ROBERT K. REIMAN

1	3.3 Admitted that the site contains surface water flow, but denied that this flow is
2	relatively permanent. Admitted that Craig Creek is a relatively permanent tributary to the
4	South Fork of Little Campbell Creek, which ultimately flows into Campbell Creek. Denied
5	in al other respects.
6	3.4 Denied.
7	3.5 Denied.
8	
9	3.6 Denied.
10	3.7 Admitted that Respondent did not obtain a permit. Denied in all other respects.
11	3.8 Denied.
12	3.9 This allegation states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the
14	
15.	extent one may be required the allegation is denied.
16	3.10 Denied.
17	3.11 Denied.
18	Count 1
19	Discharge of dredged or fill material into approximately one-half acre of wetlands
20	3.12 Respondent incorporates his prior answers herein by reference.
21	3.13 Denied.
22	3.14 Denied.
23	3.14 Demod.
24	3.15 Denied.
25	Count 2
26	Discharges into Craig Creek
27	•
28	ANSWER - PAGE 2

i	3.16 Respondent incorporates his prior answers herein by reference.
2	3.17 Denied.
3 4	3.18 Denied.
5	Count 3
6	Discharges into tributary originating from the south spring
7	3.19 Respondent incorporates his prior answers herein by reference.
8	3.20 Denied.
9	3.21 Denied.
11	Count 4
12	Discharges into tributary originating from the middle spring
13	3.22 Respondent incorporates his prior answers herein by reference.
14	3.23 Denied.
15.	3.24 Denied.
16 17	Count 5 Discharges into tributary originating from the north spring
18	3.25 Respondent incorporates his prior answers herein by reference.
20	3.26 Denied.
21	
22	3.27 Denied.
23	V. PENALTY
24	4.1 This allegation states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the
25	extent one may be required the allegation is denied.
26	
27	
28	ANSWER - PAGE 3

6.2 This allegation states a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

VII. INFORMAL SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

- 7.1 Respondent hereby requests a settlement conference to discuss the facts of the case, the proposed penalty, and the possibility of settling this matter.
 - 7.2 This allegation states a legal conclusion to which no response is required.
 - 7.3 This allegation states a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

VIII. RESERVATIONS

8.1 This allegation states a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.
- 2. Lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
- 3. Impossibility to correct and mitigate any violation due to stop work order.
- 4.Good faith belief in legality of work done.
- 5. A permit would have been granted for the work performed if it had been requested.
- 6. Necessity, as the existence of beetle kill spruce and lack of adequate fire protection in the area was the reason for the actions taken by Respondent.

DATED this 27 day of August, 2008. LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT K. REIMAN Attorney for Respondent Alaska Bar No. 831014 ANSWER - PAGE 6