

RECEIVED
U.S. E.P.A.

2003 NOV 18 AM 8:39

ENVIR. APPEALS BOARD

101 N. Capitol Blvd., Suite 1900
Boise Idaho 83702
phone 208.389.9000
fax 208.389.9040
www.stoel.com

Name:	Fax No.	Company/Firm	Phone No.
TO: Clerk	202-233-0121	Environmental Appeals Board	202-233-0122

Name:	Sender's Direct Dial:	Sender's Direct Email:
FROM: Teresa A. Hill	(208) 387-4264	tahill@stoel.com

Client: Hecla Mining Company	Matter: Lucky Friday
------------------------------	----------------------

Date: November 17, 2003

No. of Pages (including this cover): 6

Originals Not Forwarded Unless Checked:



First Class Mail



Overnight Delivery



Hand Delivery

In case of error call the fax operator at 208-389-9000.

This facsimile may contain confidential information that is protected by the attorney-client or work product privilege. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an employee responsible for delivering the facsimile, please do not distribute this facsimile, notify us immediately by telephone, and return this facsimile by mail. Thank you.

COMMENTS:**Attached is the cover letter, Motion for Leave to File Reply Brief.**

RECEIVED
U.S. E.P.A.

12

2003 NOV 18 AM 8:39

ENVIR. APPEALS BOARD

101 S. Capitol Boulevard Suite 1900
 Boise, Idaho 83701
 Phone 208 389 9000
 Fax 208 389 9040
 www.stoel.com



TERESA A. HILL
Direct (208) 387-4264
tahill@stoel.com

November 17, 2003

VIA FACSIMILE

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Clerk of the Board, Environmental Appeals Board (MC 1103B)
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20460-0001

**Re: In the Matter of Hecla Mining Company - Lucky Friday Mine
NPDES Permit No. ID-000017-S**

Dear Clerk:

Attached is a copy of the Motion for Leave to File Reply Brief. Please file this document with the Environmental Appeals Board.

I will follow up by regular mail with the original of the Motion for Leave to File Reply Brief.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Teresa A. Hill

Oregon
Washington
California
Utah
Idaho

RECEIVED
U.S. E.P.A.

12

2003 NOV 18 AM 8:39

ENVIR. APPEALS BOARD

Kevin J. Beaton
Teresa A. Hill
STOEL RIVES LLP
101 S. Capitol Blvd., Ste. 1900
Boise, Idaho 83702-5958
Telephone: (208) 389-9000
Facsimile: (208) 389-9040

Attorneys for Hecla Mining Company

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

IN THE MATTER OF)
HECLA MINING COMPANY -)
LUCKY FRIDAY MINE)
NPDES Permit No. ID-000017-5)
_____)

Appeal Number - NPDES 03-10
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY
BRIEF

COMES NOW Hecla Mining Company, Lucky Friday Unit ("Hecla") and petitions the Environmental Appeals Board ("EAB" or "Board") for an order granting it leave to reply to the Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") Response to Hecla Mining Company's Petition for Review ("Response").

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Procedural Background

On September 10, 2003 Hecla filed a Petition for Review and supporting memorandum seeking review of conditions contained in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Permit No. ID-000017-5 (the "Lucky Friday Permit"). EPA's Response to the

Petition for Review was due on October 31, 2003 and was received by Hecla's counsel via email on November 6, 2003 and by certified mail on November 7, 2003.

B. Standard for Leave to File Reply

The rules governing a Petition for Review of an NPDES permit to the EAB are contained in Title 40 C.F.R. pt. 124. Although the rules do not specifically make provision for a reply to the permitting authority's response, the EAB Practice Manual allows "petitioners who believe that the permitting authority's response requires a reply" to seek leave to file a reply brief and upon "motion explaining why a reply brief is necessary" may be granted the opportunity to file a reply brief. See EAB Practice Manual at pt. III, D(5). According to the EAB Practice Manual, there is no specific deadline for such a motion, but the motion should be made as soon as possible upon receipt of the permitting authority's response. *Id.*

II. DISCUSSION

A. A Reply is Necessary for an Informed Review of the Petition.

A reply brief addressing arguments raised in EPA's Response is necessary to ensure informed resolution of Hecla's Petition for Review. As noted in the EAB Practice Manual, the Board "endeavors to resolve as many cases as possible during the first stage of the appeals process;" therefore, the Board sets forth a procedure that seeks to obtain sufficient information to conduct a "thorough analysis" of the issues raised by the petition. EAB Practice Manual at pt. III, D (1). EPA has raised various arguments in its Response, both factual and legal, which require reply by Hecla to make sure the Board has complete and sufficient information to conduct a fully informed analysis of the Petition for Review.

First, EPA's Response mischaracterizes several of Hecla's arguments. For example, EPA's response mischaracterizes Hecla's arguments regarding EPA's failure to act on the

variance request, stating that Hecla is not contesting the permit conditions regarding the effluent limitations for cadmium, lead, zinc and mercury. EPA also mischaracterizes Hecla's arguments regarding its challenge to the Permit's effluent limitations for mercury. Hecla should be allowed to reply to address these, and other, mischaracterizations in the Response.

In addition, EPA's Response contains legal arguments that require further briefing by Hecla. For example, EPA presents legal arguments supporting the inclusion of the seepage study as a permit condition and legal arguments challenging the Board's authority to review items raised in the Petition, including the variance request. EPA's legal arguments are understandably one-sided, therefore, they do not fully and sufficiently frame the legal issues presented in the Petition. These arguments are not adequately addressed in Hecla's opening brief and Hecla should be allowed to reply to these legal arguments to assist the Board in conducting a meaningful review of the Petition for Review.

Finally, EPA challenges Hecla's Petition for failure to demonstrate that various permit conditions warrant review by the Board. Again, these arguments mischaracterize the arguments in Hecla's Petition, and Hecla should be allowed a chance to reply.

Because there are numerous factual and legal issues raised in EPA's Response that have not been adequately briefed, mischaracterize the arguments, and do not represent a full analysis of the issues, Hecla should be granted leave to reply to EPA's Response in order for the Board to conduct a thorough analysis of the Petition for Review.

B. The Motion for Leave to File a Reply Brief is Timely.

Hecla's Motion for Leave to File Reply Brief is timely and will not delay the EAB's review and decision-making on the Petition for Review. As discussed above, there is no specific deadline to request leave to file a reply brief, but such motions should be made as soon as


possible upon receipt of the permitting authorities response. EAB Practice Manual at pt. III., D(5). The Practice Manual does, however, indicate that "timeliness of the motion may be a factor in the Board's consideration of whether to grant it." *Id.* EPA's Response to Hecla's Petition was received on by Hecla's counsel on November 7, 2003. Hecla is filing this motion as soon as possible after receipt and review of the Petition; therefore, the motion is timely. In addition, Hecla is prepared to file the reply within fourteen days of the order granting the motion to facilitate timely processing of the Petition for Review.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Hecla respectfully requests the EAB to grant Hecla leave to file a reply brief in support of its Petition for Review.

Dated this 17th day of November, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin J. Beaton
Stoel Rives LLP
Attorneys for Hecla Mining Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 17th day of November, 2003, I served a copy of the Motion for Leave to File Reply Brief by facsimile and regular mail on:

David Allnut
Assistant Regional Counsel
Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

Facsimile 206-553-0163

Kelly Huynh
Acting Manager
NPDES Permits Unit
Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

Facsimile 206-553-0165



Teresa A. Hill