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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So for the record, I'm Sarah Clerget, and I'm the Hearing Officer in this matter, which is being recorded directly after the adjourned BER meeting. And on the phone $I$ have representatives of Talen. In the room $I$ have representatives for $D E Q$ and for Westmoreland. And I would like everybody to put their name on the record of this hearing, please. MR. HAYES: This is Ed Hayes, Counsel for DEQ.

MR. LUCAS: Mark Lucas, Counsel for DEQ. MR. CHEREN: Robert Cheren, Counsel for Westmoreland.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Talen, would you guys identify yourselves for the record, please.

MR. FRANK: Sure. This is Joshua Frank from Baker Botts on behalf of Talen.

MR. STERUP: Rob Sterup, Brown Law Firm on behalf of Talen.

MR. BOOHER: And this is Marty Booher, Baker Hostetler, on behalf of Westmoreland.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Rosario Doriott Dominguez, Baker Hostetler, also on behalf of Westmoreland.

MR. COTTRELL: Jeremy Cottrell,
Associate General Counsel, Westmoreland.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Now having those appearances, $I$ want to state the status right now.

In front of me $I$ have just been given jurisdiction over an emergency motion for expedited relief from ARM 17.20.1803(d), which was filed by Westmoreland on May 20th; and then $I$ have a response from DEQ which was filed today.

And $I$ understand from both filings that they have been served on Westmoreland and on DEQ, but Talen has not been served on either filing, although Talen, $I$ think $I$ just heard you say that you have received them recently. So you have them, although you weren't served with them originally?

MR. FRANK: This is Josh Frank. Yes, just before the hearing $I$ saw that they were online, so probably ten minutes before the hearing. So $I$ just have just had the opportunity to read them, but have not consulted fully with my
client about them.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So Talen --
MR. HAYES: For the record, I do not think they have received a copy of my brief that $I$ filed because $I$ did not serve them.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I think we posted it on the website, so they should have it through that.

Now, Talen, $I$ want to be clear. In my understanding, you are the applicant or permittee; is that correct?

MR. FRANK: That is correct.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Before we get to the emergency motion for expedited relief, I want to deal with a preliminary matter that $I$ think might moot that issue.
My reading of 75-20-223(1)(c) says, "If
a hearing is requested by someone other than an applicant or permittee --" in this case that would be Westmoreland -- "the applicant or permittee may file a written election with the Board within 15 days of receipt of the request for a hearing, and elect to have the matter proceed to a hearing before the Board, or have the matter submitted directly to a District Court for judicial review
of the agency action."
It goes on to say, "The party who requests the hearing may also elect" the same thing.

So by my reading of that statute, either the applicant or permittee -- meaning Talen -- or Westmoreland can elect to have this matter proceed to a hearing before the Board, or have it go directly to District Court, and the deadline for that happening is within 15 days, which is the same deadline that we're dealing with in 17.20.1803.

And if you were going to go to District Court directly anyway, then we probably wouldn't need to deal with whether or not we need expedited relief from 17.20.1803(d).

So what $I$ would like to know is if anybody, Westmoreland or Talen, intends to take advantage of that, so that we can save everybody some time and energy.

MR. CHEREN: So Westmoreland is not prepared at this time to make that election, which again is due in 15 days. Also we're not 100 percent sure that we're not going to see this argument if we proceed to a District Court, the
same argument. So $I$ think we're not in a position to at this time say that we're electing to go before the District Court at this time.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Okay. Talen.
MR. FRANK: We're in the same position. We're still evaluating whether or not to make the election to the District Court.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Well, I
understand the potential prejudice to everybody by having oral argument on the emergency motion right now, with Talen having not been served and having not become an Intervenor, if that is in fact what they intend to do.

However, $I$ do think there is some merit to having some argument on this as soon as possible, and what $I$ am going to allow everybody to do is make the oral argument to the extent that they can right now. And $I$ recognize why we need a decision on this quickly.

So Talen, I'm going to let DEQ and Westmoreland make their arguments now, and then if you would like to file something responsive to their arguments that they make today, you can do so tomorrow by noon, and then $I$ will have a decision out by tomorrow, by the end of tomorrow.

MR. CHEREN: Yes.
MR. HAYES: That satisfies DEQ.
HEARINGS OFfICER CLERGET: Talen, does
that seem like an appropriate way to proceed? MR. FRANK: I think that's fine. I would just add that we'd like the opportunity after the parties argue to -- I mean I'll see how it goes. We might have something to add at the end, so we'd like that opportunity.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: All right. To that end, if you intend to -- My guess is that you intend to become an intervenor in this proceeding; is that a correct assumption?

MR. FRANK: Yes. My understanding was that upon the filing of the appeal that there would be a pretrial order sent that would explain how to intervene. So yes, our intent is definitely to be an intervenor.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: All right. Give me one second please while I need to check
something in the rules.
MR. FRANK: Just reflecting on it, $I$ was under the impression that we were automatically an intervenor, to intervene as the certificate holder, that --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: No, that's -MR. FRANK: Regardless, we intend to be an intervenor.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Let me check something here, because my intention is if you would like to be an intervenor, unless $I$ find some reason why you can't, $I$ think you can just make that motion right now, but $I$ want to check.

DEQ and Westmoreland, do you have any reason that you know of that they can't just make a motion to be an intervenor right now?

MR. HAYES: This is Ed Hayes for DEQ. I don't, and it would be my understanding that they clearly have standing to be an intervenor, and DEQ would not object to any motion for them to intervene.

MR. CHEREN: Westmoreland does not object to their intervention, or know of any reason why they cannot intervene.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: It looks like

Rule 24(a)(2), "Untimely motion. Permit anyone to intervene who claims an interest relating to the property or transaction to the subject of the action," which is certainly the case. So Talen, would you like to make a motion to intervene pursuant to Rule 24(a)(2)?

MR. FRANK: Yes, pursuant to Rule 24(a)(2), we would like to move to intervene in this proceeding.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: That motion is granted. We can follow that up with a written motion and order, but for the purposes of today, that means you are an intervenor. So now we officially have three parties, and everybody is represented.

All right. So let's hear oral argument on the emergency motion for expedited relief from 17.20 .1803 (d).

MR. CHEREN: So in order to understand, there is several reasons why we're asking for relief, several bases, and there's some questions about which one, the authority to proceed. But we need to kind of start with what this proceeding is about, and the magnitude of the proceeding.

And this is a proceeding about the Major

Facility Siting Act, which forbids amending away the environmental protection that's required by a certificate. So we have a proceeding here where Talen went and got an ancillary amendment to their State air permit. You have two air permits when you are in Montana. You have what's called a Title 5 permit, and then you have another permit. So they went and got an amendment to their other permit that was final March 13 th, and that amendment, in terms of the substance, in terms of what's in the permit and what they changed, simply relates to a small aspect of what Talen wants to do here.

What Talen wants to do is substitute seven million tons a year of Montana coal from across the street in Colstrip with coal from 300 miles away in Wyoming. And there is a legal requirement under the Major Facility Siting Act to minimize environmental impact by only burning the mine mouth coal.

They want to remove that. In their application, they only dealt with a small part of this, which was for fugitive emissions from a few parts of the handling facilities. They talked about this desire that they have to get rid of
this provision in their certificate, and replace seven million tons a year of coal from outside of the state.

So our objection obviously, which they have anticipated, is that this is going to degrade the environment without any need to do so, and that it's unlawful under the Act, that it's unreasonable, and that they can't get this amendment.

Our issue that brings us here today is that this sequence of events where they went and got that permit amendment, this ancillary small piece of the permit amendment, and then forwarded to the Board within ten days.

We anticipated that the argument would be made, and now the Department has made, that maybe that brings us under 1803, and we think that that's an erroneous reading of 1803. It doesn't make sense under the context. And if anything, we have to definitely limit the application of 1803 just to those small pieces of things that were in that air permit.
So 1803, it says right at the top, is when you go get some other permit that you have amended, you have a certificate under the Major

Facility Siting Act that makes you comply with all of your permits, and sometimes those are specified.

So if you go get this other permit amended, we're going to have an expedited procedure for you to fix your certificate when it doesn't really implicate anything to do with the Major Facility Siting Act. That's what's there.

The procedure for this proceeding is in the statute, it's in 223 , and you were reading from it, and it says that if it proceeds before the Board, it's a contested case under the Montana Administrative Procedure Act before the Board.

It's not this short cut procedure for technical and conforming amendments where technically you need to amend your certificate because maybe you've changed a pollution control or something like that, because EPA has promulgated a new regulation, like they do so often.

So we think this proceeding is in no way supposed to come within 1803 , but when we saw Talen go and do this strange thing of talking endlessly in this application -- I shouldn't say endlessly -- but talking about a provision that
they weren't seeking in that application for their air permit amendment, analyzing the coal before -and then forwarding it withing the ten days.

We're like, "Okay, we're worried that they're going to be arguing --" and I guess we'll find out today -- that $1803(d)$ imposed this totally unreasonable fourteen day deadline that doesn't make any sense given the complexity of this case, given the stakes of this case, given the fact that what we're dealing with here requires expert testimony, and given that this is a case where the people of Colstrip, the workers for Westmoreland, and the State of Montana, and Montana's environment, all have huge equities in this proceeding.

We want regular order. We want the opportunity to develop and present our evidence on all of the environmental impacts that haven't been considered here.

So this idea that 1803 applies, we anticipated it, it was a concern. We raised the matter last Friday on the phone call. We appreciate Mark Lucas was on the phone, and you were on the phone, and we raised this issue, and people said, "Huh, maybe this is -- this is at
least -- we need to think about this," which is why we asked for the meeting, that noticed that this issue would be dealt with on Friday.

And we timely put together a motion, we filed it on Monday. And $I$ know it was posted on the internet yesterday, just clearing that up a bit.

But substantively speaking, we don't think 1803 has any place in this proceeding whatsoever, if you read the heading, read the sequence of what it's talking about, and read it in the context of the statute, 75-20-223.

The Board did not thirty years ago just flout the Legislature's direction that it be a contested case. They were dealing with a set of cases where the Board had to amend certificates for conforming and technical reasons.

I understand that the Department's argument, which they made in their motion, was, "Well, it doesn't expressly say that it only applies there," and they're right. That's why we're here, and we have this concern, is about that we think it's confusing.

You read the heading, you read the sequence, and you say, "What does this apply to?,"
and when it's ambiguous as to whether or not this means just the reference to within the jurisdiction of the Board, it's like, "What is going on here?"

We agree with that issue, but in context, it just makes no sense that when the statute says you're going to have a contested case proceeding under the Administrative Procedures Act, that you have this lightning quick procedure where you have to submit evidence in fourteen days.

So that doesn't make sense, and we don't think it applies. We think that it's a narrow regulatory provision, and so that's our argument. We don't think it applies. We think the Board's argument is wrong.

Now, it's really important. The Board has said 1803, and this motion or this opposition to the motion, they say it applies to every single amendment to a certificate.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Sorry, I just want to be clear. You mean $D E Q$ said that.

MR. CHEREN: DEQ. I apologize. So they're saying it applies globally. It has to apply to some subset. There's no way that you can
get a certificate for a tiny project and quadruple the size of it, and then insist that anyone who wants to challenge it is in fifteen days. That doesn't make sense.

So the question is if you're
interpreting this, what does it apply to? It makes perfect sense that when utility mack comes out from the US EPA, and you've got to tinker around with things, and it's, "Oh, technically $I$ need to get an amendment to my certificate to make this small change," yes, let's have an expedited proceeding.

But it makes absolutely no sense to think that the constitutionally guaranteed environmental protection from the Major Facility Siting Act is limited in this way, when someone comes in and they say, "We want to get rid of this major, major element of the environmental impact minimization of the project."

And the other reason that we need more time, and that more time is warranted, is that the findings that are referenced in the application and in the Board's -- the Department's documents, the Department doesn't discuss the 1979 findings that specifically addressed diesel emissions from
trains, and being a mine mouth power plant, instead of a load center power plant, and avoiding transportation emissions.

Those findings, which were made in 1979 after the Montana Supreme Court said, "You can't ignore this mine mouth versus not issue." Those findings, in order to get them, we had to send an associate from Baker on literally just like days of correspondence with people, trying to even just get a copy of it, and they reference all of this testimony, and what is known as an ethically long administrative proceeding. They reference it as the basis by which they have to burn just Rosebud coal and be a mine mouth power plant.

Now, our problem is that the legal requirement that they have to show to get an amendment approved, that Talen has to show, is that it doesn't materially affect those findings.

Well, today, just yesterday $I$ finally got a copy of some of the key findings, and then it cites evidence. I don't have a copy of that. I don't think the Board has a copy of that. I don't think the Department has a copy of that. I don't know whether Talen has a copy of that.

But there is a huge amount of assessment
that has to go in here just on that one issue alone, that we definitely have cause to say, "You can't make us put all of our evidence in about findings that aren't accessible by no fault of us as a party."

And in terms of the issue of waiver and your jurisdiction in order to waive it, so this is an issue which if people who follow the Supreme Court cases in recent years, there has been all of these cases about what's jurisdictional versus not.

And the Department is going back to a case from 1989, where back in those days, what the Court, Supreme Court has called the bad hole days, that they weren't so clear about what was jurisdictional not jurisdictional.

The Supreme Court in Arbonne 2006 (phonetic) said, "Guys, we need to be really careful about this, what's jurisdictional and not," and the Supreme Court of Montana in BNSF Railway Company v. Cringle (phonetic), there is two cases there, and they cite other cases.

Montana followed that retrenchment of jurisdictional versus non-jurisdictional acts. So you can't go back to a case from 1989.

When you look at the more recent cases, there is three categories of deadline rules. The first category is the jurisdictional rule that cannot be waived by the opposing party. The second category is a mandatory claim processing rule. The third category is a non-mandatory claim processing rule, one that doesn't have additional requirements.

So if it is jurisdictional, then the other side can't waive it. If it's a mandatory claim processing rule, then you have a much more stringent standard in order to get around that, and deciding whether equitable tolling applies or it's just forfeiture, or what are those circumstances. That's something that's being worked out literally in the cases.

But before getting to what Montana has said about a mandatory claim processing rule, there are ordinary claim processing rules here, and we think that this is one. We don't think that this language satisfies the requirements to be a mandatory claim processing rule in this situation.

But in Montana, the exceptions are if you may have reasonable diligence to preserve your
legal rights, but have been prevented from doing so by circumstances beyond your control.

I don't think there is any question that Westmoreland is being diligent in these proceedings. We filed a 27 page notice of hearing. We related all of these facts. We set forth forty legal arguments. We have people preparing experts right now.

Our concern isn't that we don't want to be diligent or that we want to wait. It's that we want this proceeding to -- the state to have the benefit, and you to have the benefit, of all of the evidence presented, in a quality that warrants the stakes of this proceeding for the state, and the people, and the environment.

So we are definitely being diligent. We definitely meet the standard in Montana for even a categorical claim processing rule. But we don't even think this is that. We think it's a lower standard. So it doesn't apply, it should be waived.

And if the Board -- the Department's, the DEQ's opposition brief says, "Well, you cite the Constitution, and you don't have case law support," well, I'll cite the Constitution of the

State of Montana. I'll cite Article 2, Section 17. And we have a right and we have an opportunity to be heard appropriately to the proceeding, and this is a proceeding that is about the future and survival of this mine.

We absolutely have a due process right that's implicated in this proceeding, and telling us that we need to have all of this evidence on this extremely fast tracked, unlawful removal of an environment protection certificate that impacts us in this way, that impacts the community in this way, we absolutely have -- There are constitutional implications to this case. I don't think you need to get there.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I can't get there. I'm not the executive branch. The BER can't decide constitutional issues. So there is -- but $I$ recognize you need to make your record. MR. CHEREN: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that -- Board Member Tweeten, wasn't there a motion on that, that they were going to bring that up before the Board as a whole, because they didn't agree on that question? We don't have to get there, but --

$$
\text { I mean } I \text { think you can certainly read }
$$

the rules. This is how you get there. You can read these rules knowing that when $D E Q$ and the Board prepared them, that they knew what the Constitution said about our rights, and this was not an attempt as an end run around our rights to jam us if there's an amendment in the future for any Major Facility Siting Act anywhere in the state.

This was simply dealing with a routine administrative process. That's what it was about. There is no way that anybody would have ever thought that two weeks was constitutional at that time. So that's a way to get there without -- as the executive branch, but --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I have a couple of questions. First, I'm reading -- In reading the $A R M, I$ want to be clear that you haven't requested a show cause hearing, have you?

MR. CHEREN: We -- On Wednesday I think we called and we said, "What do we call this?," right? And the reason we were calling to say, "What do we call this?" is we want to make sure that we're styling it correctly.

I believe that we have filed a notice of contested case. I believe that was the
appropriate thing under the statute under 223, but we now have the Board -- the Department arguing that this is under 1803 , in which you would interpret it as a request for a show cause hearing.

But $I$ think that gets to an issue, which is: If you're going to apply 1803, the only thing that you would apply it to is the part of this that implements the permit amendment to MAQPD Permit 0513-10 to get to version eleven. That's the only thing that would be a show cause hearing, and the rest of it needs to proceed --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I'm sorry. You're going to have to back up and explain that one more time because I'm not sure I'm following that argument.

MR. CHEREN: Sure. So it's possible we've requested two hearings at once.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So I have your notice of contest here in front of me, and the thing that it appears to be contesting is the Major Facility Siting Act certificate amendment from March 15th of 2019.

MR. CHEREN: That is correct.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Is that one
or both of the things that you just said?
MR. CHEREN: That would be all of -both of the things that we're saying, is that to the extent -- and we think this is absolutely wrong -- that 1803 could potentially apply under these circumstances with this kind of manner, that the only thing that it could apply to would be the part of this that implements the permit amendment to their air permit, which doesn't actually relate to stripping out the requirements to burn local coal.

So if you apply to just that, like literally the things that they amended out of that air permit, that's a small issue in this case compared to removing the requirement that they minimize the impact to the environment by not trucking -- by having 1.3 billion ton miles of coal crisscrossing the state of Montana.

So if you just look at what they got changed in their permit, their air permit, even though they said they were asking for all these things in the application, as a technical matter, that's much more narrow.

So it's possible to interpret this as there is a show cause hearing on implementing
changes to the air permit; but again, $I$ don't think that applies here because $I$ think those implementing changes are when EPA changes the regulations and says, "Look. You've got to have -- instead of the continuous emission monitoring that you're doing right now, you need to do different continuous emission monitoring, and your certificate says, 'I'm going to use this type of continuous emission monitoring.'"

But it's a change in emissions
monitoring or something like that, where you have an external reason that you need to update your permit.

Here they want to build this coal hauling facility. So we think that under the rules, that's something that comes up -- it doesn't mean you get to end run around anything.

But we would distinguish those two things, what they actually got changed in their air permit, and what they haven't changed yet, because it's a requirement of the certificate in their Title 5 permit, which is just citing a certificate.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So I just want to be sure I'm following. So I'm looking at
the first page of the Major Facility Siting Act certificate amendment, and there is Items 1 and 2 of that. Do those correspond to the one and two that you're talking about now?

MR. CHEREN: The first one being the --
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: The air
quality permit, to modify the Montana Air Quality Permit 0513-10.

MR. CHEREN: Right. Let me look.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: And then the second thing is utilize rail or truck delivery facilities for non-Rosebud coal.

MR. CHEREN: I don't think that it breaks down like that, as that being the distinction. Otherwise $I$ would be standing here saying it's a really clean distinction. It's not a clean distinction.

They talk about two different things that they want to do. One is they want to build this 160 acre rail handling facility. They've gotten amendments to deal with the fugitive amendments component to that.

So if you tease that out and say that applies, $I$ think that's wrong, but that's not nearly as big of a deal as this thing that really
had nothing to do with that permit amendment, even though it was discussing the application, which is the switch from local coal to coal 300 miles away.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So both of those issues are contained in the entire body of the Major Facility Siting Act certificate amendment, right?

MR. CHEREN: Yes.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Okay. That makes more sense to me.

MR. CHEREN: I think just -- We may be filing a, have to file -- they did a second document on May 10 th. We may do a protective filing on Friday.

But our position is that that document says they're going to grant everything, even though it doesn't document all of its reasoning, so we think that's the operative document, but there is a second document, and there may be a second appeal.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Okay. I have two more questions for you. The first is to the point of this being jurisdictional, 17.20.1803(c) says, "Upon timely filing a request for a hearing, the Board shall" -- That's not a "may," that's a
"shall" -- "hold a show cause hearing."
So that indicates to me that you don't have to request a show cause hearing, that the minute you request any kind of hearing, we have to hold a show cause hearing.

But then (d) also says, "A person requesting a show cause hearing," which would seem to indicate to me that you would need to request a show cause hearing in order to trigger the 15 day deadlines.

MR. CHEREN: Sure. Absolutely. So the answer to that question is that -- and the Supreme Court just weighed into this in the Nutricycle (phonetic) case, and basically the "shall" still doesn't get you to claim processing.

Here is an example of mandatory claims -- of not being able to be subject to exceptions in appropriate circumstances when justice requires.

In that case, the federal rules had a deadline, and they had another provision of another rule that said this: It said rule -- the appellate rules can be waived for good cause except that one. They said all of the rules except that one can be subject to equitable
tolling.
That's what it takes. It's not just the "shall" in order to get -- Like even if it is a claim, a mandatory claim processing rule to eliminate judicial and discretionary safety valves, it's got to be that specific. That's the standard where under current case law in the state of Montana that you have to meet, based on when you look at these two cases from the Supreme Court and Montana's juris prudence, which closely tracks what the Supreme Court is doing in this area, and clearing up a lot of law in this issue.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So do you believe that the $A R M$ is in conflict with the statute, or is there a way that they can be read to --

MR. CHEREN: The way to read them not in conflict is to interpret this as being simply a business rule for a very small number of issues dealing with conforming and technical amendments.

If you read the heading, and you think about it, and you interpret it narrowly, as we're interpreting it, then it's not in conflict. And $I$ think that's important because $I$ don't think --

This was one of these rules that was
promulgated towards the beginning. I don't think that they were --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: 1984 by my research.

MR. CHEREN: I don't think that they were looking in 1984 to ignore 223's direction that you hold a contested case pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act. That's pretty specific.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Well, so that brings me to my second question for you, which is:

So I went back and looked at the legislative history of both the statute and the ARM, and it looks to me like originally the ARM was referencing a procedure through the Board of Health, when there is a request for an amendment through the Board of Health, and the certificate holder is requesting a show cause hearing after that process.

So just a heads-up to DEQ that this question is going to come to you, too.

Do you know anything about the history of that? Was it in fact a different process than this amendment process that we're using now?

MR. CHEREN: When you go back and you
look at the permits that the Board of Health was doing, it's a similar thing where you have to -the certificates for the Major Facility Siting Act are including provisions that conform to rules and permits issued by the Board of Health.

And so it's simply just we know that we have -- it's like your Title 5 permit, where incorporating all these other permit provisions, that could be an administrative nightmare. So that further makes clear that this is supposed to narrowly apply as opposed to the broad -- this governs every single proceeding.

We think it was literally just somebody thought, "Hey, what happens if the Board of Health --" I mean think about this. With Colstrip, if the Board of Health changed some things because the US EPA told them that they had to change something, and they said, "We need to change this in your permit, and now we're going to have a whole hearing on that," that's what this rule was aimed at, was somebody had come up with that scenario.

That's not this case. That's not anything like this case. This is a case where the central thing they're trying to do is get rid of
a core component of the certificate.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: But then the flip side of that is that the statute has been amended several times since that ARM, and the ARM hasn't changed since 1984 . This statute has changed several times. And the statute doesn't ever clearly articulate a difference between the kinds of processes or amendments that you're talking about.

MR. CHEREN: Right. I think that the answer to that question is this is a de minimis exception to 223. There are de minimis and then the certificates. De minimus is read into every single legal framework. There are de minimis certificate amendments, and so the Legislature doesn't have to tell the Department to create a de minimis certificate amendment procedure, and they also would have no reason to object.

And $I$ would bet that if any member of the Legislature called the Department and said, "What is this?," they would have said, "This is a de minimis certificate amendment. This is not cutting off people's rights that you guaranteed in $223 . "$

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I think I
want to hear from $D E Q$ and Talen, and those folks who have appeared in front of me before know that I generally will devolve into question and answer, so you'll probably be back later. Let's hear from DEQ now.

MR. HAYES: On that specific issue or -HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Go ahead.

MR. JENSEN: May $I$ just interrupt for a moment, please? My name is Tim Jensen. I'm with the Montana Environmental Information Center.

This hearing is not being conducted with public's input. We are not able --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: No. This is a contested case.

MR. JENSEN: It doesn't matter. This is a public --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: No, wait. Stop. This is a contested case process. This is a hearing before the Hearing Examiner. There is no opportunity for public comment here.

MR. JENSEN: I'm not asking public
comment -- on participation. People are not able to call in. We've had members who wanted to listen in. They are unable to get on.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: There are
often contested case proceedings that are not able to be called.

MR. JENSEN: No, but your notice said people would be able to do so.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: The BER meeting was held, and that was publicly available. People could call into that.

MR. JENSEN: But you're not - -

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: That is not this. This --

MR. JENSEN: - - extending that to this contested case hearing?

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: NO. This is -- Go ahead.

MR. JENSEN: How do you say your last name?

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: My name is Clerget.

MR. JENSEN: Thank you.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I want to be clear that is not the Board meeting. This is a proceeding that's happening different. And most of all, that $I$ know of, proceedings in a contested case that appear before a Hearing Examiner, the public is welcome to come sit in the room, but we
do not make them available by phone. So this is standard operating procedure for a hearing.

MR. JENSEN: Is the press aware of that restriction?

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: It is common practice for a contested case hearing. It is very rare to have a contested case proceeding open by phone. Now, the BER proceedings are different, but this is -- I'm a Hearing Examiner, and this is -- so that does usually not happen by phone, and the public is not to participate in those. The public may listen, but you are not to be heard as a party during this.

I would encourage you -- you can file as an intervenor if you would like to become a party, but this is not a party -- this is not a proceeding for anyone other than the parties to be heard.

MR. JENSEN: Was this contested case hearing noticed at the same time on the same agenda as the BER meeting?

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Contested case hearings do not have the same notice requirements as the BER.

MR. JENSEN: I'm just asking if this one
happened to have been noticed.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: No. This is a separate occurrence from the BER meeting. MR. JENSEN: Completely separate. HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Yes. This is something that --

MR. JENSEN: Was there notice -HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: It doesn't need to be noticed. I don't want to have this debate with you right now. You can --

MR. JENSEN: I don't care if you don't want to have this debate with me right now. I'd like to know when the public was meant to be able to participate in this hearing under the statute. HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: There is no public participation in a contested case process. So --

MR. JENSEN: Chris, is that your understanding?

MR. HAYES: It is my understanding -This is Ed Hayes, Chief Legal Counsel. A contested case is not a meeting of a public body that needs to be noticed under Montana's public notice requirements for meetings of boards, other government agency --

MR. JENSEN: This is not a public -MR. HAYES: It's not a public meeting. MR. JENSEN: Public hearing. MR. HAYES: It's a hearing under MAPA, and those are to my knowledge --

MR. JENSEN: It has to be noticed under -- as long as this objection is placed on the record. This is going to require some interpretation. I don't think you're right, Ed.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I would just ask you to sit down, please, and you're welcome to listen. More than the door is open, you're welcome to -- the public is always welcome to listen, but this is not a time for public comment.

Let's continue with DEQ's argument.
MR. HAYES: DEQ sort of understands some of the concerns that Westmoreland advances in terms of the complexity of the issues and the mistakes, at least for Westmoreland as they see it, in regards to their view of whether they need to submit the testimony and the evidence within 15 days under Subsection (d) of 1803.

But that really is beside the point, because before you in black and white are jurisdictional requirements that must be followed
before the Board has jurisdiction to hear a show cause hearing, and the complexity, the stakes, the expert testimony that needs to be developed, the fact that -- the assertion that Subsection (d) applies only to technical or de minimis amendments, none of that is included in the plain language of the rule, which must be followed because it's clear and unambiguous.

To do otherwise would insert obviously something in the statute that's not there in violation of the rules of construction.

In regard to the amendment itself that DEQ received from Talen, $I$ think the Hearings Examiner was on the right track in looking at that actual language of the proposed amendment.

The proposed amendment was meant to do two things: It was meant to allow Talen flexibility to use coal, not only continuing from Westmoreland, but also from other sources of coal, some in Montana, some in Wyoming. And then the second purpose of the amendment was to modify the facility at Colstrip in order to receive coal in a stockpile, and also a new rail off-loading facility.

And so when you look at what you were
referring to, No. 1 and No. 2 in the amendment and on the document you were referring to, No. 1 refers to the amendment application as it relates to obtaining coal from other sources; and as No. 1 indicates that amendment to follow, or proceeded, or was predicated on the application that they had submitted to DEQ's Air Quality Program, Montana Air Quality Permit 0513-10.

And then the second reason for the construction of the coal mine load-out facility is set forth in the second paragraph, and that was to implement, or is predicated on authorization under Montana Air Quality Permit 0513-11.

Obviously both of those have different contributions potentially to air emissions, No. 1 actually burning of coal from the other sources out of the stack of Colstrip; and No. 2 the load-out facility concerns of emissions from the unloading of the coal, whatever.

So both portions of the amendment application were predicated on other permits that DEQ was processing, or amending, or had amended. HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Can I ask you. Do you think that there is a distinction between a show cause hearing as contemplated by

1803 and the contested case hearing as contemplated by 75-20-223?

The addition of the show cause language
 different for me than what is contemplated by the statute.

MR. HAYES: Let me answer your question by explaining DEQ's view in terms of the interplay between 20-223, the statute, and the Administrative Rule.

If you look at 75-20-219, there is Subsection (1), Subsection (2), and Subsection (3). And at the end of Subsection (3) is that a if a hearing is required under 75-20-223, the party requesting the hearing has the burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence that the Department's determination is not reasonable.

So it's at that point in 219, actually is what $I$ 'm referring to, what's discussed above there is subject to a hearing requested under 75-20-223 Sub (2).

But then there is the tack-on of Subsection (4), and the language of Subsection (4) is important. It reads, "If an amendment is required for a certificate that would affect,
amend, alter, or modify a decision, opinion, order, certification, or air or water quality permit issued by the Department or Board, the amendment must be processed under the applicable statutes."

And if you look at the first language of the Administrative Rule ARM 20.1803, it mirrors exactly that language in Sub (4). "An amendment affecting, amending, altering, or modifying a decision, opinion, order, certification, or permit issued by the Department of Environmental Quality or Board."

So it's the same language. And then if you look at the footnote of 1803, it indicates that it's implementing 75-20-219. So it's not implementing 75-20-223(2). So it's my view that --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I don't know, because 219, Subsection (3) of 219 implicates 223, too, so --

MR. HAYES: But in that case it wouldn't -- DEQ would have said, or the Board would have said implement 75-20-219 and 223, which --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: All right,
but --
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MR. HAYES: But even if you don't want to go there, $I$ think the plain language used both in Subsection (4) of 219 , and then in the first language in 17.20 .1803 , in my view it's clear that 1803 is implementing Subsection (4) of 75-20-219. HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: But what are the applicable statutes administrated by the Department or Board if not 223? Are they -- I mean is it the air quality? MR. HAYES: Right. Correct.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So the argument there would be --

MR. HAYES: Right.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: -- correct me
if I'm wrong -- but we need a petition for an amendment of the air quality permit, which would be entirely different than the Major Facility Siting Act certificate amendment that we're talking about, right?

MR. HAYES: Right.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So that would seem that we need -- that $D E Q$ would need something entirely different in order to modify that air permit, right?

MR. HAYES: If they were solely
challenging the provisions of the air quality permit, that would be correct. If they're saying somehow DEQ's incorporation of the air quality permit modification has somehow jeopardized complying with the provisions of the certificate itself, then that would be an appeal under the Major Facility Siting Act subject to the appeal provisions, subject to 219.

MR. CHEREN: So I think he just hit it on the head. It's incorporation of a change to a another permit. The other permit that was changed, and he cited, 0513-10, was changed to 0513-11, does not have a change in that permit to allow them to burn coal from Wyoming.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: But that's an appeal of a different issue, right? I mean that's a --

MR. CHEREN: Exactly. If I could lay this out, what they're saying is that sometimes you have an appeal of a different issue, and then you also have to change your certificate to match it because you can't violate your certificate in order to comply with the other permit.

That's all 1803 is about. It's that you do the other proceeding for the other reason, and
then you incorporate it, and it's a streamlined procedure for incorporation. That's what 1803 is about.

If there was another proceeding, there was a permit issued, and that's a separate proceeding, and just incorporating the only changes there, this proceeding is of much broader scope.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So I just want to make sure $I$ understand what you're saying.

Then there would be a process essentially appealing the amendment to the air quality permits?

MR. CHEREN: We had that opportunity to amend that permit, to appeal that permit, and because of that opportunity, that's why you streamline it here, because we would have had a contested case. If we challenged the tiny little changes they made to their air permit for fugitive emissions, we would have already had a proceeding.

So this provision says you don't need to have a full dress hearing if there was a separate one, but again in this case, the ballgame is something that wasn't changed in the air permit, but $I$ think we're getting close to exactly what

1803 does.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So Ed, that question then comes back to DEQ. If four says, if 75-20-219(4) says an air quality permit issued by the Department must be processed under the applicable statutes, which would mean an appeal of an air quality permit amendment, then $I$ think -if I'm following your argument -- 1803 wouldn't apply under Subsection (4), because then we're going to go to the appeal for the air quality permit amendment.

MR. CHEREN: This deals with there's two appeal opportunities. That's what this is about. MR. HAYES: Right. Subsection (4) of 219 is talking about two different amendments, one amendment to the certificate issued under the Major Facility Siting Act; and then there is the amendments in this case of an air quality permit that has to be processed under the provisions of the Air Quality Program.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: But --
MR. HAYES: And it's subject to appeal under the Air Quality Program.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Then, again, I mean if I'm reading (4), it says, "If an
amendment is required to a certificate --" so that's the Major Facility Siting certificate -"that would affect, amend, alter, or modify --" something something -- "of an air quality permit.

So if the Major Facility Siting
certificate is going to modify or amend an air quality permit, the amendment must be processed under the applicable statutes administrated by the Department, which to me says the applicable statutes for amending an air quality permit, which is not 1803. 1803 is very specifically about the Major Facility Siting Act, right?

MR. HAYES: Right.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So at least with respect to Subsection (4), it would seem that for the air quality permit piece of it, we're not under 1803, which sort of subverts your argument because you are proceeding, if anything, under 1803.

MR. CHEREN: That's correct. That's correct. It's that -- There is two different orders of operation here. You could want to do a Major Facility Siting Act permit process to build a power plant, and you're going to need an air permit, a water permit, and a certificate under
the MFSA, and it says this proceeding under MFSA in this statute, you still have to go do the other proceedings for air and water. Okay?

Now, you've got your air permit, and you've got your power plant built, and you've got your certificate, so you've got three things: The power plant, and the permit, and the certificate.

This 1803 is even narrower, that says if you go get a change to your air permit, and you need to update your certificate, we already know that you're going to -- people are going to be able to appeal the change to that permit under the rules of that program, so there is really not many questions for the Board if you're just implementing, incorporating a change to your air permit.

And if that's all you're doing, and it's just a technical conforming, "We've got to fix the certificate," they're saying, "Well, technically you're going to get a second appeal, but it's going to be a narrower appeal because you're getting two bites at the apple."

But that's only where the thing driving the process is the certificate. And if $I$ can just -- this is really key. The paragraphs you read,
the Paragraph 1 doesn't refer to the permit amendment, it refers to the application to amend the permit, which had all of this extraneous material, which is quite frankly why we're here today, because we were concerned that this was an end run around MFSA.

So the actual amendment to that permit does not have anything to do with burning coal from Wyoming, other than there is this small little piece of it, but it doesn't talk about this restriction of which coal they burn.

So we have a separate legal right to challenge that permit, and in addition, if all we were doing was challenging whether the Board should update the permit, that's 1803; but that's not what we're doing because this proceeding is about a totally separate legal obligation in the certificate. It's not even in that permit. It's in some other permit, it's in the Title 5 permit.

So this proceeding is about a change.
You've changed the fundamental aspect of the certificate, and saying that 1803 governs is saying that the tail wags the dog, because they happened to go get some other random permit change that they can then constrain our contested case
under the Administrative Procedure Act appeal rights for the amendment to the certificate.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: DEQ, do you have any other argument that you want to make before $I$ let Talen give their piece?

MR. HAYES: I would just point out that I think under 1803 under Paragraph 1 , it's clear that when there is an amendment to another ancillary permit, and that that needs to be incorporated then back into the certificate, that is what triggers 17.20.1803. That's both expressed in the title of the rule, and then in the first -- in Subsection (1).

And that is where we are in regards to the application submitted by Talen to DEQ to modify its certificate of compliance to incorporate the modifications that were made to the air quality permits.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Talen, are you still there?

MR. FRANK: Yes.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Would you like to offer any argument at this time?

MR. FRANK: Respectfully, $I$ think it would be for us to file something, as you
suggested, so that we can have a little bit of time to formulate our response. And I would ask for perhaps, given the complexity of the issue, perhaps at least a couple more hours to finalize a filing.

I understand the need for speed, but we want to get this right. So if we could have until the end of the day tomorrow, $I$ think we would appreciate that.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I apologize because $I$ don't have the calendar in front of me, but the 15 days is up the Monday after the $31 s t$, right? Which is the second of June?

MR. CHEREN: Yes, that's how we're interpreting it.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Okay.
MR. CHEREN: I think that puts you in an uncomfortable position, given our need for exigency, given that we specifically asked for direction, we emailed them the notice of hearing that contained the statement that this issue was going to be heard before the Board today.

So they knew about this on Friday, and I'm confident that they could have taken the time to work on this. And quite frankly --

MR. STERUP: Did you email us the brief? MR. CHEREN: -- the way that they did their application, where they talk about all of this extraneous material --

MR. STERUP: (Inaudible)
MR. CHEREN: -- and the timing of this,
I find it -- would have a hard time expecting that they will represent to you that they were not aware of this issue before last Friday either, so I think --

MR. STERUP: -- (inaudible) -- needed to notify us when you didn't send us the brief.

HEARING OFFICER CLERGET: Let's
everybody back up, because we're trying to get this all on the record. So folks on the phone, can you identify yourself, and then say your piece.

MR. STERUP: Rob Sterup, and then I'll yield the floor to Josh. I want to respond to the comment that Westmoreland knew that we needed to be notified of the agenda. They sent it to us, but $I$ would point out that they did not provide us the brief.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Well --
MR. FRANK: This is Joshua Frank for

Talen. I mean $I$ would echo that. We did see the hearing agenda, but we did not receive any copies of the briefs, and happened to see them today when they were posted.

So we're not trying to play any games here, and we think we can offer meaningful response that will help a decision on this. We would just like a sufficient amount of time to do that. If need be, we'll get something in by $2: 00$ tomorrow --

MR. CHEREN: I think we can withdraw -HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Wait. Let him finish. Sorry. Finish, please.

MR. FRANK: But $I$ think an additional two hours would allow us to give you a better product that will be more useful. So if we could have until 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, $I$ think that's a small concession to ask for.

MR. CHEREN: We will withdraw our objection to 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, but $I$ think that this emphasizes that needing to go from a Friday to a Thursday to address a discrete legal issue suggests that -- why something in which all of these workers have the stakes of whether they're going to keep their jobs, that our case shouldn't
have to be on in 15 days.
So we withdraw our objection to that, and we will have to be faster on the jump if we have to get relief from the Court. But 5:00 p.m. tomorrow is fine if you can rule on Friday.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I recognize the need, or the request for an expedited ruling, and why that is; but ultimately the most important thing here is that we get it right. So $I$ care more about it being right, and if you guys have to seek some additional relief, then that's fine.

The other thing $I$ would request is that if anybody is going to choose to file this election under $223(1)(c)$ that takes us directly to District Court, the sooner you could do that the better, because it will make everybody's life -if you're going to District Court anyway, then there is no point in having a decision on this.

So $I$ would just ask that if between the time that $T a l e n$ files their response and $I$ issue a decision, if anybody comes to a decision about whether or not they're going to take that election, please don't hesitate to file it immediately.

So I guess $I$ want to put this question forward to all three of the parties for a specific answer. My inclination is that 17.20 .1803 is in conflict with 75-2-223. It seems to me that (1) (a) contemplates a MAPA proceeding, and it seems that 1803 contemplates a show cause hearing that happens in 15 days, which is certainly not a MAPA proceeding, or at least it's not a MAPA proceeding that $I$ believe is contemplated by (1) (a).

So if those are in conflict, and if this is a -- $I$ know that 1803 is a BER rule. Isn't it the BER's obligation to attempt to reconcile their rule with the $223(1)(a)$ whenever possible such that we're interpreting 1803 in a way that makes it not in conflict? Let's just take that question first. Isn't that the obligation of the BER? I'll pose that to DEQ first, I guess.

MR. HAYES: I think it's the obligation or the goal under statutory construction is to find a way to construe the statutes to be consistent with each other, and to give effect to all.

And as I've indicated before, it's my perception that 1803 was specifically enacted to implement 17.20.219(4), where as the run of the
mill --
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Where are you getting that? Because I mean I've looked through the legislative history of 1803 , and $I$ don't see that. It doesn't say when it was enacted that that was its purpose.

MR. HAYES: I'm going basically on clear language, the repetition of that language in Subsection (4) of 219 , and then the repetition of that same language in 17.20.1803(1).

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Okay.
MR. HAYES: And it's my view that the implementing footnote of 17.20 .1803 does not reference the 223, 75-20-223.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: To your knowledge, has there ever been in front of the BER an appeal of an amendment pursuant to this rule?

MR. HAYES: To my knowledge, there has not been an appeal to the Board either under 75-20-223 or ARM 17.20.1803.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So we have no essentially precedential procedure here.

MR. HAYES: That would be correct.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: And then do you think -- I'll pose this to DEQ, but then $I$
will probably want answers from everybody else, too.

Do you think that 1803 can be read, putting together (c) and (d), to be discussing a show cause hearing as separate from -- a request for a show cause hearing, which is something separate from the contested case hearing in 223? Would that be a way to reconcile the ARM and the statute, such that -- whereas here there has not been a request for a show cause hearing, and therefore 1803 would not apply?

MR. HAYES: Well, $I$ think in Subsection (c) where it says request for hearing, it's actually talking about a request for a show cause hearing, because the first lead-in to Subsection (d), "A person requesting a show cause hearing shall file."

I understand your point that there is somewhat of an inconsistency. Sometimes it uses just "hearing" and sometimes "show cause hearing," but in my construction of (c) and (d) it's referring to the show cause hearing.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Which is something different. I mean to request a show cause hearing appears to me to be something that
you're requesting internal to a contested case hearing.

For example, like I'm requesting a show cause hearing in this matter on a discovery issue, or on a -- I mean there is any number of show cause hearings that you can request within the context of a contested case hearing, which is something different than the contested case hearing itself. Do you follow my logic there?

And it's potentially one way to read them, so that they're not in conflict, is that there is a contested case hearing that occurs pursuant to 75-20-223(1) (a), when an entity is appealing DEQ's decision; and then within that, pursuant to $1803(d)$, you could request a show cause hearing, and then all of the evidence for the show cause hearing essentially would need to be submitted within 15 days, but that show cause hearing would presumably be something different or reduced from the entirety of the contested case.

MR. HAYES: I'm not sure that makes sense, because the entirety of this contested case is the two amendments that I've talked about. And it would seem to me that it wouldn't be the intent to provide two avenues to -- if I'm hearing you
right -- challenge the validity of the DEQ's amendment, giving the option of a show cause hearing --

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: No, I think you'd have the contested case hearing, and then you can request the show cause hearing within the context of the contested case hearing on a smaller, on some subset of the contested case, is what --

But again, I'm struggling to reconcile these, and $I{ }^{\prime} m$ trying to find a way that they can -- if they can't be reconciled, it seems to me that the statute trumps. It has to. So -- Right?

MR. HAYES: Well, I guess I don't see your interpretation, because for example in 1803 Sub(c), it says, "Upon timing filing of the request for hearing, the Board shall hold a show cause hearing why the proposed action should not be taken." It's talking about the entirety, not just some sort of subset of what's before the Board on the MAPA contested case.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: But then so is it your argument that then this 15 day proceeding that's contemplated by $1803(\mathrm{~d})$ constitutes the MAPA hearing that 223
contemplates? Because that's the only other way to read them without a conflict, as see it.

And $I$ am struggling, because my guess is -- and I would love for somebody to give me some more information on this -- is that this ARM was put in place in 1984 when there was a Board of Health, and an entirely different structure, and nobody has changed it in the intervening time.

The statute has changed, and we're left with a relic here that contemplates a procedure that's different than the procedure contemplated by 223. And in that case, the statute has to trump, $I$ think.

But if somebody has any other information that's other than speculative -- I've heard a lot of speculation, but $I$ haven't seen any legislative history, or any precedential case, or anything specifically to 1803 that tells me that --

MR. HAYES: My only opinion is that $I$ also looked at the rulemaking history of 1803 , and saw the 1984 amendment, and in my reading of that, it was not really relative to this proceeding or substantive.

I thought the amendment was -- At one
time the Board of Health was the entity that had the authorization to issue certificates of compliance. At some point DEQ stepped in the shoes of the Board. But at that time, I'm not aware of any changes in the process or anything.

So even though now the rule might refer to the DEQ instead of the Board, I don't think that amendment had any impact on the actual procedure.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Talen, I guess you've heard my question, so to the extent that your filing wants to address any of those questions, $I$ 'm guessing you're not prepared to answer them now.

MR. FRANK: Sorry. You broke up a little bit there. But $I$ don't think we are -- the time to respond to that. We did hear your questions, and we'll do our best to put whatever light we can on it in our filing tomorrow.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: All right.
Do you have any response to my question?
MR. CHEREN: Yes. I think the show
cause language, it trips us up, too. I mean we're operating very quickly like in our motion, our emergency motion. If somebody referred wrong and
refers to a show cause hearing is what we requested, and that's not what we want, because this is confusing, and it hasn't been done before, and there is not a lot of precedent. But $I$ wish that --

I did look at the administrative history, and often I've gone back and found things and said, "Here's the answer," and this one, the record is not very clear, but $I$ think the show cause tells you that the question is when someone comes to get their certificate amendment and says, "I've gotten this other technical change done to this permit," the only thing that would be decided in a show cause hearing is is that true, not whether you're complying with MFSA.

And it's not 223. It's just a show cause hearing about whether or not at that time a different agency had in fact completed its procedures in the proper way. That's what this was contemplating, is a show cause hearing about whether or not the facts of a technical amendment actually occurring. It's not contemplating 223, it's not implementing 223. It's just dealing with the fact that you had two different agencies doing two different things, when it was the Board of

Natural Resources and it was the Board of Health. So I think that's all it is.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: All right. I apologize. I have one more question. I know that's a famous lawyer -- "One more question." You guys made a bunch of jurisdictional arguments, and $I$ just want to be clear. Despite the potentially jurisdictional nature of this ARM, even if it's jurisdictional, the statute would still trump if they're in conflict; do you disagree with that?

MR. HAYES: I would not disagree with that.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Do you guys -- I'm assuming you don't disagree with that. MR. CHEREN: We don't disagree with that. I think that's correct.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Talen, you can address that as well if you want in your filing.

So here's what we're going to do. Talen, you have until -- you can go ahead and have until midnight tomorrow. We'll give it a Federal Court deadiine. So you have until tomorrow at midnight to file a response based on this oral
argument to both DEQ's response to the emergency motion and the emergency motion itself.

And then $I$ will issue an order on
Friday. And again, if anybody is going to go to District Court in the intervening time, please let me know that. And hopefully that will give everybody enough time that if they need to go to District Court based on my ruling, they can do that.

MR. CHEREN: That's enough time.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: So with the exception of Talen's additional filing, $I$ will take this under advisement, and $I$ will issue an order. I also issue an order -- I will try to issue an order today.

MR. FRANK: I'm sorry. You're breaking up for those of us on the phone.

HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: I will try to issue an order today. I don't know if it's going to happen today or tomorrow, just opening, stating the caption of the case, that Talen is an Intervenor.

So if you guys could go ahead and issue, if you could send me notices of appearance, that would be really helpful, so that $I$ know that I'm
sending that to the right place. And then you can file something, notices of appearance and then a written motion for intervention, so that $I$ can get that all on the written record.

MR. STERUP: Your email?
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: You can send that to my email. It's sclerget@mt.gov. It's also on the $B E R$ website in the policy there.

MR. STERUP: Thank you.
HEARINGS OFFICER CLERGET: Thank you everybody.
(The proceedings were concluded at 3:44 p.m. )
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