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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR DEVENY: So we're now moving on to action on contested cases, and we have an order before us. Sarah, do you want to --

MS. CLERGET: Yes. There is also a memo in your packet that explains, reminds you of the procedures and the options that you have with regard to a proposed decision under MAPA, and that memo is at 203 in your packet. And my
understanding is that -- Well, let me -- Do you need a reminder of what those options are?

CHAIR DEVENY: Why don't you go ahead and run through those.

MS. CLERGET: So on Page 204, you can see the bulleted options. Essentially you have the option to accept the proposed order in its entirety, and adopt it as the Board's final order;
you can accept the findings of fact in the proposed order, but modify the conclusion of law or interpretations of Administrative Rule -- and you don't have to do that with a review of the entire record.

And then the third option is reject the
proposed order, review the entire record that was before the Hearing Examiner, find the proposed order is not supported by substantial evidence, and modify the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the proposed order accordingly.

This could mean modifying the order granting summary judgment in this case, or denying summary judgment, or ordering a hearing, or some combination thereof.

CHAIR DEVENY: So I believe our first step is to hear oral arguments.

MS. CLERGET: Yes. In your packet you have the proposed order, and there were no exceptions to the proposed order filed, so you don't have those. All you have is the order. And then there are -- My understanding is both parties are here and wish to present oral argument, so however you would wish to do that.

CHAIR DEVENY: We will hear oral arguments. I think we'll hear from DEQ first, and then we will hear from the Oil Field Rock and Logistics, and then we'll move on and have a discussion among the Board.

MS. CLERGET: Would you like to give the parties a time?

CHAIR DEVENY: Could the parties limit their testimony to ten minutes?

MR. KAKUK: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIR DEVENY: We'll start with DEQ.
MR. LUCAS: Good morning, Madam Chair, Board members. My name is Mark Lucas, I'm a staff attorney with the Department's Air Energy and Mining Division. And once again, we find ourselves before you with another opencut mining enforcement case. Once again, we find ourselves before you on an uncontested summary motion as to which there were no disputed issues of fact.

This case is a little unique in that it calls upon the Board to apply the well settled administrative law principle of failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

The short version of what happened here was the Department issued an opencut mining permit to someone name Fisher in 2010. Fisher moved into the site, removed a quarter of a million cubic yards of material from the site. And then the company, which is the Petitioner before you, Oil Field, took over the site via an assignment of the permit.

When Oil Field undertook the assignment
of the permit, they undertook all of the obligations under the permit. These opencut cases, as you know, or at least the ones you've seen so far that I've had the honor to bring before you, tend to deal with reclamation a lot.

And what happens in the process of opencut mining is that they go in, and they strip off the top layers of soil, which is called overburden, to get to the pay dirt, if you will, below which is the opencut gravel and material.

And when Fisher got their permit, it included some soil borings and a plan of operation which called for the reclamation of the site involving the replacement of eighteen inches of the overburden in the mine area, and that is an obligation that Petitioner Oil Field assumed when they took the assignment of the permit. And under the signature of Oil Field's representative, they assumed all the obligations in the permit.

Unfortunately for Oil Field, this case represents a complete absence of due diligence prior to taking the assignment, because it turned out things didn't go so well for Oil Field. They were eventually kicked off the site by the landowner. And I believe it was in September of

2016 for the first time they advised us that there was not, in their opinion, sufficient overburden material left on the site to complete the reclamation.

So what they do is they're supposed to strip the overburden off, and salvage it on site, stockpile it so when they go to fill in the hole, they'll have that.

Oil Field had a number of administrative remedies which they did not avail themselves of in this context. First of all, they could have done something called a pre-app, which before you apply for an assignment of a permit, want to take over a permit, you talk to the Department.

That was never done. It's apparent to us there was no due diligence done to just go out to the site and say, "Gee, there should be some big giant stock piles of overburden here, and they're not here." We don't know what happened.

Part of the problem with what Oil Field is asking you to do is asking you to go back in time, and determine after the removal of 250,000 cubic yards of material that there never was eighteen inches of overburden on the site anyway.

The problem is they could have done that
through a permit amendment; they didn't. They could have done that through the preapplication process; they didn't. They could have appealed the assignment of the permit that we issued them and said, "This eighteen inches of overburden doesn't exist there."

So we're faced with a legal and factual impossibility which really goes to the importance of the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies. Instead Oil Field waited until they were kicked off the site, at which point they had to reclaim the site within one year.

And then we eventually brought an Administrative Order against them seeking, among other things, a compliance directive that they reclaim the site, and I believe approximately $\$ 17,500$ and penalties for related violations.

Oil Field appealed that administrative order, but they basically asked in their appeal that the Board go back and amend their permit. The only issue they raised on appeal was their claim that there never was eighteen inches of overburden on the site in the first place, and therefore they can't complete reclamation according to the permit.

Once again, they put the Department in an impossible situation. We can't go back and amend a permit once we've gone in to enforce that permit, and the reclamation is overdue and has to be conducted.

MS. SOLHEIM: You have five minutes remaining.

MR. LUCAS: Thank you. Now, the Board is a creature of the Legislature, and as such the Board is constrained by some very specific limitations that the Legislature gives the Board.

On the appeal of an administrative order, your options are to affirm, modify, or reverse the order. There is nothing in the statute that allows you to go back and amend the underlying permit upon which the order is granted, and as $I$ think you can see, that is a legal and factual impossibility here.

So recognizing the growing docket of Hearing Examiner Clerget, as well as myself, we try to dispose of these matters on summary judgment where we think summary judgment is appropriate, and avoid a hearing.

And $I$ think the Hearing Examiner's order captured pretty well the fact that Oil Field, in
addition to failing to exhaust all of its administrative remedies during the permitting process, did not make a meaningful response to our summary judgment motion, didn't cite law, did not dispute the facts we raised. And that order was entered, and then Oil Field never took any exception to that ruling.

And here we find their attorney here today, and I would just note for the Board that having failed to take those exceptions, we have yet additional failures to exhaust remedies. He certainly has the right to come here and speak. I just don't know what difference that can make to the Board since now they've failed to exhaust their administrative remedies even in front of this Board.

There were no exceptions taken to the ruling. The ruling was sound factually, since no facts were disputed. And once again, we find ourselves here in an opencut case on reclamation dealing with a pure question of law, and that question is:

When DEQ brings an administrative order against an opencut operator, does the opencut operator get to travel us all back in time to
amend the permit to reflect what they believe was there? And the answer is no. There is nothing to do except affirm, modify, or reverse the Department's Administrative Order.

We think the Hearing Examiner got it right. We believe you should adopt her ruling in all respects. And I'd like to save a minute or two for rebuttal in the event $I$ need that. And I will also be available for any questions the Board members might have starting now, or you can call me back when you need me.

CHAIR DEVENY: Let's hear from the other party. Thank you, Mr. Lucas.

MR. KAKUK: Good morning, ma'am, members of the Board. Michael Kakuk, last name is K-A-K-U-K, representing Oil Field.

Board authority. Counsel said it
himself. You have authority to amend, or modify, or rescind an order. My client was ordered to replace eighteen inches. We want that modified to twelve inches. And here are the reasons.

Counsel was correct. Mistakes were definitely made. We had administrative remedies that we could have used and didn't. I don't think, though, that that rises to the level of
failure to exhaust because as $I$ mentioned in my inadequate response, you can't exhaust a remedy to a problem you don't know exists.

Should we have known that there wasn't eighteen inches? Yes, we should have. My clients did not do due diligence, and for that, $I$ apologize for dragging everybody here, and for dragging this out.

We met with DEQ two years ago, explained the problem, and they said, "Back this up." We showed them documentation from 2010, clear documentation that in this area of the permit there was not eighteen inches of overburden. I thought we had made some progress that day. All we're looking for is a reduction to twelve.

I've argued and submitted evidence that that represents $\$ 60,000$ to my client on top of administrative penalties, that extra six inches of overburden. We can't reclaim until we know how much overburden we need. So it's not a question of us not stockpiling the overburden, it's that it wasn't there to stockpile.

And again, mea culpa. We should have known, we didn't. This Board has full authority to go ahead and modify an order. We were ordered under your statute to replace eighteen inches. Just reduce that to twelve.

This is not going to open up Pandora's Box. I don't know of any other situation -- I wouldn't have taken this case. They contacted me after the permit had been rescinded. So you're not being to asked to modify a permit. There is no permit. And $I$ think that's why DEQ couldn't help us with the eighteen to twelve, although we have never heard that. They just never heard back from them at all until $I$ got the motion for summary judgment.

So you're not modifying a permit, you're modifying an order which says eighteen inches. I just want it to go to twelve and we'll get it done. We're ready. We have trucks standing by, as they say.

It is uncontested that there was not eighteen inches. No one has ever said there was. Again, you have got clear contemporaneous evidence that was there was only twelve, that it was less than twelve inches. We're happy to go to twelve. So this is not going to open up a Pandora's Box.

I've never seen a situation like this, as $I$ was saying a minute ago before $I$ lost track.

I have never seen a situation where I've got clear, uncontroverted, contemporaneous evidence showing overburden at twelve inches. It is almost unheard of. But there it is.

Fisher Sand and Gravel did the due diligence, and there was eighteen inches up here, twelve inches down here -- (indicating) -- My clients had the unfortunate luck to mine down here where it was less than twelve. This was their first foray into Montana opencut mines. They should have had their due diligence, and again, they didn't.

In conclusion, again, $I$ 'm just going to argue that the law is clear. You have the authority. And the evidence is clear. It should be a twelve, so please reduce it to twelve, and we'll get on with this. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: DEQ, would you like to rebut, and then we'll open it up.

MR. LUCAS: Briefly, Madam Chair.
Counsel just made two errors, and asked you to adopt those errors in your decision here.

The first error is that he is seeking to ask you to modify an order. The order doesn't exist in a vacuum. The order is based on the
permit, and the regulations say you must comply with the terms of your permit. So you can't really modify the order without effectively modifying the underlying permit.

Otherwise what you would do here is open up a Pandora's Box where every time we enforce against someone, they get to go in and try and get you to change the terms of the underlying permit. That just doesn't work. And this isn't strict legal formalism or me playing gotcha with my opponent based on some case law.

The whole process falls apart. You just heard him say that it was uncontested that there was twelve inches of soil there. If it was uncontested, perhaps some facts alleged on summary judgment by the Petitioner would have helped. That was the time to claim something was uncontested. They didn't.

And in fact, what the facts do show is that the Fisher Sand and Gravel, the original permittee, determined that there was eighteen inches of overburden, and they put that in their plan of operation, and then that permit was assigned to Oil Field. And when Oil Field took the assignment of that permit, they filled out a bond reclamation spreadsheet which indicated that eighteen inches of overburden would be replaced. MS. SOLHEIM: You have one minute. MR. LUCAS: So while these facts were not disputed at the appropriate time and at the appropriate place in the Agency's procedures, they are not uncontested. The facts show what they show, and all that they show is that eighteen inches of overburden was there. That is what Oil Field agreed when they took the assignment of the permit to replace.

And it is not like they didn't have multiple opportunities, including most recently on summary judgment, or by taking an exception to the Hearing Examiner's order.

So we think the issue before the Board is simple. We understand, as government regulators, sometimes what we have to do is unpleasant, but there has to be a system of rules, there has to be a procedure that is followed, or we're just devolving into basically sheer legal and factual anarchy here. So thank you for your time.

CHAIR DEVENY: At this point do members of the Board have questions of $D E Q$, or of Mr .

Kakuk, or a question of Sarah?
MR. BUSBY: Just --
CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter, do you have a comment?

MR. BUSBY: I do. Well, questions. In this case, what's the difference between the plan of operation and the permit?

MS. CLERGET: The plan of operation is attached to the permit. It becomes part of the permit. So they're sort of part and parcel of the same. DEQ might be able to correct me if I'm wrong on that, but that's my understanding.

MR. LUCAS: That's correct.
MR. BUSBY: So if I understood what I heard from both, the plan of operation is what contained the eighteen inch number that seems to be ticked out, not necessarily the permit itself?

MS. CLERGET: Well, the plan of
operation is part of the permit, so the permit incorporates the plan of operation, so --

MR. BUSBY: It references?
MS. CLERGET: Not just references, it incorporates it. So the plan of operation becomes the permit as well. Does that make sense? The permit doesn't make any sense without the plan of
operation.
MR. BUSBY: Okay. I understand.
CHAIR DEVENY: Other questions or comments by Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I have a question of Sarah. Say, do you concur with DEQ's comments about the Board's legal authority with regards to that, to making changes?

MS. CLERGET: I do, and believe that that's reflected in the proposed order.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions, discussions by Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Anybody would like to make a motion?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I'm a little I guess confused at this point about exactly what is in front of the Board right now, and I'm sure it's in the packet somewhere and I may have just missed it. But what exactly are we being asked to review here?

MS. CLERGET: Chris, it is the --
MR. TWEETEN: It is not the revocation of the permit?

MS. CLERGET: No. Chris, the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and recommended order beginning on Page 206 of your packet. It is my proposed order based on the summary judgment motions.

MR. TWEETEN: No. I understand that, Sarah. But when Oil Field filed its request for a hearing in this matter, what was it asking the Board to hear? Were they complaining about the penalties that were imposed for failure to reclaim in accordance with the governing rules and statutes, or -- They're certainly not complaining about the revocation of their permit at this point, are they?

MS. CLERGET: I don't want to get too far into the weeds. Would the parties like to respond to that?

MR. KAKUK: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Mr. Kakuk.
MR. KAKUK: Is that Chris Tweeten on the phone?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, it is.
MR. TWEETEN: Yes, it is, Michael. How are you?

MR. KAKUK: No complaints, sir. Nice to
hear from you.
Again, what Oil Field is looking for is relief from the order requiring it to replace eighteen inches of overburden instead of the twelve.

And there are disputed facts, DEQ Fact 23, 25, and the additional disputed fact that $I$ have raised in my statement of disputed facts, which placed this clearly in front of the Board. Does that help, Mr. Tweeten?

MR. TWEETEN: Well, $I$ guess we don't have all of those background summary judgment documents in our packet. Mr. Lucas tells us that the facts are uncontested. Now you're saying that you filed, with respect to the Department's motion for summary judgment, you filed a statement of contested facts?

MR. KAKUK: That's correct, sir.
MS. CLERGET: No. This is Sarah, and I'm going interject here because $I$ want make sure that the record is clear.

Chris, what happened is that DEQ filed a statement of undisputed facts. There was a response which I've outlined in the order that disputed three of the facts. Those facts are not
included in the proposed findings of fact. So the proposed findings of fact do not include any disputed facts. And when Counsel just told you the three numbers that he just cited, those facts are not included in the proposed findings of fact.

MR. TWEETEN: So then you would say that those facts were not material to your decision?

MS. CLERGET: Yes.
MR. TWEETEN: I'm just thinking back to the language of Rule 56 with respect to genuine disputes with respect to material facts is what could block a motion for summary judgment. And if the facts -- it doesn't matter if they're disputed facts if they're not material to the legal issues that are presented.

So I take it, Sarah, that your position would be that while there may be arguments about certain facts, they don't affect the propriety of your summary judgment order; is that correct? MS. CLERGET: Correct. MR. TWEETEN: Mr. Kakuk, what do you say to that?

MR. KAKUK: I disagree that they're not relevant or material. I think it is the material fact. is the material fact as to what actually was on the ground in 2010, eighteen or twelve. Thank you, sir.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, any follow up, or Sarah, any clarification?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, I need to take a minute before $I$ speak again to take another look at Sarah's order, so if you could give me just a moment. If there were other people that want to speak.

CHAIR DEVENY: We're all kind of
looking. Let's just take thirty seconds.
MS. CLERGET: Chris, to answer your question about the notice. I have the notice of appeal in front of me if you would like additional questions answered about that. I can read you what it says, if you need that answer from the record.

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris again. And Sarah, with respect to the administrative remedies, $I$ think failure to exhaust is a judicial review principle. It is not exactly -- I don't think it is technically applicable when the matter is still before the
agency, because nothing in front of the agency is final until the agency final order is issued, which is what's in front of the Board today.

What is there to prevent the Board from remanding this case to DEQ to allow Mr. Kakuk to bring his complaints about the overburden depth question to appropriate administrative channels? I understand that the permit has been revoked. There is nothing to be done with the permit. So is it the case then -- and I'd like to hear the Department's view on this as well -Is it the case then that the time for challenging the factual appropriateness of Fisher's representation that there is eighteen inches of overburden, which was tacitly or overtly adopted by Oil Field when it assumed the permit, the time for taking issue with the depth of the overburden was before the permit was revoked, and that once the permit was revoked, Oil Field was basically stuck with the representations that were made at the time that Oil Field assumed the permit?

MS. CLERGET: Chris, $I$ don't want to risk advocating for a party, so $I^{\prime} m$ going to let Mark from DEQ respond.

MR. TWEETEN: That would be great.
MR. LUCAS: Madam Hearing Examiner.
Member Tweeten, $I$ have to disagree with you on a legal point you just made. It is in fact well settled in Montana -- and I don't have the cases at my fingertips. I believe they were cited in my brief. If not $I$ can get them to you -- that administrative remedies must be exhausted at all levels of agency review.

So where you have an intermediate board sitting rendering decisions, you have to exhaust your remedies before you get to that board, because otherwise where would we be, Member Tweeten? We'd be back opening up a permit that was already issued, which involved a technical proceeding and review by technical folks.

So you're probably thinking of the MAPA provision -- and $I$ don't have it memorized. Maybe it is 702 -- where it talks about judicial review. That's a different animal because there, MAPA strictly says, and even with a respect to judicial review it says you have to exhaust all administrative remedies before the agency.

MAPA does not expressly include an exhaustion requirement. It leaves it to the agencies. There is a savings clause made that says nothing in here affects anything else an agency does basically. Bad paraphrase, but it's there.

So what the agencies do, there is an implied exhaustion where we set up a procedure, and you need to follow it, or you wind up where you are here, which is in court on an appeal of an Administrative Order seeking to amend the permit, rather than deal with the order. So the issues you have are issues of statute of limitations, and also jurisdictional limitations.

Oil Field appealed the order, and when they provided on May 10 th, 2017 their basis for appeal, the sole basis for appeal they raised -and I'm quoting -- the basis of the appeal is that Oil Field cannot complete reclamation under the terms of the permit due to a lack of overburden.

That's their words, Mr. Tweeten. When you appeal an Administrative Order, you are limited to affirming, modifying, or reversing the order. You are not allowed to go back and do this post hoc amendment of a permit. I can't even imagine how such a process would be even be undertaken.

So that's where we are. The permit had been issued; the time to appeal that permit had run; the opportunity to amend the permit at any time during the term of the permit had run.

So it is a very simple case, from our perspective, and we believe the law makes it very simple, too, once you understand those two concepts: Number one, that administrative exhaustion has to occur at all levels of the agency.

And number two, Oil Field appealed an Administrative Order. They didn't deny liability, they didn't contest the amount of the penalty, all they said was, "We can't meet the terms of the permit." That's a challenge to the permit, sir.

And $I$ realize Oil Field is in a difficult situation, but they've admitted to you themselves here. They're here because of a lack of due diligence on their part. And we have signed statements from them assuming responsibility for replacing eighteen inches of overburden in 2012.

So it is a difficult case, Member Tweeten. I understand that. But it also resolves itself rather simply and ultimately in favor of
the Department in this case. We just can't go back and do a Mulligan on a permit that is final.

And yes, we did talk to them. My first day of work here, we sat in this very room, and we listened to Oil Field's pitch, and we sat there trying to figure out how they could tell that it was uncontested that twelve inches of overburden was there when we knew 250,000 cubic yards of material had already been removed from the site.

So it is a legal and a factual
impossibility that you're being asked to adjudicate here, and for that reason, we strongly urge you to adopt Hearing Examiner Clerget's order in its entirety. I'm available for further questions. Otherwise, thank you.

MR. TWEETEN: Mr. Lucas, I think somewhere in what you just said is the answer to my question. The question that $I$ wanted an answer to was: Is it the case then that once the permit was revoked, there were no further administrative remedies available to Oil Field to change the overburden determination from eighteen inches to twelve? And $I$ gather from your answer that the Department's position is that there were no further remedies available after that time.

MR. LUCAS: No remedies that I'm aware of, Member Tweeten. And the problem is the intervening and superseding event was an Administrative Order was brought for a violation of the permit. So you can't - - If you get caught violating your permit, you can't then say, "Okay. I'm going to amend it," because the amendment would not become effective until approved by the Department. The violation will still be there.

And we've seen this in other cases, too. While you have that permit, you're bound by the terms of that permit, you need to comply with that permit, and especially on matters of reclamation. There is a constitutional dimension to the requirement for reclamation in Montana.

And Oil Field's mistake and lack of diligence cannot under law, under any sense of justice or fairness, be externalized to the people of Montana and the landowner of that land, who was also a participant in this case, and that they can just say, "Well, the permit was wrong in the first place." Those costs can't be internalized to the landowner or the environment, Member Tweeten. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, does that answer
your question?
MR. TWEETEN: Well, Madam Chair,
eventually it did. I think there's a lot more there that doesn't have anything to do with my question, but $I$ think $I$ understand what $I$ think needs to be done with this case at this point, and so I'm ready to make a motion if no one else has any questions or comments.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions or comments from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Would you go ahead and make your motion then, Chris.

MR. TWEETEN: Sure. Madam Chair, I move that the Board adopt Hearing Examiner Clerget's proposed decision as the Board of Environmental Review's final order in this matter.

CHAIR DEVENY: I would second that.
MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, in support of the motion, $I$ would just state that $I$ think it is clear that, cutting away all of the weeds here, the request to make the change that Mr. Kakuk requests is simply not timely at this point.

There were opportunities to make a factual record with respect to this matter while
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the permit was still in effect. Once the permit was revoked, those opportunities ended, and it is not appropriate or lawful, $I$ think, to go back and amend the permit at this point in response to the complaints regarding the Department's enforcement order.

So I think Sarah's proposed decision is entirely correct, and $I$ think that the Board should just adopt it and let this matter come to conclusion, and if Oil Field thinks we've got something wrong legally, they can certainly ask the Courts to intervene and fix it.

CHAIR DEVENY: There is a motion before the Board to accept the proposed order in its entirety and adopt it as the Board's final order, and it has been seconded. Is there further discussion by Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, we'll take a vote. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Those opposed, signify by saying nay.

> (No response)

CHAIR DEVENY: Motion carries. MR. KAKUK: Thank you very much for your time.
(The proceedings were concluded at 11:03 a.m. )

*     *         *             *                 * 
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