

**FILED**

**DEC 29 2008**

*Jim Ruby, Executive Secretary  
Environmental Quality Council*

BEFORE THE  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL  
STATE OF WYOMING

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL )  
OF CLABAUGH RANCH, INC. FROM )  
OF WYOMING POLLUTANT DISCHARGE )  
ELIMINATION SYSTEM (WYPDES) )  
PERMIT WY0056588 )  
)

Docket No. 08-3809

**YATES PETROLEUM CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO  
CLABAUGH RANCH, INC.'S PETITION**

Comes now Yates Petroleum Corporation (Yates), by and through its undersigned counsel, and responds to Clabaugh Ranch, Inc.'s (Clabaugh's) appeal of Yates' WYPDES permit number WY0056588 (as set forth in Clabaugh's Petition [the Petition], dated November 26, 2008). Yates responds as follows.

**Yates' Responses to Allegations Set Forth in Clabaugh's Petition**

1. Yates admits, based on information and belief, the allegations set forth in Paragraph 1 of the Petition.
2. Yates admits, based on information and belief, the allegations set forth in Paragraph 2 of the Petition.
  - 3(a). Upon information and belief, Yates admits the allegation set forth in Paragraph 3a. of the Petition.
  - 3(b). Yates admits the allegation set forth in Paragraph 3b. of the Petition.
  - 3(c). Yates admits the allegation set forth in Paragraph 3c. of the Petition.
  - 3(d). Yates admits that the outfalls are located up drainage from the Clabaugh Ranch. Yates denies all other allegations set forth in Paragraph 3d. of the Petition.

3(e). Yates cannot admit or deny the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3e. of the Petition as it is without sufficient knowledge of the allegations regarding the “Lance permit.” Yates denies any other allegations set forth in or implied by paragraph 3e. of the Petition.

3(f). Yates denies all allegations set forth in Paragraph 3f. of the Petition.

3(g). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3g. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit fails to maintain and protect water uses in violation of Chapter 1, Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations (WWQRR), Section 8 or any other provision of the Environmental Quality Act. Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3g.

3(h). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3h. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 1, Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations (WWQRR), Section 15 or any other provision of the Environmental Quality Act. Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3h.

3(i). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3i. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 1, Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations (WWQRR), Section 16 or any other provision of the Environmental Quality Act. Yates cannot frame

a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3i.

3(j). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3j. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 1, Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations (WWQRR), Section 17 or any other provision of the Environmental Quality Act. Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3j.

3(k). The allegations set forth in Paragraph 3k. of the Petition are vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 1, Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations (WWQRR), Section 20. Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3k.

3(l). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3l. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 1, Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations (WWQRR), Section 23. Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3l.

3(m). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3m. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 2, WWQRR, Section 5(c)(ii). Yates cannot frame a responsive

pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3m.

3(n). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3n. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 2, WWQRR, Section 9(a)(v). Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3n.

3(o). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3o. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 2, WWQRR, Section 9(a)(vi). Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3o.

3(p). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3p. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 2, WWQRR, Appendix H paragraphs (b)(i), (b)(ii), (b)(v), (b)(vii) and (b)(ix). Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3p.

3(q). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3q. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of Chapter 2, WWQRR, Appendix H paragraph (d)(iv). Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3q.

3(r). The allegations set forth in Paragraph 3r. of the Petition are vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of 40 C.F.R. § 435, Subpart E and/or Chapter 2, WWQRR, Appendix H paragraph (d)(iv). Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3r.

3(s). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3s. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fail to specify any facts regarding how the permit will not protect plant life from adverse effects of the discharge or how the permit will cause a measurable decrease in crop and livestock production. Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3s.

3(t). The allegation set forth in Paragraph 3t. of the Petition is vague, ambiguous and conclusory and fails to specify any facts regarding how the permit is in violation of the anti-backsliding provisions of the Clean Water Act. Yates cannot frame a responsive pleading to this allegation. Accordingly, Yates denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 3t.

4. Petitioner's request for relief is not an allegation of fact to which an answer is required.

#### **Yates' General Denial**

To the extent the Petition raises any allegations beyond those specifically denied above, Yates denies all such allegations and reserves the right to fully address all allegations during these proceedings, as appropriate.

**Yates' Affirmative Defenses**

1. The EQC lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Clabaugh's appeal.
2. Clabaugh lacks standing to bring this appeal.
3. Clabaugh did not properly exhaust its administrative remedies before the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality.

To the extent Clabaugh's Petition raises any allegations beyond those specifically denied above, Yates denies any and all such allegations and reserves the right to fully address all allegations at appropriate stages of these proceedings.

**WHEREFORE**, Yates respectfully requests that the Environmental Quality Council enter an order affirming the issuance of WYPDES permit number WY0050601.

Respectfully submitted this 26<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2008.



---

Matthew Joy  
Eric L. Hiser (Wyo. Bar No. 6-4003)  
Jordan Bischoff & Hiser  
7272 E, Indian School Road, Suite 360  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251  
Phone: (480) 505-3900  
Fax: (480) 505-3901  
Attorneys for Yates Petroleum Corporation

## Certificate of Service

I certify that on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2008, service of a true and complete copy of Yates Petroleum Corporation's Response to Clabaugh Ranch Inc.'s Petition was made upon each party or attorney of record herein as indicated below.

The ORIGINAL and eleven (11) copies were filed by Federal Express of the same on December 26, 2008 with:

Jim Ruby, Executive Secretary  
Wyoming Environmental Quality Council  
122 W. 25<sup>th</sup> Street  
Herschler Bldg., R. 1714  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

COPIES were served by Federal Express of the same on December 26, 2008 with:

Tom C. Toner  
Attorney for Clabaugh Ranch, Inc.  
319 W. Dow St.  
P.O. Box 6288  
Sheridan, WY 82801-1688

John Burbridge  
Office of the Attorney General  
123 Capitol  
200 W. 24<sup>th</sup> Street  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

John Corra, Director  
Department of Environmental Quality  
122 W. 25<sup>th</sup> Street  
Herschler Building, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor West  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

(2 COPIES)

John Wagner  
Wyoming DEQ, Water Quality Division  
122 W. 25<sup>th</sup> Street  
Herschler Building, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

