

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD  
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

---

In re:	)	
	)	
Buena Vista Rancheria	)	Appeal Nos. 10-05, 10-06, 10-07 & 10-13
Wastewater Treatment Plant	)	
	)	
NPDES Permit No. 0049675	)	
	)	

---

**BUENA VISTA RANCHERIA OF ME-WUK INDIANS' SUPPLEMENTAL  
STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE**

Pursuant to the Environmental Appeals Board's order dated July 26, 2011, the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians ("Buena Vista") respectfully submits this Supplemental Statement in Support of its Motion for Leave to Intervene. Currently pending before the Board are four petitions seeking review of a Clean Water Act ("CWA") National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit issued by U.S. EPA Region 9 ("Region"). The NPDES permit authorizes discharge from a wastewater treatment plant to be constructed in connection with Buena Vista's proposed casino project in Amador County, California.

On July 5, 2011, the Region gave the Board notice that it planned to issue a Notice to Proceed authorizing Buena Vista to commence construction of the project facilities, but not to commence any treatment or discharge of wastewater until these appeals are resolved by the Board. *See* Dkt. No. 18. In response, Petitioners filed motions or letters asking the Board to stay the Region's action. Dkt. Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24. On July 21, 2011, the Region filed a motion for an extension of time to respond to Petitioners' motions to stay. Dkt. No. 29. On July 22, 2011, Buena Vista filed a Motion for Leave to Intervene and Oppose the Motions to Stay. Dkt. Nos. 30, 31. The Board subsequently granted the Region's motion for an extension of time, until

August 15, to respond to Petitioners' motions to stay. Order, Dkt. 33 (July 26, 2011). The Board also instructed Buena Vista to "contact the parties to these appeals and file a supplemental statement . . . indicating whether the parties oppose or do not oppose Buena Vista's motion to intervene." *Id.* at 4.

Counsel for Buena Vista has contacted each of the parties seeking their position on Buena Vista's motion to intervene. The parties responded as follows:

U.S. EPA Region 9 ("Region") does not oppose Buena Vista's motion. Email from Jo Ann Asami (July 26, 2011) (Ex. A).

Petitioner Ione Band of Miwok Indians "is not opposed to [Buena Vista's] intervening, so long as the [Ione] Tribe has the same opportunity to reply to [Buena Vista's] proposed opposition as to the EPA's response which is due August 15 – and to do so on the same time schedule –as the [Ione] Tribe does oppose the substance of [Buena Vista's] papers. Thus the Ione Band's non-opposition to [Buena Vista's] intervening is conditioned on the [Ione] Tribe's being able to reply at the same time to [Buena Vista's] proposed opposition to and the EPA's response to the [Ione] Tribe's motion to stay issuance of the proposed notice to proceed." Email from William Wood (July 29, 2011) (Ex. B).

Petitioner Amador County opposes Buena Vista's motion to intervene unless the County is given the opportunity to reply to both Buena Vista's Opposition to the motions to stay and also the Region's response to the motions to stay at the same time, after the Region responds on or before August 15. Telephone Call from Cathy Christian (July 29, 2011).

Petitioner Friends of Amador County does not consent to Buena Vista's motion and stated: "It is our contention that the Tribe was erroneously given federal recognition. . . . We

have addressed this issue in our pending lawsuit.” Email from Jerry Cassesi (July 27, 2011) (Ex. C).

Petitioner Glen Villa, Jr. opposes Buena Vista’s motion and stated: “Region IX made a decision to [issue the] Notice To Proceed, not the Buena Vista Rancheria. It is the responsibility of the US EPA Region IX to defend their actions, not the Buena Vista Rancheria.” Email From Glen Villa, Jr. (July 28, 2011) (Ex. D).

\* \* \*

For the reasons stated in Buena Vista’s Motion for Leave to Intervene and its Opposition to the Petitioners’ motions to stay, further delay poses a substantial risk of impairing Buena Vista’s interests in pursuing the casino project. Buena Vista therefore respectfully urges the Board to resolve the outstanding motions and petitions for review expeditiously.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David T. Buente, Jr.  
David T. Buente, Jr.  
Roger Martella, Jr.  
Peter R. Steenland  
Matthew D. Krueger  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 736-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 736-8711  
Email: dbuente@sidley.com  
rmartella@sidley.com  
psteeland@sidley.com  
mkrueger@sidley.com

*Counsel for the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk  
Indians*

Date: July 29, 2011

# Exhibit A

**From:** Joann Asami [Asami.Joann@epamail.epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2011 5:09 PM  
**To:** Krueger, Matthew  
**Cc:** Dawn Messier; Buente Jr., David T.; Krueger, Matthew; Steenland, Peter R.; Martella, Roger; Tod Siegal; Steve Sweeney  
**Subject:** Re: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene  
**Attachments:** 2011.07.26 EAB Order.pdf

dear mr. krueger:  
region ix does not oppose the buena vista rancheria of me-wuk indians' motion to intervene in the permit appeal.  
best,  
jo ann

From: "Krueger, Matthew" <mkrueger@sidley.com>  
To: Joann Asami/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: Tod Siegal/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dawn Messier/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Martella, Roger" <rmartella@sidley.com>, "Steenland, Peter R." <psteenland@sidley.com>, "Buente Jr., David T." <dbuente@sidley.com>, "Krueger, Matthew" <mkrueger@sidley.com>  
Date: 07/26/2011 12:12 PM  
Subject: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Ms. Asami:

I am one of the attorneys representing the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians in connection with the EAB's review of NPDES Permit No. 49675. Pursuant to the Board's order dated today (attached), the Tribe seeks Region 9's consent to the Tribe's July 22 motion to intervene in the permit appeal. Could you please let us know the Region's position regarding the Tribe's participation?

Thanks,  
Matt

Matthew Krueger | Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20005  
202.736.8057 | [mkrueger@sidley.com](mailto:mkrueger@sidley.com)

-----  
IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To comply with certain U.S. Treasury regulations, we inform you that, unless expressly stated otherwise, any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication, including attachments, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding any penalties that may be imposed on such taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, if any such tax advice is used or referred to by other parties in promoting, marketing or recommending any partnership or other entity, investment plan or arrangement, then (i) the advice should be construed as written in connection with the promotion or marketing by others of the transaction(s) or matter(s) addressed in this communication and (ii) the taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify us immediately.

\*\*\*\*\*

# Exhibit B

From: william.wood@hklaw.com  
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2011 2:31 PM  
To: Krueger, Matthew  
Cc: Buente Jr., David T.; Steenland, Peter R.; Martella, Roger;  
william.wood@hklaw.com  
Subject: Re: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Counsel,

As we discussed earlier, the Ione Band of Miwok Indians is not opposed to BVR's intervening, so long as the Tribe has the same opportunity to reply to BVR's proposed opposition as to the EPA's response which is due August 15 -- and to do so on the same time schedule -- as the Tribe does oppose the substance of BVR's papers. Thus the Ione Band's non-opposition to BVR's intervening is conditioned on the Tribe's being able to reply at the same time to BVR's proposed opposition to and the EPA's response to the Tribe's motion to stay issuance of the proposed notice to proceed.

Respectfully,  
Bill

William Wood | Holland & Knight LLP  
400 South Hope Street, 8th Floor | Los Angeles CA 90071  
Direct 213.896.2511 | Main 213.896.2400 | Fax 213.896.2450

-----Original Message-----

From: Krueger, Matthew [mailto:mkrueger@sidley.com]  
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2011 7:16 AM  
To: Wood, William (LAX - X52511)  
Cc: Buente Jr., David T.; Steenland, Peter R.; Martella, Roger  
Subject: RE: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Bill: Thanks for your message. We could speak at 12:45 pm Eastern, 9:45 am Pacific. Would that work for you? Hoping so, here is call-in information:

Dial-in: 877-589-6971  
Participant code: 320984

Regards,  
Matt

-----Original Message-----

From: william.wood@hklaw.com [mailto:william.wood@hklaw.com]  
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2011 5:22 AM  
To: Krueger, Matthew  
Cc: Buente Jr., David T.; Steenland, Peter R.; Martella, Roger;  
william.wood@hklaw.com  
Subject: Re: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Matt,

I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. I've been out of the

office on vacation.

Would you be available to talk tomorrow, mid-day or early afternoon DC time? I'm in Hawai'i (6 hour time difference) but plan to be up early here for another call I have at 10am California time. Perhaps we could speak before that call, leaving you ample time to file the supplemental statement with the EAB per the July 26 order.

Respectfully,  
Bill

William Wood | Holland & Knight  
400 South Hope Street, 8th Floor | Los Angeles CA 90071  
Phone 213.896.2511 | Fax 213.896.2450

---

From: Krueger, Matthew [mkrueger@sidley.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 12:35 PM  
To: Wood, William (LAX - X52511)  
Cc: Buente Jr., David T.; Steenland, Peter R.; Martella, Roger  
Subject: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Mr. Wood:

I am one of the attorneys representing the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians in connection with the EAB's review of NPDES Permit No. 49675. Pursuant to the Board's order dated today (attached), Buena Vista seeks the Ione Band of Miwok Indians' consent to its July 22 motion to intervene in the permit appeal. Could you please inform us of the Ione Band's position regarding Buena Vista's participation?

Thanks,  
Matt

Matthew Krueger | Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20005  
202.736.8057 | mkrueger@sidley.com<mailto:mkrueger@sidley.com>

-----  
-----  
IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To comply with certain U.S. Treasury regulations, we inform you that, unless expressly stated otherwise, any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication, including attachments, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding any penalties that may be imposed on such taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, if any such tax advice is used or referred to by other parties in promoting, marketing or recommending any

partnership or other entity,  
investment plan or arrangement, then (i) the advice should be construed  
as written in connection  
with the promotion or marketing by others of the transaction(s) or  
matter(s) addressed in this  
communication and (ii) the taxpayer should seek advice based on the  
taxpayer's particular  
circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is  
privileged or confidential.  
If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any  
attachments and notify us  
immediately.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

---

To ensure compliance with Treasury Regulations (31 CFR Part 10, Sec.  
10.35), we inform you that any tax advice contained in this  
correspondence was not intended or written by us to be used, and cannot  
be used by you or anyone else, for the purpose of avoiding penalties  
imposed by the Internal Revenue Code.

---

NOTE: This e-mail is from a law firm, Holland & Knight LLP ("H&K"), and  
is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is  
addressed. If you believe you received this e-mail in error, please  
notify the sender immediately, delete the e-mail from your computer and  
do not copy or disclose it to anyone else. If you are not an existing  
client of H&K, do not construe anything in this e-mail to make you a  
client unless it contains a specific statement to that effect and do not  
disclose anything to H&K in reply that you expect it to hold in  
confidence. If you properly received this e-mail as a client, co-counsel  
or retained expert of H&K, you should maintain its contents in  
confidence in order to preserve the attorney-client or work product  
privilege that may be available to protect confidentiality.

---

To ensure compliance with Treasury Regulations (31 CFR Part 10, Sec. 10.35),  
we inform you that any tax advice contained in this correspondence was not  
intended or written by us to be used, and cannot be used by you or anyone  
else, for the purpose of avoiding penalties imposed by the Internal Revenue  
Code.

---

NOTE: This e-mail is from a law firm, Holland & Knight LLP ("H&K"), and is  
intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. If

you believe you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately, delete the e-mail from your computer and do not copy or disclose it to anyone else. If you are not an existing client of H&K, do not construe anything in this e-mail to make you a client unless it contains a specific statement to that effect and do not disclose anything to H&K in reply that you expect it to hold in confidence. If you properly received this e-mail as a client, co-counsel or retained expert of H&K, you should maintain its contents in confidence in order to preserve the attorney-client or work product privilege that may be available to protect confidentiality.

# Exhibit C

**From:** jerry cassesi [lucydog@wildblue.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2011 11:47 AM  
**To:** Krueger, Matthew  
**Subject:** Re: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Mr. Kruger,

The Friends of Amador County does not consent to the Tribe's Motion to Intervene. It is our contention that the Tribe was erroneously given federal recognition. Even though the Tribe was federally recognized in 1995, that recognition was in error because the Tribe failed to meet the seven federal mandates required for Tribal recognition along with other issues. We have addressed this issue in our pending lawsuit.

Sincerely,  
Jerry Cassesi

----- Original Message -----

From: [Krueger, Matthew](#)  
To: [lucydog@wildblue.net](#)  
Cc: [Buente Jr., David T.](#) ; [Steenland, Peter R.](#) ; [Martella, Roger](#) ; [Krueger, Matthew](#)  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 12:37 PM  
Subject: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Mr. Cassesi:

I am one of the attorneys representing the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians in connection with the EAB's review of NPDES Permit No. 49675. Pursuant to the Board's order dated today (attached), the Tribe seeks the Friends of Amador County's consent to the Tribe's July 22 motion to intervene in the permit appeal. Could you please inform us of the Friends of Amador County's position regarding the Tribe's participation?

Thanks,  
Matt

Matthew Krueger | Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20005  
202.736.8057 | [mkrueger@sidley.com](mailto:mkrueger@sidley.com)

-----  
IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To comply with certain U.S. Treasury regulations, we inform you that, unless expressly stated otherwise, any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication, including attachments, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding any penalties that may be imposed on such taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, if any such tax advice is used or referred to by other parties in promoting, marketing or recommending any partnership or other entity, investment plan or arrangement, then (i) the advice should be construed as written in connection with the promotion or marketing by others of the transaction(s) or matter(s) addressed in this communication and (ii) the taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.  
\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify us immediately.

\*\*\*\*\*

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 6327 (20110726)

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

# Exhibit D

**From:** Glen Villa [glenvilla@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 28, 2011 11:55 PM  
**To:** Krueger, Matthew  
**Subject:** Re: In re Buena Vista Rancheria - Motion to Intervene

Mr. Krueger,

I oppose the Buena Vista Rancheria from intervening in the motion to stay. The US EPA Region IX made a decision to Notice To Proceed, not the Buena Vista Rancheria. It is the responsibility of the US EPA Region IX to defend their actions, not the Buena Vista Rancheria.

Sincerely,  
Glen Villa Jr.

On 7/26/2011 12:42 PM, Krueger, Matthew wrote:  
Mr. Villa:

I am one of the attorneys representing the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians in connection with the EAB's review of NPDES Permit No. 49675. Pursuant to the Board's order dated today (attached), the Tribe seeks your consent to the Tribe's July 22 motion to intervene in the permit appeal. Could you please inform us of your position regarding the Tribe's participation?

Thanks,  
Matt

Matthew Krueger | Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20005  
202.736.8057 | [mkrueger@sidley.com](mailto:mkrueger@sidley.com)

-----  
IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To comply with certain U.S. Treasury regulations, we inform you that, unless expressly stated otherwise, any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication, including attachments, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding any penalties that may be imposed on such taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, if any such tax advice is used or referred to by other parties in promoting, marketing or recommending any partnership or other entity, investment plan or arrangement, then (i) the advice should be construed as written in connection with the promotion or marketing by others of the transaction(s) or matter(s) addressed in this communication and (ii) the taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify us immediately.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on the 29nd day of July, 2011, I caused a copy of **BUENA VISTA RANCHERIA OF ME-WUK INDIANS' SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE** to be served electronically on:

Jo Ann Asami  
Assistant Regional Counsel  
EPA Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Asami.joann@epa.gov  
Siegal.tod@epa.gov

Dawn Messier  
Tod Siegal  
Office of General Counsel, U.S. EPA  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20460  
Messier.dawn@epa.gov

William Wood  
Attorneys for Petitioner  
Ione Band of Miwok Indians  
Holland & Knight LLP  
400 South Hope Street, 8th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
william.wood@hklaw.com

Jerry Cassessi  
Chairman, Friends of Amador County  
100 Cook Road  
Ione, CA 95640  
lucydog@wildblue.net

Glen Villa, Jr.  
901 Quail Court  
Ione, CA 95640  
glenvilla@sbcglobal.net

Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross & Leoni, LLP  
Cathy Christian  
Kurt R. Oneto  
1415 L Street, Suite 1200  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
cchristian@nmgovlaw.com  
koneto@nmgovlaw.com

/s/ Matthew D. Krueger  
By: Matthew D. Krueger