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(Mr. Tweeten not present)
CHAIR DEVENY: I'd like to call this meeting to order. Chris Deveny, Chair, Board of Environmental Review. And we'll go around and we'll have a roll call first.

MS. BASS: Chris Deveny.
CHAIR DEVENY: Present.
MS. BASS: Chris Tweeten.
(No response)
MS. BASS: Dexter Busby.
MR. BUSBY: I'm here.
MS. BASS: Hillary Hanson.
MS. HANSON: Here.
MS. BASS: John Dearment.
MR. DEARMENT: Here.
MS. BASS: John Felton.
MR. FELTON: Here.
MS. BASS: Tim Warner.
(No response)
MS. BASS: We have five Board members.
We have a quorum.
CHAIR DEVENY: And let's have
introductions of other people in the room. We'll start with George.

MR. MATHIEUS: George Mathieus, Board liaison for the Department.

MR. HAYES: Ed Hayes, Acting Chief Legal counsel for DEQ.

MS. BOWERS: Kirsten Bowers, Legal Counsel for DEQ.

MR. MORGAN: John Morgan, supervising attorney for the Waste Management Remediation Division.

MR. LUCAS: Mark Lucas, DEQ Legal Counsel.

MS. WEAVER: Christine Weaver, DEQ.
MS . SCHERER: Sandy Scherer, DEQ.
MS. CHRISTOPHERSON: Sarah Christopherson, Legal Counsel for DEQ.

MR. PETTIS: Aaron Pettis, attorney for DEQ.

MR. URBAN: Eric Urban, Water Quality Planning Bureau at DEQ.

MS. KELLY: Myla Kelly, Water Quality Standards.

MS. DEVANEY: Rainie Devany, Department of Environmental Quality.

MS. McCARTHY: Mindi McCarthy, DEQ. MR. GARBER: Jason Garber, Water Protection Bureau, DEQ.

MS. SIR: Haley Sir, DEQ.
MR. FLEMING: Derek Fleming, Water Protection Bureau, DEQ.

MR. SLOAN: Dick Sloan, DEQ.
MS. BALLIEW: Caroline Balliew, DEQ.
MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Joanne McLaughlin, DEQ.
MR. TIETZ: I'm John Tietz, Browning,
Kaleczyc, Berry, and Hoven on behalf of Columbia Falls.

MR. WRIGHT: Steve Wright, Columbia Falls Aluminum Company.

MS. LAUGHNER: Catherine Laughner, Browning, Kaleczyc on behalf of CFAC.

MR. DAVIS: Tim Davis, Water Quality Division, DEQ.

MS. HARBAGE: Rebecca Harbage, Air Quality Bureau, DEQ.

MS. ULRICH: Liz Ulrich, Air Quality Bureau, DEQ.

MS. MERKEL: Julie Merkel, Air Quality Bureau at DEQ.

MS. GRIMM: Deb Grimm, Air Quality

Bureau, DEQ.
MR. KLEMP: David Klemp, Air Quality
Bureau, DEQ.
MR. WARNER: Ed Warner, Air Quality
Bureau, DEQ.
MR. JUERS: Shawn Juers, Air Quality, DEQ.

MR. SIVERS: Eric Sivers, DEQ, Water Protection Bureau.

MR. KENNING: Jon Kenning, Water Protection Bureau, DEQ.

MS. CLERGET: I'm Sarah Clerget, Board attorney from the AG's office.

CHAIR DEVENY: And $I$ think --
MR. MOZER: Kurt Mozer, attorney, DEQ.
CHAIR DEVENY: And are there any individuals on the phone who would like to introduce themselves, let us know that you're on the phone today? Would the gentleman speak his name first?

MR. OLSON: Alan Olson, Montana Petroleum Association.

CHAIR DEVENY: And the woman.
MS. TRANK: Peggy Trank, Treasure State Resources Association.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you very much. Anybody else on the phone?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you everybody.
Before we get started, I'd just wanted to mention there's just a slight change to the agenda today. It was just under the action under contested cases, there will be no public comment. That's not something that is actually allowed. So that will not be on the agenda.

So with that, let's move to -- Did you have something, George?

MR. MATHIEUS: Sure. Thanks, Madam Chair. Just that we just sort of updated our technology today, so like this is the first time we've used it. So we don't have a microphone, so I think when people speak at the podium, kind of making sure -- it shouldn't be a problem for -- I just want to make sure it's not a problem for people in this room, when you come to the podium, but it's a small enough room, I think we can hear each other.

But for people on the phone and stuff, that microphone behind you is supposedly a super microphone, and picking up stuff. So anyway it's a new capability. We're trying to get in the modern era. So hopefully it goes without any hitch.

CHAIR DEVENY: So let's move to the minutes. Does anybody have any comments about the minutes from the last meeting?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Would anybody like to
entertain a motion to approve the minutes?
MR. DEXTER: So moved.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved. Is there a second?

MR. FELTON: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All in favor of approving the minutes of the June 8 th meeting, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: The minutes have been reviewed and approved. So let's move on to the next agenda item, which is our briefing items, and update on our cases. And I'll turn that over to

Sarah.
(Mr. Tweeten present)
MS. CLERGET: Sarah Clerget. Madam
Chair, we have, going through the agenda items, it would be Section II(A) (1) (a). This is CMG Construction. And just to reiterate what's on the agenda, the parties have requested a stay of proceeding due to settlement negotiations. We issued an order granting the stay, and they have to file status reports every thirty days. They're essentially waiting for the technology experts. They've met, and they're working on the scope of work in regard to the remediation. And once those technical details are worked out, they should be giving us an administrative order, and a notice of dismissal. So that's moving along without our supervision at this point, other than the status updates every thirty days.

Copper Ridge. I issued the decision.
We just received the exceptions. Now we're waiting for the responses to the exceptions, which are due at the end of this month. So that will be on your agenda for December for a decision.

In Fischer Land Development, I granted a stay. They filed a joint status report asking continue of the stay. They say they've come to an agreement in principle, and they asked for an additional extension. I gave them until the 4 th.

And $I$ apologize. They did give an update yesterday, but $I$ don't know what it is yet. So I have wait for Aleshia to get back here, because $I$ was out of the office doing stuff all day yesterday, so $I$ haven't seen it yet. But they have given me an update essentially explaining -I asked them why they needed more time, and so they have filed that update, $I$ know, but $I$ can't tell you what it says right at this moment. So I can give you an update on that a little bit later in the meeting.

Wagoner Family. They have indicated that they need a stay because they're close to settling. I issued the stay. They filed a status report, and their next one is due next week. So they're continuing to update me on this, getting their settlement details worked out.

Little Bear. There is a scheduling order in place. They have filed a stipulated extension for deadiines, which $I$ granted. It was just a few of the procedural deadiines, so overall
that scheduling order is in place, and they're working towards it.

Moving on to Section (2) (a), first we have the Absaloka Mine. This is MEIC and the Sierra Club case that's in the Supreme Court that we're waiting on an answer before that can proceed. And $I$ don't know if DEQ wants to note where that is in the Supreme Court process now. Ed, do you know?

MR. HAYES: Madam, Chair, Board members, that matter is before the Montana Supreme Court and is undergoing briefing, and will be heard in due course there. I really don't have much of an update in terms of expectations and timing.

MS. CLERGET: Next we have (2) (b) is Signal Peak. I issued a scheduling order. There is an ongoing proceeding regarding a motion to quash a subpoena that's being litigated in District Court, and the underlying case before the Board is stayed while that occurs.

They filed summary judgment on that, and that's in the middle of briefing, so $I$ don't have a timeline on that, but it is not going to be immediate. That will continue for awhile.

And for Western Energy and Rosebud, this
one $I$ did the hearing. They have now submitted their exceptions and their responses, so this one is due for a decision from me, and I'll get that done as soon as $I$ can, but that was a four day hearing, so it's substantial.

CHAIR DEVENY: Is it possible we'll see that in February?

MS. CLERGET: Possible. It will depend on how fast $I$ can get out the order, and then we have to give them time for exceptions. So possible. I don't want to say probable, but possible.

And Montanore, we just did summary judgment. I issued an order granting partial summary judgment, and we had a scheduling conference, put a scheduling order in place for the remainder of the case, which is set for a two day hearing on December 3 rd and 4 th. So after that we'll have post hearing briefings, and then we'll have the decision, and then there will be exceptions, so that's going to be a bit before you guys see it, but it is coming to a head.

So Laurel Refinery. We had a scheduling conference about this case, because I needed the parties to explain to me so that $I$ can explain to
you why they need an additional stay, and they explained to me that this appeal began with six distinct issues. We're down to one.

And there is currently a modification for the permit that is the subject of the appeal out for a public comment right now, and so depending on how that modification goes, it may moot some of the issues in this case, and then there is also some potential rulemaking that may moot some of the issues in the case.

So the additional stay -- also the parts of the permit that this case affects don't go into effect until November of 2019, and if the modification goes through, they wouldn't go into effect until $I$ think it's 2020. So we have time, is the point, that a stay is not changing anything substantive for this permit. So that's why there is an additional stay which $I$ granted, set for six months.

Golden West Properties. This is the one that we consolidated at the last meeting, and in the intervening time, one of the parties moved for dismissal, leaving only Mr. Weyer's appeal to continue. He has gotten Counsel, and there is a scheduling order in place at this point.

And then (3) (a) is for $D E Q$ to update.
MS. BOWERS: Members of the Board, there is not much of an update on -- I'm Kirsten Bowers, attorney for DEQ. There is not much to update on the Western Energy appeal that is currently before the Supreme Court. We're briefing the case, and the reply briefs are due October 25 th.

So after that, the case will be fully briefed, and then we'll wait to see if the Court wants oral argument, and wait for our decision.

And then $I$ just wanted to clarify the non-enforcement case (2) (a), it's this case, this Western Energy case, that Westmoreland, they appealed their MPDES permit, and then that appeal was stayed. They're waiting for the decision in the Western Energy case because there are similar issues. So as soon as we get the decision, we will file a status report on the Westmoreland Absaloka Mine case.

MS. CLERGET: I think that completes the contested case update.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Do Board members have any questions?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Next is our action items,
and we have some air quality rules to either appeal, amend, or adopt, or reject. So if we could have a presentation from someone from the Air Quality Bureau.

MS. ULRICH: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the board. My name is Liz Ulrich, and I'm the Supervisor of the Analysis and Planning Section of the Department's Air Quality Bureau.

I'm here to request that the Board adopt the proposed amendments to the air quality operating fees as established in Section 17.8.505 of the Administrative Rules of Montana.

The Department requested the Board initiate rulemaking at the June 8 th Board of Environmental Review meeting. At that meeting we proposed that the Board initiate rulemaking to increase the operation fee for facilities that register in lieu of a permit from $\$ 800$ to $\$ 900$.

In addition for those facilities that require Montana air quality or Title 5 operating permits, the Department proposed the Board increase the administrative fee from $\$ 800$ to $\$ 900$, and the per ton fee from $\$ 38.24$ per ton up to an amount not to exceed $\$ 45.37$ per ton of emissions. During this meeting, we also committed
to the Board that we would continue to evaluate our program's financial situation, and engage stakeholders before proposing a final operation fee for the Board's consideration.

So since that June 8 th Board meeting, State fiscal year 2018 concluded, we have a better understanding of the amount of federal grant and State General Fund currently available for air quality activities. We completed our annual emission inventory process, and we have continued to engage stakeholders.

The Board held a public hearing on July 13th, 2018 to consider the proposed amendments of the air quality operating fees. The Department provided comments in support of the proposed rule, with revised amounts for the oil and gas registration fee of $\$ 850$, and the per ton operation fee of $\$ 44.35$ for those facilities that hold a Montana air quality or Title 5 operating permit.

This increase would allow the Department's Air Quality Bureau to collect sufficient revenue to support the appropriate implementation of the Air Quality Program.

In addition to the Department's comments
at the public hearing, the Board received two comments that indicated while regulated entities do not want to increase the operating fees, they do understand sufficient fees are necessary to enable the Department to continue implementing the Air Quality Program. The regulated entities appreciated the Department's engagement through the stakeholder process, and wish to be included in future fee discussions.

In response to these comments, we are currently forming a work group that will work to develop a fee structure that will be sustainable into the future. If approved by the Board, these amounts will be used to calculate the operation fees assessed to facilities in November 2018. We request that the Board adopt the operating fees as proposed in the notice of amendment. Thank you. Are there any questions? CHAIR DEVENY: Do Board members have questions?

MS. HANSON: I think just can you clarify for a second. You said you're going to develop a work committee, so you're asking for us to adopt these as is, but a work committee is going to be what looks at it just for the future
after this?
MS. ULRICH: Yes. We understand that as a whole, a per ton fee may not be the best sustainable into the future, so we have some stakeholders that we've asked, and that have volunteered to help us out, and we're still recruiting, to look at what we could do in the future through our Clean Air Act Advisory Committee.

CHAIR DEVENY: Are there any other questions by Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any public comments?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: No comments from the public. With that, would the Board like to entertain a motion?

MS. HANSON: So moved.
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion to adopt the amendments and the air quality operation fees as proposed by DEQ. The motion has been made and that's going to --

MR. DEARMENT: I'll second.
CHAIR DEVENY: There's a second. Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those in favor of the motion before us, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion passes. Thank
you. And next on the agenda we have some more information from $D E Q$ on additional Air Quality Bureau rules that will be coming before the Board, so if we could have a brief presentation on that.

MS. HARBAGE: Good morning, Madam Chair, Board members. For the record, my name is Rebecca Harbage. I'm an Air Quality Planner with the Department's Air Quality Bureau. I'm also the project manager for the team of air quality professionals, some of whom are in the room today, who are working to develop a new registration program for portable sources of emissions.

So as it says on the agenda, that would be a transition from case-by-case permitting to air quality registration program for those sources.

So today $I$ just want to provide you with a really quick briefing on the upcoming rulemaking
that we will be bringing before the Board related to that project. I don't have slides or anything, but $I$ do want to split this into three sections, just to give it some structure.

So first I'm going to start out with talking about why we're talking about developing a registration program; second, what exactly are we proposing that we do differently to change the way we work; and then how to do we propose that we get there.

First of all, because this is a relatively big project for us, we're really changing the way that we think about how we work. We really want to get here before the Board today in advance of going into the details of rulemaking, so that we can give you some context that hopefully will be helpful as this project moves forward.

The first thing $I$ want to start to tell you about was why we're here today talking about a registration program for portable sources. Over the last few decades of permitting sources, a lot has changed in the world of air quality. When things change, it makes a lot of sense to adjust the way that we do our work to adapt to those
changes.
One example of that is that when oil and gas well development took off in eastern Montana, the Legislature adjusted our idea of permitting as usual for air quality sources by authorizing the Board in 75-2-234, Montana Code Annotated, to adopt a registration program in lieu of case-by-case permitting.

That registration program for oil and gas well facilities enabled the Department to effectively deal with hundreds of very similar permit applications that were coming in the door, and it allowed us to do it in a way that was administratively efficient, and still protected air quality at the same level.

Today we're in a similar situation, and you just heard from Liz who talked about how we are evaluating the way we do our work, and trying to work within our means. So although we do not have hundreds of new applications coming in the door, we are currently having to stretch our resources in both staff time and funding to cover the workload that we do have.

What we really need to do is figure out a way to continue to do the work that we do
protecting air quality, but do it in a more efficient manner. And so in other words, we need to figure out how to use our limited resources strategically to get the most environmental benefit out of those resources.

You've probably heard a little bit in the past at Board meetings about this registration program. We've been thinking about it for awhile. Over the last ten or fifteen years, the Air Quality Bureau identified portable source permitting as an area in which we could become more efficient.

Really over the last couple years, this has risen to the top of our priorities, and over the last just about a year, we've been working specifically on this program with stakeholders.

The bottom line is that we've been permitting portable sources the same way for a very long time, and so $I$ just want to pause for a minute. When $I$ talk about portable sources, what I'm really talking about are three specific source categories that we consider portable because they're able to move around the state.

They include crushing and screening operations, concrete batch plants and asphalt
plants. Combined, these three source categories make up more than half, 55 percent, of all of our active Montana air quality permits. What that means is it takes considerable staff time in the Air Quality Bureau to process permit applications for these sources, although really they're relative minor compared to a lot of other source categories.

Currently the Administrative Rules adopted under the Clean Air Act of Montana require the owners or operators of portable sources to obtain a permit, an air quality permit, prior to construction or operation. Similar to other source categories, when a permit application comes in, DEQ performs a case-by-case analysis of the emissions, and the potential environmental impacts that may result from operation of equipment at that facility.

Based on that case-by-case analysis, the permit may require certain emission limitations, or the operation of appropriate control technology. So specific examples for one of these source categories, at a concrete batch plant, a DEQ permit may require the operation of dust suppression, so that might include a baghouse or
water spray bars for a concrete batch plant.
Over many years of permitting portable sources in Montana, we've found that this case-by-case analysis has resulted in almost identical requirements and permit conditions that vary very little from facility to facility within these source categories.

In other words, we have permitting staff who are spending a lot of time doing a case-by-case analysis for portable sources, when really the result of that analysis is very likely to be identical for any crushing and screening operation, any concrete batch plant, any asphalt plant.

Not only are those control requirements nearly identical within each source category, they also haven't changed in the last few decades of permitting. The result of that is that we essentially know what the permit conditions will be before we ever get an application in the door; but the process of coming to that conclusion and finalizing a permit can take up to three months.

So what can we do differently to get more efficient in this process? As I mentioned earlier, 75-2-234, MCA, allows the Board to adopt
a registration program in lieu of case-by-case permitting. Registration in lieu of permitting is proper for source categories where there are a large number of very similar sources with identical requirements, and for which there is no substantial benefit from individual permitting.

As I mentioned earlier, oil and gas well facilities were one such source category, and the Board adopted a registration program for those facilities in 2006. Portable sources like I'm talking about today also fit into such source categories.

A new registration program would allow that the owners or operators of portable sources could register their operations with the Department instead of submitting a permit application, having that process, and then getting a permit.

The owner or operator of a portable source, in order to register, would still be required to submit the same type of information that they currently submit in a permit application.

They would also, once registered, still be required to follow the same rules of operation
that are very similar to their current permit conditions. Those rules of operation would require things like emission limits, air pollution control equipment installation and operation, and other things like requirements for testing, monitoring and reporting.

So essentially the control requirements that are now included as permit conditions would instead be adopted into Administrative Rules, that would then apply to all portable sources across the source category. By registering their requirement with the Department, the owners or operators of those sources would be certifying that the operation of their equipment would comply with the applicable rules and regulations.

What $I$ really want to stress in this is that transitioning from case-by-case permitting to registration would not significantly change the requirements that apply to these sources. What it would change would be the process by which those requirements are applied, so by rule rather than permit.

The new registration program would streamline that process, and it would reduce the administrative burden and the time commitment for
both Air Quality Bureau staff and the owners and operators of portable sources. This would allow the Air Quality Bureau to refocus our time on areas where we get more environmental benefit, such as, for example, major sources, or spending time providing education and compliance assistance in the field.

So that's what we want to do, but how do we get there, and who is involved in that process? The Air Quality Bureau, our project team has been working very closely with a variety of stakeholders over the course of the last year. We've been working with stakeholders within the agency, as well as outside of State government, to develop a registration program for these sources that we believe is going to be appropriate and effective in protecting air quality.

Over the last year, we've had conversations with stakeholders, including our Clean Air Act Advisory Committee, the Opencut Section stakeholders, the Montana Contractors Association, environmental groups, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Out of those conversations, we've formed a technical working group comprised of
representatives from the industry who could help us work through the details of how a portable registration program might actually work for those sources.

Internally we've coordinated with the Opencut Section. There is a lot of crossover in those sources, and how they are permitted in the Department; as well as our own Oil and Gas Services Section, because they have experience with the registration program.

We have additional meetings with all of these stakeholders planned over the next couple of months. And I'm really here today because we feel like we're just about ready to move this project forward into a more formal process to propose the new registration program.

As it says in the agenda, development of this program will take the form of new Administrative Rules. At the Board's December 7 th meeting, the Air Quality Bureau plans to ask the Board to initiate rulemaking on new and revised Administrative Rules to adopt a new registration program for portable sources.

These rules would provide both the process through which eligible portable sources
will be required to register, as well as the control requirements that would apply to them once they're registered.

As I said, we have additional
stakeholder meetings planned over the next couple of months before we get to that December meeting. We do have rules drafted at this time, but they're currently being reviewed by our stakeholders, so I'll be able to provide you with more detail on the specifics of what goes in those rules in December, but if you do have questions today, I'm available to answer them as well. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. We'll be hearing more. Do Board members have questions right now?

MR. DEARMENT: Madam Chair, yes, one quick question. Ms. Harbage, you make a very compelling case for the registration program. I'm just wondering if DEQ or your stakeholders groups have come upon any down sides or major stumbling blocks you have had to work through during the process.

MS. HARBAGE: Madam Chair, Mr. Dearment. That's a very good question. I would say we haven't had any major stumbling blocks. The one
interesting part about this that we have discovered and worked through is when we look at portable sources, they're a little different than stationary sources, in that they do move around the state. So it has just been a really fun challenge for us to try to figure out how to appropriately register sources when they don't stay in one place. But we've worked through it, and we've had a lot of help from our stakeholders addressing that.

MR. DEARMENT: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: John.
MR. FELTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. It strikes me that one of the things that differentiates when you might need a more unique permit versus a registration process is the amount of variability in the process.

So with those three primary sources you identified, do they basically do everything the same way at all these sites?

MS. HARBAGE: Madam Chair, Mr. Felton.
Yes. So crushing and screening operations are generally doing the same thing. When we look at air pollution, the air pollution sources at those facilities are generally almost identical. They
may have more crushers at one site and fewer screens on another site, for example. The same goes for asphalt plants and concrete batch plants.

We're pretty confident that the control requirements that would apply to any crushing and screening operation or the other two would be appropriate for any of them.

MR. FELTON: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions?
Dexter.
MR. DEXTER: One real quick. Are you talking about three registration programs for the individual source, or one registration for all three?

MS. HARBAGE: Madam Chair, Mr. Busby, that's a good clarifying question. Currently we have drafted rules that would basically set up one registration program, but then there would be some specific requirements that would apply to the different source categories.

MR. BUSBY: Just one program?
MS . HARBAGE: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Anything else?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. I think we
had a couple of new folks that came into the room since we went around and introduced ourselves. Would they care to state their name just so we know who is all here.

MR. COLEMAN: Sure. I'm Ed Coleman, I'm the Bureau Chief over at DEQ Coal and Opencut Mining Bureau.

MR. ANDERSON: Chad Anderson,
Enforcement Program Manager.
CHAIR DEVENY: So I guess we should have some public comment on that last presentation. Was there anybody in the public that wanted to comment on the presentation that we just heard? Anybody on the phone?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, we'll move on. Welcome. Come on in. Would you state your name, please, and who you represent.

MR. MEYER: My name is John Meyer. I'm here for the ORW petition.

CHAIR DEVENY: Just in time. We're just getting ready to get to that. So our next agenda item is the petition for rulemaking that the Board received from the Cottonwood Environmental Law Center and the Gallatin Wildlife Association. And

I would refer you to the information in our packet that our Board attorney prepared for us.

And with that, Sarah, would you like to review your memo with the Board.

MS. CLERGET: Sure. First before we start, $I$ want to remind everybody of where we are in the process, and $I$ think if it is all right with you, Madam Chair, we might like to have DEQ and Cottonwood come up, so that they're ready to talk about this. If you guys want to come and sit at the tables.

So a reminder of where we are in this process. At the last meeting, the Board indicated that they moved past the initial phase to determine whether there was sufficient information in the application.

The next stage is to decide whether you intend to adopt the petition. If you do, then it needs to go out for -- we need to write a proposed decision, which then goes out for public comment through the regular public comment period, published in the newspaper, all that sort of thing. And then we respond to those comments that we receive, and then issue a final decision on the adoption of the petition.

If you choose to reject the petition, then you have to issue a written decision stating the reasons for your decision to reject.

At the last meeting you asked me to provide you a memo with a recommendation. In order to do that, $I$ asked DEQ and Cottonwood both to provide me with memos, and both of those memos are in your packet, in addition to the communication back and forth between me and Cottonwood and DEQ.

The intention with that -- This is not a contested case. This is an entirely different thing under its own statutory regime. So the purpose of that was so that you guys understand what has gone on in the intervening time.

Also I thought the questions and email correspondence were helpful in addition to what was in the memos. So that's everything that was in your packet.

Then you have a memo from me with a recommendation that goes through the factors that you have to consider in the statute, based on the memos that have been given by both -- I'm going to refer to them as parties out of habit, but by that reference, $I$ don't mean to indicate that this is a
contested case. It's just meant to indicate that they are people who are here to talk about this. And so I go through, based on their memos, the factors in 75-5-316 that you have to consider, one through three -- this is what I'm looking at, Page 2 of my memo -- one through three are things you must consider. They're conjunctive so you have to consider all of those things.

So your ultimate decision can be based on even just one factor that's contained in the Section 4 analysis, we call it, which is the big list of "A" through "F." So those are not conjunctive, meaning that not all of those have to be present.

So as I said in my memo, this standard is a preponderance of the evidence standard, which means that essentially you have to have 51 percent, you have to be 51 percent convinced by the evidence.

So there has to be a preponderance of the evidence that the section of the Gallatin that Cottonwood has petitioned to be designated an Outstanding Resource Water is an Outstanding Resource Water, that's one; has a risk of having one or more of the Section 4 criteria compromised
as a result of pollution; and that that class is necessary because there is no effective process that could otherwise address it.

Based on that, on my analysis, that that preponderance has not been met. There is not a preponderance of the evidence to indicate that those three factors are met; and therefore, it's my recommendation that you reject the petition.

If you choose to take my recommendation, you can adopt some or all of this memo as your written decision, or modify it as you see fit.

If you do not agree with that recommendation, then you'll need to write, or probably instruct me to write your own proposed decision, and outline why it is that you believe these factors have been met by a preponderance standard.

So I think if you would like to hear from the parties to answer questions. I'm happy to answer any questions that there are about my memo, but the parties are obviously here as well to answer questions, since they I'm sure have responses to my memo as well.

CHAIR DEVENY: Hopefully we've all read the memo. So $I$ think I'd like to hear from

Cottonwood at this point to see what they have to say, and then we'll take questions of the Board, both to Sarah and to Mr. Meyer. And then DEQ is here as a resource as well.

MR. MEYER: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. I haven't seen the memo, so I'm not quite sure what we're referring to in terms of any analysis that the attorney for the Board may have done, so $I$ really can't speak very -- at all to that memo. So you guys obviously know more than me. Do you have questions out of the gate, maybe in terms of your decision, based on the memo that was never provided?

CHAIR DEVENY: Sarah, do you have any response in regards to the memo?

MS. CLERGET: I would just like to indicate that, as you can see from the communication, it was clear that this was happening at the meeting today, and the memo was included in the Board packet that was posted publicly a week ago, and so it is available and has been available.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Maybe somebody can provide --
(Document provided)

MR. MEYER: Thank you for providing that.

So as you may know, we've already been here before. In 2000, there was a group called the American Wildlands that petitioned the Board to designate the Gallatin River, this exact section, as an Outstanding Resource Water.

The Board accepted the petition, accepted public comment, and ultimately the Montana Department of Environmental Quality prepared an Environmental Impact Statement. And before it accepted, before it issued a Record of Decision that would have adopted or proposed the Montana Legislature adopting this section as an Outstanding Resource Water, a final decision was never made.

So we've already been here before. The only thing that's changed, there's two things that have changed. One thing that is the Montana Department of Environmental Quality has issued numeric criteria for nutrients, which means that -- do you guys understand what that means? It basically says you can only discharge "X" number of nitrogen and phosphorus or whatever -- and before it was a narrative standard.

So the Montana Department of Environmental Quality is now saying that standard is more stringent, and that is going to protect the river more. And what has changed is that not only has the Montana DEQ issued a numeric criteria, but it's also issued what's called a Circular -- is it 12B?

MS. CLERGET: There is a 12A and 12B.
MR. MEYER: So the 12A is a numeric
criteria, and the 12 B is the variances. And so my understanding is that there are at least one lawsuit, if not several, against Montana DEQ for issuing variances to several potential pollutants. And so the thought of this numeric criteria somehow protecting the Gallatin River is directly undermined by the fact that the DEQ has been issuing variances to several potential dischargers in the past.

The other issue that needs to be considered is pharmaceuticals. The attorney for the Montana Department of Environmental Quality sent the Board attorney a memo or a handout from the EPA expressing concern regarding pharmaceuticals. Did you guys get that?

MS. CLERGET: It is in the materials, yes.

MR. MEYER: What did you guys think about that?

CHAIR DEVENY: You can continue with your statement.

MR. MEYER: Well, there are several people across the state of Montana that are concerned that the Gallatin River is going to be polluted with pharmaceuticals. There are no numeric criteria to protect the Gallatin River from pharmaceuticals; is that correct, attorney?

MS. CLERGET: This is your argument, so I'm going to let you make your argument.

MR. MEYER: We're not arguing because we're not parties contesting any issue.

MS. CLERGET: It is not my position to advise you or your client, so $I$ would prefer that you make your statement, and unless there is a question about the Board's obligation, I'll answer that.

MR. MEYER: So the US Forest Service has stated that the Gallatin River is an outstanding scenic resource, so you meet the criteria right there. The federal government said as much; is that correct?

MS. CLERGET: It is true that under Section 75-5-316(4) (c), it has been designated an outstanding recreational fishery, if that's what you're referring to. It has not been designated wild and scenic.

MR. MEYER: A wild and scenic designation protects the Gallatin River from dams. It does not protect the Gallatin River from pollution. Those are two separate things. There is no proposal to dam the Gallatin River.

The Big Sky Water and Sewer District has in its meeting minutes, and has evidently issued a notice of request for qualifications from engineering firms that would design and develop a pipeline to discharge treated waste water into the Gallatin River; is that correct?

MS. CLERGET: I am uncomfortable with you putting me in the position of confirming your facts. I have stated the position in the memo. I think if you have additional argument, you need to make it, and I'm not going to make it for you.

MR. MEYER: I'm not asking you to make my argument. I'm asking you whether or not it is true that the Big Sky Water and Sewer District has issued a request for qualifications from
engineering firms to manufacture a pipeline to discharge treated waste water into the Gallatin River.

MS. CLERGET: The RFP or the equivalent that has been put out by the Big Sky Water and Sewer District was discussed in your memo and in my memo.

MR. MEYER: So the US Forest Service has said this is an Outstanding Resource Water. People come here from all over the world to fish this area. People come here from all over the world, from all over the state of Montana, all over the country to go whitewater rafting in this area. I've not talked to a single person that wants to swim in the Gallatin River, fish in the Gallatin River, if there is treated waste water being discharged into there.

The last time $I$ was here someone said, "Are you anti-development?" I'm clean water. I want clean water. I think everyone here wants clean water. If wanting clean water means I'm anti-development, then $I$ guess yes, that means $I$ am anti-development, because I'm clean water. If you have no other questions, I'll sit down.

CHAIR DEVENY: We may have questions of
you for sure. Board members, questions of Sarah in regards to her memo, or questions of Mr. Meyer?

MR. DEARMENT: I have one, Madam Chair.
Question for Ms. Clerget.
So if I understand correctly, we have something of a precedent here, which a previous Board moved forward with this, 2002 or whenever it was. It seems to me that the situation now is largely the same as it was then, as the river is not listed as wild and scenic, there is no endangered species, and so on.

The difference perhaps between now and then is that the Circular 12 A has come out, and we have the numeric nutrient standards that we didn't have then, and that's sort of the major difference between now and the previous effort; is that a reasonable summary?

MS. CLERGET: I think probably the specific words that the Board used previously were that they were concerned about nutrient loads, which $I$ think that not only the Circular 12 A and 12B, but also the changes to the MPDES permitting process that have occurred in the intervening time would be an additional difference.

MR. DEARMENT: Okay. I guess what I'm
getting at is I appreciate your memo and generally agree with it. I'm wondering, just procedurally, given Cottonwood's concerns about pharmaceuticals and the growing awareness of pharmaceuticals, our options right now are we could just end this essentially, or we can give notice of our intent to accept, and have a public comment period.

I'm wondering, just as discussion for the Board, if we think there is any value in allowing that public process to proceed for another month or so, and seeing if there is anybody else out there who supports this idea, and doing a more thorough job of vetting concerns from other members of the community in the Big Sky area.

I'm not necessarily advocating that we do so, just more trying to -- I'm curious what my other Board members think about continuing that process for another month or so during this comment period.

CHAIR DEVENY: I was kind of thinking along those same lines, too. And to me the significant difference between what the previous Board approved, as Sarah described, was the nutrient loading that at that time was numerical,
as was brought up, but now is a specific number. And so that's probably not the big concern at this point, at least from a point source type of pollutant.

The concept of emerging chemicals, emerging pharmaceuticals as an emerging pollutant, pharmaceuticals and other personal care products, is something that is kind of cutting edge right now, and is becoming more and more -- we're becoming more and more aware of the potential that that could possibly have an aquatic life.

And while the science isn't really solid on that yet, the memo from EPA makes it pretty clear that there is a real need for more research and work on that, and even in the RFQ that the water and sewer district put out, they directed their engineering firm to look at potential treatment for that in the future, knowing that the technology doesn't exist these days, but that someday it may need to.

And so there is a recognition out there.
And I think if you look at the purpose of the Outstanding Resource Water designation by the Legislature, it is one of the few pieces of legislation that is there to sort of preempt
anything from happening.
Most of the other legislation that's out there is really sort of preventative in a way, but if something happens, then there is ways to correct. But this is sort of a preventative precautionary measure.

And $I$ think that the issue of pharmaceuticals to me is enough to maybe move along to that next step, to get some more input from the public, to see where other people in the Big Sky area in particular, what their thoughts are on this. We really haven't heard much except from the Petitioner. There hasn't been a lot of public comment on our deliberations here.

So that's kind of where $I$ was leaning, too, John. And I don't know if other members have thoughts.

MR. BUSBY: I would like to hear if DEQ has any comments before we go any further.

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, I'm Kirsten Bowers, DEQ attorney. And in general, DEQ agrees with the Board attorney's recommendation. The petitioned stretch of the Gallatin River does meet the Outstanding Resource Water criteria as an outstanding fishery, and it
meets the criteria with regard to other important environmental and economic factors, including recreational use of the river.

And $I$ do think the difference between the 2006 petition to the Board from American Wildlands and this current petition is that DEQ has numeric nutrient standards which would be incorporated in an MPDES permit for a point source. Those standards are designed to protect the beneficial uses including the fishery, and recreational use of the water.

And it would be unlikely that a new point source discharger would be granted a variance from those standards, because the discharge is to high quality water, and existing beneficial uses have to be protected.

So DEQ is also concerned about pharmaceutical pollution, as those are emerging issues of concern with regard to pharmaceuticals, and also certain personal care products. And you're correct there are no water quality standards designed to protect beneficial uses from those types of pollutants, and so there are no standards that can be incorporated in a permit.

Most permits do have a reopener
provisions if in the future there are water quality standards, and there is a reasonable potential that a discharger could violate those standards.

So I guess the bottom line for DEQ is the petitioned section is an Outstanding Resource Water. It is of high economic and environmental value to the State of Montana. But there isn't the required showing of necessity to protect the waters beyond the available processes, which are MPDES permitting and application of the State's nondegradation policy.

CHAIR DEVENY: Does that answer your question?

MR. DEXTER: It pretty much does personalize. Can $I$ make a couple of comments on this myself?

CHAIR DEVENY: Sure.
MR. DEXTER: I tend to agree with DEQ on this thing, that pharmaceuticals is going to be a problem in the future. While it is there today, we have no way of addressing it through regulation until such criteria and methods of treatment have been proven.

So I'm not sure we can address
pharmaceuticals, and I'm not sure what -- Big Sky is sitting up there -- what they can do to address pharmaceuticals. So are we getting the cart ahead of the horse here? We can't protect the water, or we can't protect Big Sky, because that economic development is probably just as big as the fishery. So are we going to damage one or the other? I don't like those choices.

CHAIR DEVENY: Other comments by Board members. John.

MR. FELTON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
This strikes me as a little bit like the pharmaceutical concern, which I absolutely share, is a little bit in my mind like the earlier application when there were no nutrient standards. Nutrients were identified as a concern, but there were no standards. And so perhaps at that time there was a different view of it.

I think it does evolve, and it makes me -- I've been uncomfortable as well to essentially kind of defacto set some rule when that hasn't been done. It looks to me like the accept or reject petition is really on the three factors that were outlined in the memo, and I'm not sure that we should be sort of creating new factors
outside those rule or statutory guidelines.
CHAIR DEVENY: Are there other comments by the Board?

MR. DEARMENT: Madam Chair, perhaps a question of Mr. Meyer, please. Madam Chair, Mr. Meyer, we have a letter from American Rivers in our packet signed by Scott Bosse, which pertains to the previous attempt of this, where he says groups that were -- the petition was withdrawn.

And he says, "Groups that were previously at loggerheads over the ORW proposal -conservation organizations, developers, local property owners, and the Big Sky Water and Sewer District -- join together to pursue a more collaborative approach at protecting water quality in the upper Gallatin River." That process continues today, does it not?

MR. MEYER: My understanding is that the Wastewater Solutions Forum has come to an end. They could never agree on whether or not a pipeline should be built into the Gallatin River to discharge treated wastewater.

MR. DEARMENT: It's my understanding that a new version of that had formed, and was still trying to address that. But regardless, are
you in contact with some of these other groups? Do you have any -- If we were to extend a comment period on this, do you anticipate those groups coming together to support this, or are they still kind of trying this collaborative approach working with Big Sky? Do you have any knowledge of that, where we might end up?

MR. MEYER: I don't want to speculate. I will add on a completely separate note that the memo $I$ believe says there are no endangered species in the Gallatin River. MCA 75-5-316(3) (c) (d), the presence of endangered or threatened species in the water. It says no.

And there was a petition to list Arctic Grayling as an endangered species. The US Fish and Wildlife Service denied the petition to list Arctic Grayling as an endangered species. They went up to Court in the Ninth Circuit, and the Ninth Circuit rejected US Fish and Wildife Service's decision not to list Arctic Grayling as threatened or an endangered species.

So that means that Arctics are still a proposed species for listing as being threatened or endangered.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other comments or
questions by Board members?
MS. HANSON: I think my questions fell in line in terms of that Wastewater Solutions Forum, and where that was. And it looks like it, reading it, that there was even a study that was put out. And so I feel like we're missing some pieces of the puzzle on where this kind of broke down, and where those groups are at right now. MR. DEARMENT: I guess I was -- and again, $I$ 'm not advocating for this at the moment, just as part of a conversation -- thinking about a comment period would give us a chance to hear from them, if they would like to either support or oppose this. And just wondering to give this sort of the maximum benefit of the doubt while it is before us, and give it as much of a chance as possible.

Is there any value in giving notice of an intent to adopt this, giving that comment period a chance to play out, and then seeing where we are and what we know at the end of it?

CHAIR DEVENY: I think there is some merit in that. And the other thing we need to be aware of is if we go ahead with the public comment period, $I$ believe -- and Sarah, correct me if I'm
wrong -- after that public comment period, we come back and make a decision whether to continue or not.

MS. CLERGET: Yes, that's correct.
CHAIR DEVENY: So there is that point. And if we decide to continue at that point, then there is the EIS, and there is a point after the EIS where the Board has a decision to decide whether to recommend. And then if that continues, there is yet another process. It has to go through the Legislature.

So any action we take today, if we take action to further ahead, is not a definitive commitment on the part of this Board that we're necessarily in full agreement that the designation should occur. It does merely kind of broaden the opportunity for the public to weigh in on this, and we would maybe find out what these other groups are considering.

MS. HANSON: I'm not sure I fully understand that. From the standpoint $I$ guess of today, would we then -- would you have to accept it to move it to that, or could we just -- Is it just saying we want one more month to allow more people to speak on this topic?

MS. CLERGET: It is up to you. If you want to put this out for a formal public comment period, which is what is contemplated by the statute, we have to issue a proposed written decision.

So I need guidance from you guys about what you want in the written decision, which $I$ will then do, and then that -- and practically what we could do is $I$ can write it, and give it to the Board Chair for her to confirm that it does reflect what you guys talked about today, and then we can put it out for public comment, which means newspaper notification, and sending it to interested parties.

And then we could, if you would prefer, set the public hearing for in front of the Board at the next meeting, rather than me doing a public hearing, as we would often with proposed rulemaking separately. Then we'd need to get comments, you would have to put a comment period in, we have to get written comments, and those written comments have to be responded to in writing, and put together a proposed decision, which then the Board would vote on.
MS. HANSON: In doing that today, I
think somebody used the language, and I may not be totally correct on this, but used the language of "intent to accept," but you could also do an intent to decline, and open it up for a public hearing.

MS. CLERGET: The statute doesn't contemplate that, but $I$ don't think it prevents it. So if you wanted to do that, that's another option as well.

Since the statute is not specific on that, it sounds to me like what you're contemplating is potentially just putting off a decision on whether you intend to accept or deny it until the next meeting to perhaps allow other people to weigh in on that decision, without -- it would essentially be adding a step to what the statute contemplates, which is not going to harm anybody's due process. It doesn't hurt anything to add additional steps. So I don't think the statute precludes that, if you wanted to.

CHAIR DEVENY: Another question, Sarah.
With regard to the hearing, does that have to come before the Board, or could we assign you as the Hearings Officer to run it, to run a hearing? Say if it were held in Big $S k y$, for example.

MS. CLERGET: Yes, you can designate it to me if you want to. The same way we would do any other kind of rules hearing.

CHAIR DEVENY: That's an interesting option you sort of raised.

MS. HANSON: I mean I guess kind of jumping off of what John said earlier, in reading the memo, $I$ don't know that $I$ stand on the side of intent to accept when $I$ don't think that it right now meets, without more information and guidance maybe, what is laid out that needs to be met to accept it.

So I guess $I$ tend more towards an intent to decline with what's already been written in the memo, and the thought process of saying, "If you disagree with this, bring more information." But that's my take.

MR. BUSBY: I have another comment that's really triggered by that. We've only seen one person, and this thing has been noticed several times at our meetings, three at least. I don't see any overwhelming support from the community of Big Sky for this particular petition, since it has been out there for several months, potential of it. I'd have a hard time --

I support Sarah's thing. I'd have a hard time saying we should spend any more time and effort on it without a big showing from the community, because we don't know what harm could come to the community because of the wastewater issue.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'm not sure that a lot of people go online and read our agenda either. That's another --

MR. MEYER: If I may.
CHAIR DEVENY: Excuse me. Hillary, you had a --

MS. HANSON: I just have another
question. What does happen if we decide? If the folks in Big Sky said, "Wait a second. We didn't know about this. We wanted to know about it," can they bring it forward again?

MS. CLERGET: They could bring their own petition if they wanted to for sure, and it would go through the same process as this did.

MS. HANSON: So it doesn't close the door? That's what $I$ was trying to ask.

CHAIR DEVENY: And so along those lines, if we wanted to open up that -- did somebody on the phone just say something?

MR. TWEETEN: Yes, Madam Chair, this is Chris Tweeten. I wonder if you can hear me. CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, we can now. Hi, Chris. Welcome.

MR. TWEETEN: I've been listening and biding my time here for the last hour or so, I guess. I share the concern that's been expressed that moving this process forward to public comment and public hearing without adopting some sort of a resolution of intention to accept the petition seems to me to be contrary to the statute. And I don't know that we can add a step.

We could carry it over to the next meeting, and issue some sort of a notice inviting members of the public to come and talk to us about this before proceeding to the notion, to the idea of intending to adopt.

But I'm persuaded by Sarah's memo that it wouldn't be appropriate for us to state an intention to adopt a petition at the current time because those nutrients, or those pollutants that the current $E P A$ regulations control, it seems to me, are addressed by the existing procedures for the discharge permit that the Big Sky Water and Sewer District may be pursuing.

And the pollutant that the petitioner seems to be concerned about is not one that has been identified in State law as being a pollutant that's subject to control by regulation.

And so what essentially is being asked of us is if we preempt all development in a particular corridor of the Gallatin River until such time as pharmaceuticals and other personal care products are identified as a pollutant, and some measure for controlling those pollutants would exist under State law.

So it is kind of in the nature of a preliminary injunction that would say Big Sky can't proceed with its treatment plant proposal because of the fact that we've identified this as an Outstanding Resource Water, and I'm just not comfortable doing that under the current showing that's been made.

There is no conclusive evidence that has been presented to us so far that some violation of an existing water quality standard is going to happen if the designation is not made. And that's one of the criteria that we have to find in order to adopt a resolution of the intention to accept the petition.

So I think Sarah's point was better in her memorandum than $I$ just did, but $I$ am persuaded by Sarah's memorandum that it would be premature for us to designate this in the current situation. And then that's without prejudice. I mean anybody can come back at some point in the future when scientific knowledge has advanced and circumstances have changed.

And in the meantime, the Petitioners, or people who support them, can take it up with DEQ in the permitting process. They could petition DEQ for the adoption of regulations controlling pharmaceuticals and personal care products if they wanted to, if they thought they could make the showing that's required that could bring that within the definition of a pollutant under the statute.

So it doesn't seem to me that you can make the finding that is required by the statute to go ahead with an intent to adopt, and without that, $I$ think the other option is not to intend to adopt, and for the reasons Sarah's stated in her memo. So $I$ would be inclined to go in that direction, rather than the other.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Chris. Are
there other comments from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Mr. Meyer, did you have something you wanted to add?

MR. MEYER: Sure. Thank you. There is several things that just came up in the last ten minutes. When this first was heard in front of the Board, there were several people here and on the telephone that tried to comment, and the Board closed public comment, even though people were waiting on the telephone to provide public comment.

Then $I$ heard the Board talk about, well, there hasn't been a strong showing from the public in regards to whether or not they should go forward, shouldn't go forward, and maybe we should have some public comment on whether we should move forward.

And so what $I$ hear you saying is that you want more public comment on whether there should be public comment, because ultimately if you accept the petition, you open this up for thirty more days, and there is public comment, that doesn't mean you have to move forward with it. It ultimately means you allow the public to
comment. That's what accepting the petition at this point does.

Board member Felton described the previous petition as analogous to this one, that there were no numeric criteria for pollutants such as nitrogen and phosphorus. In this case there are no numeric criteria for pollutants pharmaceuticals, etc.

What $I$ just heard Board member Tweeten say is there are no water quality standards, that maybe we should petition the Board for a standard to protect the river. And that is not what is contemplated under 75-5-316 No. 3. It says, "The classification is necessary because there is no other effective process to achieve the necessary protection, including the nondegradation policy."

If we have to spend the next five years asking the $D E Q$ to make a rule and provide public comment, by that time it is too late. The Big Sky Water and Sewer District has already issued a request for qualifications from engineering firms to design and develop a pipeline to discharge pharmaceuticals into the Gallatin River.

CHAIR DEVENY: Have you finished?
MR. MEYER: Yes.

CHAIR DEVENY: Further comments or questions by Board members?

MR. DEARMENT: I guess I'd kind of kicked this off and asked for the conversation. Thank you, everybody. But $I$ think it's helped clarify my thinking a little bit, and I'm inclined to agree with Sarah's memo, and what Chris has said, that it doesn't meet the test that we need, to me, to move forward; and others can bring this forward again if they think it necessary, but $I$ think I'm inclined to adopt Sarah's recommendation.

CHAIR DEVENY: Before we move forward, I'd like to hear if there is any other public comment right now on this particular issue by people on the phone or in the audience.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I don't believe there is anybody here. Are we ready to make a motion?

MR. BUSBY: I move that we decline the petition for naming the Gallatin River as a Outstanding Resource Water, and support Sarah's document as our -- I don't know how you want to word that but --

MS. CLERGET: Final written decision.

MR. DEXTER: -- as the final written decision.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved. Is there a second?

MR. FELTON: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Those opposed?
MR. TWEETEN: I'm a yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Nay.
We'll go ahead and take a break.
(Recess taken at 10:20 a.m.)
(Oral argument on CFAC Appeal of DEQ's modification of MPDES Permit No. MTOO30066 in separate transcript)

*     *         *             *                 * 

(Board meeting reconvened at 3:00 p.m.)
CHAIR DEVENY: We still have a couple things on the agenda that should go fairly quickly I believe. Board Counsel update.

MS. CLERGET: I've got nothing. CHAIR DEVENY: Anybody from the general public have any comments to make?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, motion to adjourn.

MS. HANSON: So moved.
MR. FELTON: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Meeting is adjourned.
Thank you all very much.
(The proceedings were concluded at 3:00 p.m. )
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