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CHAIR DEVENY: Welcome everybody to the Board of Environmental Review. I'm Chris Deveny, Chair of the Board. I'm the only one here today. The rest of the Board members are calling in. So Lindsay, if you'd take roll call and make sure we've got a quorum and see who all is here. MS. FORD: Chris Deveny. CHAIR DEVENY: Present. MS. FORD: John Felton. MR. FELTON: Present. MS. FORD: Dexter Busby. MR. BUSBY: Present. MS. FORD: Hillary Hanson. MS. HANSON: Present. MS. FORD: Tim Warner. MR. WARNER: Present. MS. FORD: John Dearment. (No response) MS. FORD: John Dearment. (No response)

MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
MR. TWEETEN: Here.

MS. FORD: We have everyone present except John Dearment. We do have a quorum. CHAIR DEVENY: All right. Hello, everybody. Good to have you on. It's kind of quiet here today up at the -- on the board, but let's go ahead and identify other people in the room. George.

MR. MATHIEUS: George Mathieus,
Department/Board liaison.
MS. CLERGET: Sarah Clerget, Board attorney.

MS. KELLY: Molly Kelly, intern with Agency Legal services.

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

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

MS. TRENK: Peggy Trenk, Treasure State Resources Association.

MR. BARTON: Darrell Barton, DEQ Water Quality.

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

MR. LUCAS: Mark Lucas, DEQ, staff
attorney, Coal and Opencut.
MS. BASS: Miranda Bass. I'm with the Air, Energy Mining Division in the Energy Bureau.

MS. SCHERER: Cindy Scherer, legal
secretary, DEQ.
MR. HAYES: Ed Hayes, Acting Chief Legal
Counsel for DEQ.
MR. WILLIAMS: Keaton Williams. I'm here on behalf of Cottonwood Environmental Law Center.

MR. GARBER: Jason Garber, DEQ Water Protection Bureau.

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

MR. URBAN: Eric Urban, Water Quality Planning Bureau Chief.

CHAIR DEVENY: And the woman that just came in.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Joanna McLaughlin, Water Protection Bureau.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thanks, everybody. Are there any other members of the public on the telephone today?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I just want to remind
people on the phone to keep your phones muted, and to remember to state your name when you speak up so our Court Reporter can get your names correct. Thank you.

So the first order of business is to review and approve the minutes from the last Board meeting. Do any of the Board members have any corrections or additions to the minutes?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, is there any public comment on the minutes, from DEQ or others in the room?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, would somebody like to make a motion.

MR. BUSBY: So moved. This is Dexter.
CHAIR DEVENY: And a second?
MR. TWEETEN: Chris Tweeten. I'll
second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes. All in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)

CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, the minutes are approved.

And next we'll move over to briefing items with Sarah Clerget, our BER attorney, to give us an update.

MS. CLERGET: Hi, everybody. This is Sarah. So going through on Page 1, $1(a)$, the enforcement cases. First is the CMG Construction. That one $I$ granted a stay on July $23 r d, 2018$, and they're required to file status updates every thirty days, and it's my understanding that they're in settlement negotiations.

> "B," Columbia Falls Aluminum, I
apologize. I was hoping to have an update for you on this case today. I don't. I believe that it will be -- my hope is to have it in front of you for argument at the October meeting, but that will be dependent a little bit on how much time the parties feel they need for exceptions.

But that order is forthcoming, and will definitely be issued before the October meeting, hopefully with enough time before the October meeting that we can put it on the agenda for October.
"C," Copper Ridge, that decision is
issued, and $I$ was hoping to have it in front of you today for oral argument, but the parties asked for more time on their exceptions briefs, and so that will be in front of you at the December meeting, that decision.

Going to Page 2, the Fischer Land Development, this one has settled, or they're working on a settlement agreement, and so I granted a stay.
"E," Wagoner Family, there is an update from what is on the agenda. My understanding is that the parties have reached a settlement, and that a motion to dismiss will be forthcoming. We just don't have it yet. So that one will drop off your agenda.

Wagoner, just to be clear, is the penalty phase of the hearing that you heard argument and a proposed order on. I believe it was at the meeting before last.
"F" is Little Bear. There is a scheduling order in place. I'm having a little bit of trouble with the permit holder who has not appeared as $I$ ordered, and so we're going to have a status conference on that hopefully next week to figure out what to do with that situation. But there is a scheduling order in place, and they're proceeding accordingly.

Two, Non-enforcement Cases.
Westmoreland is a stay pending a decision from the Supreme Court, so I don't have any further information on when that will happen. They're just going to file a status report within thirty days of that decision.
"B," Signal Peak, as you guys remember, this is the one that is stayed because there is an action pending in District Court in which the Board is named as a defendant about the subpoena issue. And summary judgment was just filed on that subpoena issue yesterday, $I$ think, or the day before, and so they're in the process of briefing that summary judgment issue, and the underlying case in front of the Board is stayed until that District Court case is resolved.

Western Energy. The parties have filed their proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. The responses to those were due or were about to be due, but the parties asked for an extension until September 20 th to file those responses. I granted that, but indicated there would be no further extensions. And this is -- I apologize -- an update from what's on the agenda.

I will have the findings and conclusions and the responses from the parties by the end of September, and then $I$ will issue a decision; and rather than double up this case with Copper Ridge, which will be on the December agenda for you guys, with discussion with Chris, I think we'd like to not have two big cases in front of the Board at the same time, so I'll get this one in front of you in the February meeting, unless anybody has any thoughts otherwise.

And Montanore, there is a summary judgment motion pending right now. Hopefully the decision should be out either today or tomorrow on that, and then $I$ will issue a scheduling order for the remainder of the case.

It's only partial summary judgment, so there is definitely going to be a hearing no matter what $I$ do. And currently the parties were talking about that sometime in October, so that's sort of what we're shooting for, but we'll see, and that will be a full blown hearing, multi-day hearing.
"E" is Laurel Refinery. That's stayed until August 24 th, so $I$ haven't heard anything. I
will hear by the end of the month about that one. JR Civil is dismissed, so you don't have to worry about that.

License MVWF-0376, which is another Payne Logging case, is dismissed without prejudice. So unless they come back and refile that one with an attorney, that's the last we're going to hear about that.

And $3(a)$ is not me, so somebody at DEQ needs to give an update on that.

CHAIR DEVENY: Could we have an update from DEQ, please.

MR. HAYES: Chairwoman Deveny, other members of the Board, this is Ed Hayes, Acting Chief Legal Counsel for DEQ.

And as indicated in the agenda, the case is currently being briefed before the Montana Supreme Court. DEQ has filed its Appellant's brief, and the Appellees have requested an extension of time for them to file their response brief, and that has a deadine of September 11th, 2018 .

And after that is filed, then DEQ will have 14 days to file its reply brief, at which time the case will be fully briefed before the

Supreme Court, and they will then make a decision in terms of whether to hear oral argument or not. Usually the cases are decided without oral argument.

And once it's fully briefed, then the case is to be resolved at the convenience of the Supreme Court. So we're still in the briefing phase of that case.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Mr. Hayes. Do Board members have any questions of Sarah about any of the scheduling or contested case procedural matters?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, I'd like to have the Board consider whether, since we've sort of had a lot of quiet meetings, whether we would maybe want to take on one of these cases, and I was thinking perhaps the Montanore Minerals case. It has to do with the MPDES permit in Libby, Montana.

Is there any interest by the Board members to leave the procedural matters with Sarah, but to have Board members conduct the hearing?

MR. BUSBY: This is Dexter. I think
that's -- because they are so quiet, I think that would be a good idea, either that or the Cenex case, either one. Laurel Refinery.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other thoughts from other Board members?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris Tweeten. I guess I'd like to hear from Sarah with respect to Montanore what other matters are anticipated to come up before the evidentiary hearing takes place, so we can get a better idea what the status of the thing is. Sarah, could you fill us in on any of that? Do you anticipate anything further beyond a partial summary judgment before the evidentiary hearing will be ready to tee up?

MS. CLERGET: There will probably be -in my scheduling orders, $I$ usually require a bunch of prehearing filings, so they'll probably -- if they have any motions in limine, and then the prehearing filings include prehearing memo, the exchange of exhibits, and objections on those.

And so there is that sort of procedural stuff, which I can take care of, and I can take care of any motions in limine if you want me to. Other than that, $I$ think it's pretty ready. We
will have done the partial summary judgment, so that there won't be any other dispositive motions.

And the parties -- I have to remember. I think the parties indicated that it would be a three day hearing, but $I$ can double check on that. I will have that answer momentarily.

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, if $I$ might. CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.

MR. TWEETEN: Thank you. I guess I've done quite a few contested cases, but I've never been involved in an evidentiary hearing in front of a multi-member Board like this. So I'm not real clear in my mind as to what the established procedure would be, if there is one, for actually conducting the hearing, in terms of things like ruling on objections, ruling on the admissibility of evidence, those kinds of things that Judges do during -- or Administrative Law Judges do during ordinary contested cases.

Would those things be put to a vote of the Board, or would the Chair be empowered to rule on those things on behalf of the Board?
I'm in favor of the idea. I think it
would be a good use of the Board's time. But I do think that we need to make some decisions about
how the Board is going to proceed as the presiding entity with the hearing.

And perhaps, Sarah, you can brief us on that at our next meeting.

MS. CLERGET: Sure. Chris, right now I can respond, too, if that would be helpful.

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
MS. CLERGET: This is Sarah again. I think my understanding, from the way $I$ have seen it done with some other boards, is that it's up to the Board how you want to run it.

If you have an attorney on the Board, as we do, or if the Board Chair is comfortable, then the Board can retain those sorts of decisions, usually by designating a point person, like the Board Chair is going to be the acting Hearing Examiner for the purposes of the hearing; or the attorney that's on the Board, as a Board member, can be designated as that Hearing Examiner for the purposes of that hearing.

Or you can designate me as the Hearing Examiner for the purposes of evidentiary rulings, but any substantive rulings would be the Board's to make, and essentially the way practically that works is that the Board sits as though they were a
panel of Judges, but any evidentiary objections are made to me, and then $I$ would rule on them as the hearing progresses.

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, may I follow up?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes. Go ahead, Chris.
MR. TWEETEN: I figured it would be probably left to the Board's discretion to as how it wanted to handle all of those things, and all of those options I think are certainly available. We just need to decide which of them we want to get, or whether there are any other options we want to follow, $I$ guess, in terms of how to handle all of those procedural matters.

So again, I'd like to ask that those -Well, at some point before we get to an evidentiary hearing, all of those decision points are going to have to be identified as to what we're going to do in this situation or that situation that comes up during the hearing in terms of making rulings.

And then the Board is going to have to adopt a hearing protocol for how we're going to handle that, because $I$ think the parties are entitled to know as they prepare for the hearing
what the protocol is going to be.
So again, I guess, Sarah, if you could -- Madam Chair, $I$ would suggest that we ask Sarah to maybe look back in history, and try to figure out when was the last time the Board did one of these, and if it is possible, what we did in those circumstances, and maybe look to some other multi-member Boards that have presided over evidentiary hearings. The PSC comes to mind, but they're probably not a good example.

You'll get some ideas as to how to do these things, and then as we prepare to conduct this evidentiary hearing, we should $I$ think issue some sort of a prehearing order, letting the parties know what we decided to do in terms of the nuts and bolts of presiding over the hearing.

MS. CLERGET: Madam Chair, I can certainly do that, and the only thing $I$ would need to know is if the Board were not -- if the Board were to just leave it in my hands as it is now, my expectation was to have a scheduling conference after $I$ issued a summary judgment order, like $I$ said, today or Monday, and have a scheduling conference sometime within the next couple of weeks to set up the hearing schedule. And the
hearing, when the hearing is will determine when all of those prehearing deadlines are.

And so if this is something that the Board wants to do, I do probably need to know at this meeting, so that $I$ can set up the schedule accordingly after this summary judgment ruling, and the idea being essentially are you willing to --

I just looked at the scheduling order, and it does not indicate -- Kurt is not here, so he can't tell me how long this hearing is going to be -- but from what $I$ know of the case, $I$ would expect it to be at least two to three days. I think we could probably get it done in two, but we might need three. And so the Board would need to give me some dates that all of the Board members would be available for that length of time.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'd like to hear from some of the other Board members. Is there interest in doing this, from those that we haven't heard from?

MR. FELTON: This is John Felton. I'm real concerned about, with the rest of my life the way it is, carving out two full days and possibly a third day to be away from the rest of my day
job. One day is a possibility. I think two or three gets a little more challenging.

MS. HANSON: This is Hillary, and I would ditto that.

CHAIR DEVENY: Tim Warner? Tim, what's your thought?

MR. WARNER: Tim Warner. Sorry. I was on mute. I'm fine.

CHAIR DEVENY: You would be fine with attending a two to three day hearing?

MR. WARNER: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Not an overwhelming
majority here saying, "Yes, let's do it." Four of us, and we don't know about John Dearment.

MS. CLERGET: There may be other opportunities aside from -- I mean there are lots of cases, so this will not be your last chance. CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter or Chris, what do you think? Should we -- and Tim, with two people saying no, do you think we should proceed, or should we wait? $I$ would just like your opinions. MR. BUSBY: Madam Chair.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Dexter.
MR. BUSBY: I would wish everybody to be there or at least comfortably there, so maybe the
best thing is to wait on it, or pick another case.

## CHAIR DEVENY: Chris.

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, I think that's right. Under MAPA, if even one of the Board members is not available, unavailable Board members who don't participate in the evidentiary hearing would have to sit down and review the entire evidentiary record, and then be prepared to affirm that that's what they did, before they'd be allowed to be participate in the decision.

So unless the entire Board can actually be there, it gets a little -- I mean it's going to be burdensome on those members who don't attend the hearing either way. And perhaps we should look for a better vehicle that might involve a one day hearing as opposed to something as intricate as the Libby case.

CHAIR DEVENY: Well, hearing that, I think I'll move on, and ask Sarah to keep us in mind, though, for another case that might be coming up that maybe we can have a little more advance notice on, and we could maybe be a little bit more prepared.

MS. CLERGET: Okay. Sure.
CHAIR DEVENY: And something that's not
quite so lengthy.
MS. CLERGET: Okay.
CHAIR DEVENY: Let's move on to the action items then. We have some rules proposed by DEQ for initiating rulemaking, so turn it over to George.

MR. MATHIEUS: Thanks, Madam Chair. Jason Garber from the Department will be presenting to you today.

MR. GARBER: Madam Chair, members of the Board, my name is Jason Garber, last name is spelled $G-A-R-B-E-R$. I am here today to request the Board to initiate rulemaking for the Administrative Rules for 401 certification.

I am the 401 certification coordinator for the agency. 401 certification certifies Federal permits and licenses for compliance with State water quality standards.

These rules have not been addressed in over 20 years, since they've been framed. In that time, we've discovered some issues that arise when we're working with our Federal partners on permitting actions, and today $I$ 'm just going to go over some of the high points of the amendments we're proposing.

The first one would be: Part of the completeness review, the current language has a 30 day completeness review window, in which if we don't make that completeness determination, that application is already deemed complete.

This can be problematic because we have to align our time frames with the Federal permitting agency, oftentimes the Army Corps of Engineers, and so we're proposing to remove that language out of the current rule.

The other high point that is important to these rules is our tentative determination. The current tentative language indicates that if we don't make a tentative determination within 30 days after we receive a complete application, the 401 certification is automatically waived, meaning that DEQ is out of the ballgame in terms of conditioning a Federal permit for compliance with water quality standards.

So we would like to remove that language. It puts us in a position to rush to make a decision in order to meet that deadline. And that's basically the high points of it.

I would just add that this is for 401 certification only. It does not pertain to MPDES
permits in any way. With that, Madam Chair, I'll take questions if you have any.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Do any of the Board members have any questions about the proposed rulemaking?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, would somebody like to make a motion?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is
Chris. I move to initiate rulemaking as requested.

MR. FELTON: John Felton. I'll second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
MR. BUSBY: Aye.
CHAIR DEVENY: Was the last aye an affirmative or a negative?

MR. BUSBY: Affirmative.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Dexter. It
has been moved and seconded and passed, so DEQ is authorized to proceed with the rulemaking on this. MR. GARBER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Moving right along, we have two new contested cases. I'll turn it over to Sarah to explain.

MS. CLERGET: Thank you. This is Sarah. And the summaries are on the agenda, and the materials are attached in your packet. My suggestion for these two cases would be to consolidate them pursuant to Montana Rule of Civil Procedure 42, which allows you to combine cases when they involve the same facts.

And as you can tell, both of these cases involve the same mining permit. They are brought by different residents around the permitted area, and my suggestion would be that you consider consolidating.

Mark from the Department is here. I don't see anybody else in the audience from the parties, and $I$ haven't heard them on the phone. But one option would be to allow anybody to comment on that consolidation, if you would like.

The other options, as you are familiar with, you can assign this to me for procedural purposes only; you can assign it to me for
everything; you can assign it for summary judgment only, or all the way through hearing.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do Board members have any questions of Sarah at this time?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none --
MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.
MR. TWEETEN: Just a question for Sarah, in light of our previous discussion. It seems to me there are some procedural issues here. One of the objectors appears to be seeking to represent an entire group of individuals. And so I'm wondering if this might not be a good candidate for the kind of Board consideration that we just talked about.

The issue has to do with, as I read the objections, whether the Department adequately considered water quality issues in particular, effect on groundwater, and other kinds of potential environmental questions with this gravel pit.

So perhaps this might be a good candidate, and in light of that, maybe we should assign it to Sarah for the prehearing procedures, and then defer to a later date, once the matter is fleshed out a little bit better, the question of whether the Board wants to hear this, hear the evidence on this itself, or whether it wants Sarah to act as the Hearing Examiner.

MS. CLERGET: Madam Chair. This is Sarah again. The only thing to keep in mind with that is that $I$ think these are probably -- or at least some of them will be pro se, which may make it a little bit more cumbersome as a hearing, but that's not to say that it can't be handled. But just as a practical matter.

CHAIR DEVENY: I think I'd rather wait for something that's perhaps a little more straight forward.

MS. CLERGET: Again, you can always change your mind. You can assign it to me now, and we can see how far you get, and if you want to take it back at any point, you can do that.

CHAIR DEVENY: Does DEQ have any
comments on the consolidation, or anybody from the public have any comments on the consolidation issue?

MR. LUCAS: Madam Chair, members.

Without the other parties here or any representatives they may have, it wouldn't be appropriate for DEQ to comment on that at this stage. That would be ex parte.

CHAIR DEVENY: Would you state your name for the record.

MR. LUCAS: Mark Lucas.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you.
MS. CLERGET: Are we correct there is nobody on the phone?

CHAIR DEVENY: There is nobody on the phone. Thank you for pointing that out. Sarah, do you have a recommendation for how to proceed at this point?

MS. CLERGET: I would recommend that you consolidate the cases into one case regarding Opencut Mining Permit 2315 , and we can keep the double headers on it. We can keep them as two separate cases, they're just consolidated for the purposes of the record, which that's how $I$ would recommend you proceed, and then whatever your pleasure is with regard to assigning it to a Hearing Examiner.

CHAIR DEVENY: I would then make a motion that the cases be consolidated, and that we
assign both of them to a Hearing Examiner for the totality of the cases.

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I second.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any further discussion about this?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion passes. The
contested cases will be consolidated and assigned to our Hearing Examiner.

Next we have the petition for rulemaking, and Board members have had the petition for awhile. Hopefully you have information about that in front of you, as well as the memo that Sarah put together two meetings ago regarding the procedural issues. So Sarah, how would you recommend proceeding with this? MS. CLERGET: It is up to you, Madam

Chair, but perhaps hearing from the parties might facilitate.

CHAIR DEVENY: There is somebody here from -- Mr. Williams from the Cottonwood group. Would you care to make a statement to the Board? I know we had asked -- With new information that came to your organization about the cost of the EIS, and we had asked that you come before the Board to tell us whether you were interested in proceeding, or wanted to withdraw your petition, based on that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. My name is Keaton Williams, and I'm here representing Cottonwood Environmental Law Center.

Madam Chair and the Board, Cottonwood at this time would like to continue with the permitting process. Looking through the procedure of the designation right now, before it has been accepted, Cottonwood would like to continue and deal with the EIS cost issues after acceptance or rejection of the petition at that time. CHAIR DEVENY: Do any members of the Board have questions for Mr. Williams?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I have one.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.
MR. TWEETEN: Mr. Williams, thank you for joining us this morning to give us the petitioner's perspective. I just want to make sure it is understood that there really isn't any issue with respect to the allocation of costs of the EIS.

The statute is extremely clear in saying that you, that Cottonwood, as petitioners would be required to accept the cost of preparing the EIS, which has been estimated by DEQ at a quarter of a million dollars. We don't have the discretion to, as a Board, allocate that cost in any way other than as directed by the statute.

So what you're essentially telling us this morning is that Cottonwood is prepared to pay whatever the cost of the EIS is, up to whatever it turns out to be, whether it's a quarter of a million or more or less.

Just so that's understood, I think the petition is complete, and in my opinion at least as an individual Board member, $I$ think it is appropriate to accept the petition, and move forward under the fairly convoluted procedure that's set forth in the statute; but there is no
point in doing that if at some point in the future Cottonwood is going to ask the Board to make some other arrangement with respect to the financial burden that's placed on Cottonwood by the statute for paying for the EIS.

So is that understood by Cottonwood that there is no flexibility here on the Board's part? If we go forward, and the EIS is prepared, Cottonwood is going to have to pay for it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, $I$ believe that's -I'm a contract attorney for Cottonwood. I don't have access to all of their financial information. But from what $I$ understand, Cottonwood understands that under Section 6 of the procedure after the petition is accepted, and that the EIS will not begin until Cottonwood has put forward that money. So yes, Cottonwood does understand that.

MR. TWEETEN: Thank you, Mr. Williams, I appreciate that. Thank you for the information.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Do other Board members have questions of Mr. Williams? (No response)

CHAIR DEVENY: Sarah, do you have any questions?

MS. CLERGET: No.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Thank you for coming today and telling us.

So Board members, what's before us is a decision that we need to make whether the petition contains sufficient credible information or not, and we need to decide whether we feel that that information is there before us today, or whether we want $D E Q$ to review the petition further and give us a recommendation. Are there any thoughts on how to proceed with that?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris again. I hate to dominate the conversation, but I'd be interested in hearing DEQ's opinion as to the completeness of the application, but it is the Board's decision as to whether that sufficient credible information is there, and on its face it looks pretty darn complete to me, but I would like to hear from $D E Q$ as to whether they think there are any omissions, or errors, or other deficiencies in the petition that would justify the Board in declining to accept it at this point. CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. And any other Board members have any comments at this time? I also agree that $I$ think that -- Dexter, am I hearing you?

MR. BUSBY: I would like to hear from Sarah also on the completeness issue.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay, Sarah.
MS. CLERGET: Again, $I$ think that this is sort of a Board decision, but the statute, the way the statute reads is this is a very preliminary stage, essentially: Does what you're given, on its face, meet the requirements of the statute, which are $3(a)$ ? And those are laid out in my memo.

And given what Cottonwood said today, in addition to their filing, it would seem to me that at least at this stage, there is sufficient credible information to proceed, but that is the Board's ultimate decision.

CHAIR DEVENY: Other questions or comments from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: As a Board member, I also feel that there is sufficient credible information before us, based on the previous EIS that was done some years ago, and also just the fact that a previous Board of Environmental Review accepted a previous petition which was also based on that EIS. So I'm willing to proceed, but I'd like to
hear other Board member comments, if there are any.

MR. FELTON: This is John Felton. If I could make a quick comment.

CHAIR DEVENY: Sure. Go ahead, John.
MR. FELTON: I sort of am kind of in the same boat that Chris Tweeten brought up, which is when we had the Cottonwood folks at a previous meeting, it seemed pretty solid cut and dried that there was no way in the world that they can afford that EIS. And now I'm not sure what happened.

Is there any way that they would need to certify or warrant somehow that they have the capacity, or does it just proceed until they say, "Well, it turns out we couldn't raise the money so we're not going to do it"? How does that work if for instance they decide, "We just can't do this if we proceed now"?

CHAIR DEVENY: That's a good question for somebody with a legal mind, and I'll ask Sarah.

MS. CLERGET: I think all we have is the statute to guide us through this process, and there is nothing that requires that in the statute at any stage, until we get to the point where the
money has to be given up front before the EIS occurs.

And so while we might be able to take the information of their ability to pay into account at any stage, $I$ did not hear them today say that they cannot pay, and we have not reached the point in the statute where they're required to pay.

So I don't think that there is any way that we could guarantee what that answer is going to be until it comes time to put money on the table, at least under the statutory authority.

MR. FELTON: Thank you very much.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thanks, John. I'm going to ask DEQ to comment, but first, are there any other questions or comments from Board members?

MR. BUSBY: This is Dexter again. Is there any way for DEQ to give us a guesstimate on how much it is going to cost just to get to the place where they do need the EIS money?

CHAIR DEVENY: I think it's time to bring DEQ forward to answer Dexter's question, as well as make other comments that they might want the Board to consider.

MR. HAYES: Sure. This is Ed Hayes,

Acting Chief Counsel. I was not involved with coming up with the estimate for the EIS, but I understand it was either $\$ 250,000$ or $\$ 350,000$.

Generally if $D E Q$ is preparing the EIS, or has a third party contractor preparing the EIS, we would enter into a memorandum of agreement or understanding with the proponent, in this case Cottonwood Environmental Law Center.

And the way that usually works then is obviously it is the contract under which they agree to pay for the cost of the EIS. And the usual mechanism is that they provide us a sum of money to give us a working balance to actually start performing tasks under the EIS in preparation of the EIS.

So there is some amount of money that they would have to put up front in order to fund the EIS, and then they would have to maintain that working capital as we go through the EIS process.

In terms of the second question $I$ think is out there, and that's DEQ's input in regard to whether there is sufficient credible information, I personally have not read the petition, and the two Water Quality attorneys that may have neither are here, so $I$ don't think $D E Q$ is in a position
today to indicate whether we believe there is sufficient credible information one way or another.

We could get that to Sarah probably in the next couple weeks, but I'm not able to represent that today.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Any other comments or questions by Board members?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris again. I appreciate Dexter's question, but I don't think the statute permits the Board to decline to accept the petition simply because we're skeptical about the petitioner's ability to pay.

I think it is an important consideration, and $I$ understand that there may be burdens that we as a Board and a Department are going to have to undertake, but I don't see where that's a consideration that goes into our calculus today with respect to whether to accept the petition or not.

And while I appreciate DEQ's statements regarding the absence of the people who are prepared to advise us as to DEQ's position with respect to the acceptability of the petition, this
is on the agenda, and it has been on the agenda since it was first published, and actually we've known it's going to be on the agenda since the last meeting.

So I think the DEQ has been on notice that it has been the case that we might take this matter up if the petition were not withdrawn by Cottonwood, which they haven't done.

So rather than wait for $D E Q$ and put this over to yet another meeting, $I$ think it's prudent for us to go forward today and accept the petition. As Sarah indicates, this is a very preliminary step.

I guess in my lawyer mind, it's akin to the determination that you make in any civil case as to whether a complaint states a claim under the law in which relief could be granted, and $I$ certainly think that this petition states the facts, the credible facts that are supported by a prior $E I S$ that was done, and it states sufficient facts to justify going forward with it at this point.

So my view would be that we should go ahead and go forward, and accept the petition, and move ahead. And $I$ said, the statute laid down a
pretty convoluted trail that we have to follow to get to the finish line on this proceeding, and rather than delay this further, I'm prepared to move that we accept the petition and proceed with it as provided in the statutes.

CHAIR DEVENY: There is a motion before the Board to move the petition forward by -Excuse me. I think I need to think how I'm going to word this.

MS. CLERGET: If I may interrupt, Madam Chair. Chris, the motion you just made was to accept the petition, from what $I$ heard, and I'm not sure that's what we do at this stage. If $I$ might offer, at this stage the Board only has to determine whether there is sufficient credible information for the Board to accept the petition. That's the decision to be made today.

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, may I amend my motion?

CHAIR DEVENY: Could you withdraw that one and just start over.

MR. TWEETEN: Sure. Let's withdraw that one and start over. Madam Chair, I move that the Board find that there is sufficient credible evidence in the petition to justify moving forward
as provided under the statute.
CHAIR DEVENY: There is a motion before the Board. Is there a second?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I'll second it. It's been moved and seconded that the petition contains sufficient credible information. Is there Board discussion on the motion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: At this time I'd like to allow George to make a comment.

MR. MATHIEUS: Thanks, Madam Chair. It is probably partially moot based on the action you just took, but $I$ was just going to add to some of Mr. Tweeten's comments that we've been in communication with Cottonwood, I think at least on two occasions since the last Board meeting, and it was our understanding they were coming here to today to say that they could not afford it.

So the fact that we weren't maybe completely ready to address a different scenario, today was a surprise to us. That notwithstanding, something probably came to light, and it seems that they can.

So I just wanted to make that clarification on some of Mr. Tweeten's comments. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, George. Are there other comments? It looks like Tim Davis has a comment from DEQ.

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, Tim Davis, Water Quality Division Administrator at DEQ.

George is right that the communications that we had, I think we were in touch both -- I was in touch with Mr. Meyer both over the phone and in email. He indicated an inability to pay.

But I think it might behoove the Board to have Sarah kind of walk through those next steps, because there are costs prior to the EIS that the petitioner is responsible for, and I think it may just behoove the Board to hear just kind of what are those next steps. There's a public notice, there is other pieces that go along that the petitioner will be responsible for, before we get to the EIS question.

CHAIR DEVENY: Question of you, Tim.
Does the petitioner pay for that up front?
MR. DAVIS: It says, $I$ believe that the statute says that the petitioner is responsible
for the costs. It doesn't require, $I$ think, in the same way that the EIS cannot be completed prior to, but $I$ would defer to Sarah to answer that question, Madam Chair.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Mr. Williams, would you like to add anything to these comments that have been said?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Again, Keaton
Williams, Cottonwood Environmental Law Center.
Personally $I$ am not aware, or was involved in any previous communications. I came here today to say what $I$ said, and $I$ have been told, though, by John Meyer, the Executive Director, that Cottonwood -- I believe the next step for costs for Cottonwood would be the publishing in the newspaper, and I received assurances from the Executive Director yesterday that Cottonwood will pay those costs, and has no issue paying those, and that's all 1 can personally speak to.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Mr. Williams.
So is there further discussion by Board members based on what you've heard regarding the motion that's before the Board to agree that there is sufficient credible information for the Board to
accept the petition?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, let's have a vote on the motion before us. All those in favor of accepting the motion, agreeing that there is sufficient credible information to accept the petition, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, the motion passes. So next steps. Sarah, would you run us through that.

MS. CLERGET: Sure. This is Sarah. In your memo, you've moved from Section 1 into Section 2 now; and on the flow chart, you've moved from the first -- on my mine it's green -- into the second decision point, which is labeled No. 2.

The steps that need to happen now are you need to decide whether or not you're going to accept the petition -- that's the next decision point -- and in order to do that, you have to make a written finding.

Essentially you're deciding whether you intend to accept the petition; and then if you
intend to accept the petition, you need to go through the public notice period; and then at the end of the public notice, you accept or reject the petition.

So I would suggest that there is a bunch of analysis that needs to go through in order to decide whether or not you intend to accept or reject the petition. So probably the most efficient way to do that is to have me prepare a memo for your next meeting.

And I would ask that that memo be based on information -- $I$ would like information from both Cottonwood and DEQ about their positions on the analysis of these factors, and then from those positions, $I$ can put an analysis and a memo together for your next meeting that analyzes the factors that you have to consider, and recommend whether or not those factors are met under the statute, which will then inform your decision about whether you intend to accept or reject.

If at that meeting, based on that memo, you intend to accept, then we can after that meeting put it out for a public comment period.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do members of the Board have questions of Sarah on that procedural matter?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, I'd like to make a motion that we have Sarah prepare a memo with involvement from Cottonwood and DEQ to determine, based on the preponderance of evidence, whether the petition meets all of the requirements. Is there a second?

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I'll second.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and
seconded. Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, I'd like to go to a vote on this. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion passes for Sarah to prepare a memo for us.

Moving right along. Any updates from our Board Counsel? Sarah, back to you.

MS. CLERGET: No.
CHAIR DEVENY: No updates. At this time I'd like to open the meeting up for comment from
the general public on any matter that has not been on our agenda today. Are there any members in the public or people that may have called in on the phone?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, I'd like to move to adjourn this meeting. Is there a second? MR. TWEETEN: This is Chris. I will second.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, this meeting is adjourned.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:00 a.m. )

*     *         *             *                 * 
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