

Response to Written Comments

In Consideration of Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R1-2017-0001 for Post-Closure of the Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation, and Conservation District, Freshwater Tissue Company LLC, and Louisiana Pacific Corporation Samoa Class III Solid Waste Disposal Site

Two public comments were received via email during the public comment period, with two additional follow-up emails containing information regarding the comment from Bob Simpson. Excerpts from these emails are listed below, with the response to each comment.

September 29, 2016, email by Bob Simpson, Freshwater Tissue

Comment 1: The property Charles is speaking with you about [this is referring to Freshwater Tissue's portion of the landfill facility] no longer belongs to Freshwater Tissue. That parcel belongs exclusively to Charles and Jan Benbow. Freshwater distributed its two remaining parcels. The office complex and approx. 22 acres went to Charles. The remaining 28.4 acres that includes a chip yard and the former chip screen room was distributed to Robert (me) & Jamie Simpson.

Response 1: Staff has had discussions with and been provided additional information by Bob Simpson and Charles Benbow regarding ownership of the parcels associated with the solids waste disposal site. Both parties are in agreement that the transfer of property from Freshwater Tissue to Charles and Jan Benbow will take place. Once the property transaction has been recorded with the Humboldt County Assessor's Office, the Waste Discharge Requirements will be amended in a future Regional Water Board action to reflect the updated property ownership.

October 12, 2016, email by April Ingram, Louisiana Pacific Corporation

Comment 2: A correction needs to be made on p. 5 under "Groundwater," in paragraph 30. The fourth sentence says MW-2 is located southeast of the landfill, but this should instead be southwest.

Response 2: The Proposed Waste Discharge Requirements incorporated the correction as suggested by the commenter.

Comment 3: Also, the Section 48 signatory requirement (c) requires a lengthy certification statement to be on every required document. It may not be a big deal, and might not be enforced against, but this is contradictory to the financial assurance submittal requirements,

which mandate the precise wording as specified in the regs for each financial instrument, and which do not include the certification text.

Response 3: Provision 48 was revised to clarify that financial assurances documents shall follow the specific requirements in California Code of Regulations, title 27, chapter 6 instead of the signatory requirements in the Draft Waste Discharge Requirements.