresponding changes to the new Nordby analysis.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks.

Catherine

Catherine George Hagan
 Senior Staff Counsel
 Office of Chief Counsel
 State Water Resources Control Board
 chagan@waterboards.ca.gov

 9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
 San Diego, CA 92123-4340
 Telephone: 858.467.2958
 Facsimile: 858.571.6972

>>> <Amanda.Halter@lw.com> 3/7/2009 6:20 PM >>>

Thanks, Phil. Chapter 6 will reflect these changes when submitted tomorrow.

From: Philip Wyels
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Catherine Hagan (George)
Cc: Garrett, Christopher (SD); Singarella, Paul (OC); pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com
Sent: Sat Mar 07 18:02:34 2009
Subject: Re: Revisions to Chapter 6

Amanda, I'll pick this one up for Catherine.

We're fine with those changes (it looks like you sent two identical emails, one at 2:39 and one at 2:42; I reviewed the language in the 2:42 email). I inadvertently omitted "the Board" in rewriting Poseidon's provision at p.6-2. Please restore it, so that the section will read:

"If Poseidon proposes one or more mitigation sites outside of the boundaries, it shall first demonstrate to the Board that the corresponding mitigation could not feasibly be implemented within the boundaries, such as when the criteria established in Section 3.0 of the MLMP are not satisfied."

Thanks,
 Phil

4/1/2009

>>>
From: <Amanda.Halter@lw.com>
To: <CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov>
CC: <PWYels@waterboards.ca.gov>, <pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com>, <CHRISTOPHER.GARRETT@LW.com>, <PAUL.SINGARELLA@LW.com>
Date: 3/7/2009 2:42 PM
Subject: Re: Revisions to Chapter 6
 Catherine,

Thank you for your proposed revisions to Chapter 6 addressing the Regional Board's authority under the MLMP. We have only three items for discussion:

(1) On page 6-2 (section 6.3, lines 13-15), you propose replacing: "If Poseidon proposes a mitigation site outside of the boundaries, it first shall demonstrate to the Board that there is no site reasonably available that meets the criteria established in Section 3.0 of the MLMP" with "If Poseidon proposes one or more mitigation sites outside of the boundaries, it shall first demonstrate that the corresponding mitigation could not feasibly be implemented within the boundaries." We would add onto this statement as follows in red: "If Poseidon proposes one or more mitigation sites outside of the boundaries, it shall first demonstrate that the corresponding mitigation could not feasibly be implemented within the boundaries, such as when the criteria established in Section 3.0 of the MLMP are not satisfied."

- The purpose of this proposed addition is to make clear that if a site doesn't meet the criteria of Section 3.0 of the MLMP it would not be feasible.

 (2) On p 6-7, you propose this change to the first row: "Upon determining that the goals or standards are not achieved, the Executive Director or the Executive Officer shall prescribe remedial measures, after consultation with each other and the permittee, which shall be.. If the permittee does not agree that remediation is necessary, the matter may be set for hearing and disposition by the Commission or the Regional Board or both, as determined by the Executive Director and the Executive Officer. ~~The Regional Board shall act consistently with any such remedial measures.~~"

We would add onto this text as follows in red: "Upon determining that the goals or standards are not achieved, the Executive Director or the Executive Officer shall prescribe remedial measures, after consultation with each other and the permittee, which shall be.. If the permittee does not agree that remediation is necessary, the matter may be set for hearing and disposition by the Commission or the Regional Board or both in a consolidated hearing, as determined by the Executive Director and the Executive Officer. ~~The Regional Board shall act consistently with any such remedial measures.~~"

- The purpose of this proposed addition is to avoid two separate hearings on the same remediation regarding which the agencies would have already coordinated, which could lead to differing and potentially conflicting remediation orders.

 (3) On p. 6-12, you propose: The Executive Officer shall similarly report to the Regional Board; in making his report, the Executive Officer may rely upon the Executive Director's report. If the Commission and the Regional Board determine that the performance standards have been met and the project is successful, the monitoring program will be scaled down, as recommended by the Executive Director and approved by the Commission.

We would change the text as follows in red: The Executive Officer shall similarly report to the Regional Board; in making his report, the Executive Officer may rely upon the Executive Director's report. If the Commission and the Executive Officer determine that the performance standards have been met and the project is successful, the monitoring program will be scaled down, as recommended by the Executive Director and approved by the Commission.

- The purpose of this proposed change is to allow the Executive Officer to make a compliance decision in coordination with the Commission, rather than leaving the implication that perhaps the full Board would need to pass on such a determination. This implication appears unnecessary and burdensome, inviting duplicative proceedings.

 Please let us know whether these changes are amenable to you and whether you would like to discuss them.

Best regards,

4/1/2009

Amanda

Amanda Halter

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

650 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Direct Tel: 714-755-2238

Fax: 714-755-8290

Email: amanda.halter@lw.com

From: Catherine Hagan (George) [mailto:CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2009 5:47 PM
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Garrett, Christopher (SD); Singarella, Paul (OC); PMacLaggan@poseidon1.com
Cc: Chiara Clemente; Deborah Woodward; Philip Wyels
Subject: Revisions to Chapter 6

All,
 Thank you for the productive call this afternoon. Attached is a document showing edits we request be included in Chapter 6 of the revised Minimization Plan. We look forward to the supplemental information that will be incorporated in the revised Minimization Plan.
 Please let me know if you have any questions.

Catherine George Hagan
 Senior Staff Counsel
 Office of Chief Counsel
 State Water Resources Control Board
chagan@waterboards.ca.gov

 9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
 San Diego, CA 92123-4340
 Telephone: 858.467.2958
 Facsimile: 858.571.6972

 To comply with IRS regulations, we advise you that any discussion of Federal tax issues in this e-mail was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by you, (i) to avoid any penalties imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) to promote, market or recommend to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

For more information please go to <http://www.lw.com/docs/irs.pdf>

 This email may contain material that is confidential, privileged and/or attorney work product for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Latham & Watkins LLP

4/1/2009

38

OC Print-Mail Center

From: Catherine Hagan (George) [CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 10:43 AM
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Garrett, Christopher (SD); Philip Wyels
Cc: Jansma, Garrett (OC); Singarella, Paul (OC); pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com
Subject: Re: Revisions to Chapter 6

Amanda,
 The same section with the typo 6.2.1 also states values of productivity which I think may need to be changed or clarified based on the revised Nordby statement.
 If it is possible to provide the Chang and Jenkins' statements by 4, that would be helpful so that we can get them posted by cob before the weekend.
 Thanks.
 Catherine
 >>> <Amanda.Halter@lw.com> 3/20/2009 10:29 AM >>>

Catherine,

Poseidon anticipates submitting the Chang statement, along with a statement from Dr. Jenkins, today.

A revised plan will not be submitted today (the only revisions contemplated at this point are removing the "consolidated hearing" language in Chp 6 and correcting the typo Debbie pointed out.)

Yes, you are correct that Nordby's supporting materials should be retained; only the actual statement should be replaced.

Best regards,
 Amanda Halter

From: Catherine Hagan (George)
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Garrett, Christopher (SD); Philip Wyels
Cc: Singarella, Paul (OC); pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com
Sent: Fri Mar 20 09:25:47 2009
Subject: RE: Revisions to Chapter 6

Thank you, Chris.
 Can you let me know when you anticipate submitting the Cheng opinion and the revised plan and redlined versions so I can give a heads up to our IT person ?
 Once we receive them, I would like to get them on-line as quickly as possible and notify the public. In addition, I have a few clarifying questions. The email transmitting Nordby's revised opinion (Attachment 7) said it would completely replace existing Attachment 7. Attachment 7 to the March 9 Plan also includes literature which it appears Nordby still relies upon. I wanted to confirm that the literature will not be removed and that it is just the statement portion of the attachment that will be replaced. Also, we assume you will be revising Chapter 6 to reflect changes due to Nordby's revised statement. However, Debbie pointed out a typographical error in a related section I wanted to mention. In section, 6.2.1., line 11, states "estimated 1,715.5 kg per day." The word "day" should be replaced with "year."

Thank you.
 Catherine

>>> <CHRISTOPHER.GARRETT@LW.com> 3/20/2009 9:13 AM >>>

Catherine,

Poseidon will include this change in the revised Plan as indicated in your email

Chris

Christopher W. Garrett

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800
 San Diego, CA 92101-3375
 Direct Dial: +1.619.238.2827
 Fax: +1.619.696.7419
 Email: christopher.garrett@lw.com

4/1/2009

<http://www.lw.com>

From: Catherine Hagan (George) [mailto:CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 12:59 PM
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Philip Wyels
Cc: Garrett, Christopher (SD); Singarella, Paul (OC); pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com
Subject: Re: Revisions to Chapter 6

Amanda,
 I had a chance to follow-up with Tom Luster at the Coastal Commission regarding the additional revisions to Chapter 6 discussed below. Tom Luster indicated that all of the changes are acceptable, with one exception. In item (2), below, Poseidon proposed adding the language "in a consolidated hearing" to the phrase on p. 6-10 of Chapter 6 (March 9 Plan) that now reads: "Upon determining that the goals or standards are not achieved, the Executive Director or the Executive Officer shall prescribe remedial measures, after consultation with each other and the permittee, which shall be.. If the permittee does not agree that remediation is necessary, the matter may be set for hearing and disposition by the Commission or the Regional Board or both in a consolidated hearing, as determined by the Executive Director and the Executive Officer. ~~The Regional Board shall act consistently with any such remedial measures.~~"

Tom Luster has asked that the phrase "in a consolidated hearing" be removed from this phrase. He does not object to the Regional Board's role, but points out that holding a consolidated hearing would be difficult, if not impossible, due to the agencies' different hearing procedures, ex parte requirements, timelines and noticing requirements. He does point out that the agencies can still coordinate review and hearings by, for example, developing similar findings, and holding the hearings close in time.

We therefore request that this revision be made to the March 9 Plan. It would seem easiest to include the revision with revised Chapter 6 that reflects corresponding changes to the new Nordby analysis.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks.

Catherine

Catherine George Hagan
 Senior Staff Counsel
 Office of Chief Counsel
 State Water Resources Control Board
chagan@waterboards.ca.gov

 9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
 San Diego, CA 92123-4340
 Telephone: 858.467.2958
 Facsimile: 858.571.6972

>>> <Amanda.Halter@lw.com> 3/7/2009 6:20 PM >>>

Thanks, Phil. Chapter 6 will reflect these changes when submitted tomorrow.

From: Philip Wyels
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Catherine Hagan (George)
Cc: Garrett, Christopher (SD); Singarella, Paul (OC); pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com
Sent: Sat Mar 07 18:02:34 2009
Subject: Re: Revisions to Chapter 6

Amanda, I'll pick this one up for Catherine.

We're fine with those changes (it looks like you sent two identical emails, one at 2:39 and one at 2:42; I reviewed the language in the 2:42 email). I inadvertently omitted "the Board" in rewriting Poseidon's provision at p.6-2. Please restore it, so that the section will read:

"If Poseidon proposes one or more mitigation sites outside of the boundaries, it shall first demonstrate to the Board that the corresponding mitigation could not feasibly be implemented within the boundaries, such as when the criteria established in Section 3.0 of the MLMP are not satisfied."

Thanks,
 Phil

>>>

From: <Amanda.Halter@lw.com>

4/1/2009

To: <CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov>
CC: <PWYels@waterboards.ca.gov>, <pmaclaggan@poseidon1.com>, <CHRISTOPHER.GARRETT@LW.com>, <PAUL.SINGARELLA@LW.com>
Date: 3/7/2009 2:42 PM
Subject: Re: Revisions to Chapter 6
 Catherine,

Thank you for your proposed revisions to Chapter 6 addressing the Regional Board's authority under the MLMP. We have only three items for discussion:

(1) On page 6-2 (section 6.3, lines 13-15), you propose replacing: "If Poseidon proposes a mitigation site outside of the boundaries, it first shall demonstrate to the Board that there is no site reasonably available that meets the criteria established in Section 3.0 of the MLMP" with "If Poseidon proposes one or more mitigation sites outside of the boundaries, it shall first demonstrate that the corresponding mitigation could not feasibly be implemented within the boundaries." We would add onto this statement as follows in red: "If Poseidon proposes one or more mitigation sites outside of the boundaries, it shall first demonstrate that the corresponding mitigation could not feasibly be implemented within the boundaries, such as when the criteria established in Section 3.0 of the MLMP are not satisfied."

- The purpose of this proposed addition is to make clear that if a site doesn't meet the criteria of Section 3.0 of the MLMP it would not be feasible.

 (2) On p 6-7, you propose this change to the first row: "Upon determining that the goals or standards are not achieved, the Executive Director or the Executive Officer shall prescribe remedial measures, after consultation with each other and the permittee, which shall be.. If the permittee does not agree that remediation is necessary, the matter may be set for hearing and disposition by the Commission or the Regional Board or both, as determined by the Executive Director and the Executive Officer. ~~The Regional Board shall act consistently with any such remedial measures.~~"

We would add onto this text as follows in red: "Upon determining that the goals or standards are not achieved, the Executive Director or the Executive Officer shall prescribe remedial measures, after consultation with each other and the permittee, which shall be.. If the permittee does not agree that remediation is necessary, the matter may be set for hearing and disposition by the Commission or the Regional Board or both in a consolidated hearing, as determined by the Executive Director and the Executive Officer. ~~The Regional Board shall act consistently with any such remedial measures.~~"

- The purpose of this proposed addition is to avoid two separate hearings on the same remediation regarding which the agencies would have already coordinated, which could lead to differing and potentially conflicting remediation orders.

 (3) On p. 6-12, you propose: The Executive Officer shall similarly report to the Regional Board; in making his report, the Executive Officer may rely upon the Executive Director's report. If the Commission and the Regional Board determine that the performance standards have been met and the project is successful, the monitoring program will be scaled down, as recommended by the Executive Director and approved by the Commission.

We would change the text as follows in red: The Executive Officer shall similarly report to the Regional Board; in making his report, the Executive Officer may rely upon the Executive Director's report. If the Commission and the Executive Officer determine that the performance standards have been met and the project is successful, the monitoring program will be scaled down, as recommended by the Executive Director and approved by the Commission.

- The purpose of this proposed change is to allow the Executive Officer to make a compliance decision in coordination with the Commission, rather than leaving the implication that perhaps the full Board would need to pass on such a determination. This implication appears unnecessary and burdensome, inviting duplicative proceedings.

 Please let us know whether these changes are amenable to you and whether you would like to discuss them.

Best regards,
 Amanda

Amanda Halter

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

650 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Direct Tel: 714-755-2238

Fax: 714-755-8290

Email: amanda.halter@lw.com

From: Catherine Hagan (George) [mailto:CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov]

Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2009 5:47 PM

To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Garrett, Christopher (SD); Singarella, Paul (OC); PMacLaggan@poseidon1.com

Cc: Chiara Clemente; Deborah Woodward; Philip Wyels

Subject: Revisions to Chapter 6

All,

Thank you for the productive call this afternoon. Attached is a document showing edits we request be included in Chapter 6 of the revised Minimization Plan. We look forward to the supplemental information that will be incorporated in the revised Minimization Plan. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Catherine George Hagan
Senior Staff Counsel
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
chagan@waterboards.ca.gov

9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123-4340
Telephone: 858.467.2958
Facsimile: 858.571.6972

To comply with IRS regulations, we advise you that any discussion of Federal tax issues in this e-mail was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by you, (i) to avoid any penalties imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) to promote, market or recommend to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

For more information please go to <http://www.lw.com/docs/irs.pdf>

This email may contain material that is confidential, privileged and/or attorney work product for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Latham & Watkins LLP