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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR DEVENY: Let's get back, and get started on this case. And Lindsay, would you take roll call again, and make sure we've got everybody with us.

> MS. FORD: Chris Deveny.

CHAIR DEVENY: Present.
MS . FORD: Dexter Busby.
(No response)
MS. FORD: Dexter Busby.
(No response)
MS. FORD: Tim Warner.
(No response)
MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
MR. TWEETEN: (No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: We seem to have lost our phone connection.

MS. CLERGET: Is somebody on the phone?
Can we hear you?
(No response)
MS. FORD: Tim Warner?
BOARD MEMBER WARNER: Yes, Madam Chair.
MS. FORD: Dexter Busby.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'm here.
MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Present.
MS. FORD: John Dearment.
BOARD MEMBER DEARMENT: Here.
MS. FORD: We're all here.
CHAIR DEVENY: Great. Thanks,
everybody. We're going to hear this case and move on, and at some point we will take a half hour break for lunch. We'll try to find a logical point at which to stop. So we have a quorum, and John Dearment has recused himself from this case. So it will be Dexter, Tim, Chris, and myself are the Board members who will be hearing this case today.

I'd like Sarah just to do an introduction to this cases for the purpose of today, which is to hear oral arguments and make a decision regarding the Copper Ridge case.

MS. CLERGET: So this is the time set.
The Case Number is BER 2015-01 WQ, and the companion case -- they're combined for the purposes of this oral argument -- is BER 2015-02 WQ. These are enforcement actions -- or excuse me -- are penalty findings against Copper Ridge and

Reflections at Copper Ridge, two different companies, and that's why there are two different case numbers, one for each company.

And it is the appeal of the
Administrative Order that is before you today. As you saw in your packets, you have two pieces of this proposed decision. One is the order on summary judgment, which was issued by Andres Haladay, and one is my proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law which obviously $I$ issued based on the hearing that $I$ held in the case.

And there are complementing decisions in both of those sources that work together to put a final set of decisions, both factual and legal, in front of you. So there's a lot of moving pieces, and some of your decisions will necessarily involve changes in other decisions, so we're just going to have to kind of work through this piece by piece, $I$ think, as we go through.

Are there any other procedural
questions? The memo that $I$ 've included in the materials outlines your options moving forward, which are the same as they always are in these cases.

You have an exceptions brief from Copper

Ridge, a response from DEQ, and then there is also a motion to strike portions of DEQ's response to the exceptions brief which was filed by Copper Ridge.

And I apologize. I'm going to refer to Copper Ridge, and when $I$ say that, it's Copper Ridge and Reflections together. Just for the purposes of shorter speech, I will say Copper Ridge, and I think often people will in the course of this case assuming that they are both.

So there is a motion to strike filed by Copper Ridge to strike portions of DEQ's response to their exceptions briefs; and then DEQ filed a response to that motion to strike, which was a supplemental part of your packet.

And as $I$ have rendered my findings, proposed findings and conclusions, the authority for that motion rests with you, so you have to deal to the motion to strike either as part of your decision. You can deal with it before or you can deal with it together with the rest of decisions that you have to make. And then as $I$ said, the memo that $I$ provided gives you your options with respect to the case itself. Any other procedural questions?

CHAIR DEVENY: Sarah, thank you. So the options that we have that Sarah has outlined in our packet is to accept the order on summary judgment and the proposed order in their entirety, and adopt them as the Board's final order; or to accept the finding of facts in the order on summary judgment and the proposed order, but modify the conclusions of law or interpretation of the Administrative Rules in either of those; or to reject the order on summary judgment and/or the proposed order, and then review the entire record that's before the Examiner.

And just to remind people, if we do not concur with findings of fact, then we're down in that section where we would need to review the entire case. I just want to be clear on that.

This is kind of a convoluted case, as Sarah alluded to, so $I$ would like to start out with addressing the motion to strike that has been presented by Copper Ridge. And again for purposes of brevity, $I$ 'm going to refer to both entities as Copper Ridge.

And so I'd like to have a separate oral argument on just the memo to strike, and then I'd like the Board to make a decision on that memo to
strike, because that is going to impact every other decision that we make here today.

So with that, if the parties are ready, I would like to first ask the Copper Ridge folks to make their oral argument on that, then $D E Q$. And if at all possible, I'd really like to try to limit each party's time on this to five minutes if that's reasonable, and we'll see how we go with that. And I'll ask Lindsay to be our time keeper.

MS. MARQUIS: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board, Hearing Examiner Clerget. Thank you for your time here today. My name is Vicki Marquis. I'm with the law firm of Holland and Hart out of Billings. I represent the Copper Ridge Development Corporation, and Reflections at Copper Ridge, LLC.

I'm joined here today with Mr. Landy
Lees, who is the Vice President of the Copper Ridge Development Corporation, and the manager of Reflections at Copper Ridge, LLC.

Regarding the motion to strike, Violations 2, 3 , and 4 were allowed to remain in this case only because the previous Hearing Examiner felt that they were serious enough to allow DEQ to proceed directly to an Administrative

Order pursuant to Montana Code Annotated 75-5-611 Subparagraph (2) Sub(a) sub-romanette (ii).

But the previous order on Page 7 said that DEQ complied with the provisions of Montana Code Annotated 75-5-611(2), and found that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge were non-compliant after September of 2013 violation.

That's wrong. I want to point that out. As a matter of fact, Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge fixed everything that they were supposed to fix, and so the September violations cannot serve as the basis for penalties.

And again, after the December 2014 violation letter, Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge fixed everything that the Department asked them to fix. Therefore, no penalty can be allowed.

But even if you assume that the Department satisfied the provisions of 75-5-617, and that the Department now gets to move into their options for enforcement response which are provided under 75-5-611, the rules simply don't allow it in this case.

First of all, the Administrative Rules of Montana that were in effect at the time, ARM
17.30.2003 Subparagraph (5) says that if an alleged violator responds and it returns to compliance, no penalty can be sought. It is undisputed that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge did this. That's reflected in the Hearing Examiner's proposed findings of fact.

Furthermore, as the Hearing Examiner noted, there was, quote, "Substantial justifiable confusion," and Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge, their frustration was understandable. Quote, "It responded to and complied with all of DEQ's demands in the correspondence, only to receive an administrative penalty three months later."

She noted, and indeed is right, that it is not fair for $D E Q$ to, quote, ${ }^{i n}$ effect be rewarded for its own failures," that being its failure to write the appropriate letters, the notice letters that are required under the statute.

Now, this current proposed order brings up another issue, which is the basis of our motion to strike. The Administrative Rules in effect at that time, ARM 17.30.2003 Subparagraph (2), provides additional notice requirements that must
be met before the Department may seek a penalty under the statute. The Department must send a notice letter in accordance with Montana Code Annotated 75-5-611(1). We know that the Department did not do that. The previous Hearing Examiner held that.

So the only way that the Department can get around that notice requirement is if the violation meets certain requirements or criteria that are specified in Administrative Rules of Montana 17.30 .2003 subparagraph (7), and those requirements are that the violations must be of major extent and gravity, or they must be a Class 1 violation.

We know from the Hearing Examiner's order that has been proposed and is in front of you today that violations 3 and 4 do not meet that requirement because neither one of them is a Class 1 violation, and neither one of them is of major extent and gravity. They have to be both major extent and major gravity. Here the proposed order finds that Violations 3 and 4 are not major extent, so no penalty can be sought for those violations.

Now, the Department's response brief,
they would have you believe that there are two opportunities to classify a violation. They would have you believe that the Department can classify the extent and gravity --

CHAIR DEVENY: Can you wrap up this in two minutes?

MS. MARQUIS: Yes, ma'am, I can. They would have you believe that the extent and gravity can be classified as something during the notice provisions, and then they can change their mind and classify it as something else during the penalty provisions.

You won't find a basis for that anywhere in the rule or the law. There is only one rule that describes how to classify a violation in terms of its nature, extent, and gravity, and that rule must be followed. It can't change whether you're in the notice provision or the penalty portion of the case.

If you were to allow that to happen, the Department could simply charge every violation as being the worst violation possible, so that they could get around those notice provisions, and then later they can change their mind and downgrade the violation for the penalty portion.

That's not fair to the regulated public, and that's not in accordance with the laws and the rules. There is only one rule that describes how to classify a violation. That rule was analyzed and the facts were considered and applied to that rule. The Hearing Examiner found that Violations 3 and 4 don't meet the standard for the notice requirement, and they can't be charged with a penalty in this case. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Marquis.
I'm going to ask DEQ to have five minutes with just a little bit longer to give their oral argument on this aspect of the case, and then we'll have questions of both parties from the Board members.

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, I'm Kirsten Bowers, DEQ attorney representing $D E Q$ in this matter.

And in response to Copper Ridge's motion to strike, $I$ believe they're conflating two different provisions in enforcement law.

What we're actually talking about here is notice that was provided to Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge, and both on orders on summary judgment, and the Hearing Examiner's
proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, it was determined that $D E Q$ did not provide a notice under 75-5-611 sub (1).

That provision has five very specific requirements, one of which is a calculation of a penalty up front that's provided to the violator, and then they are also given a time frame in which they are to make corrective actions.

There is another provision under 611, that's 611 Sub (2), in which the Department may issue an administrative notice and order in lieu of the notice under 611 sub (1), and that's if the Department action seeks an administrative penalty only for activities it believes and alleges are violations of 75-5-605, and $I$ think that language "believes and alleges" is important.

In DEQ's violation letter dated
September 23, in fact it is entitled a 617 violation letter, Copper Ridge and Reflections was told that $D E Q$ would be taking formal enforcement action. And so under 611 Sub (2), we went directly to an order.

The violation letters were a courtesy notice and not even required. They were provided a violation letter on September $23 r d$, which in
fact attached Dan Freeland's inspection report, and give them notice of all the allegations against them. And then there was a second violation letter in October after DEQ did an inspection and found violations of the permit.

I think Hearing Examiner Clerget was very clear in her proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law that some of her findings were related only to the penalty calculation, and not to the notice that was provided. In fact, she has a finding, $I$ believe it is proposed finding -- or proposed Conclusion of Law 5 that says DEQ did provide adequate notice under 617 and 611 Sub (2).

Then with regard to the rules that
Copper Ridge mentioned, as they were at 17.30 , and in the subchapter 2000, those rules did in fact add some additional requirements on $D E Q$, which $D E Q$ did comply with. The violations, the four violations $D E Q$ did allege at the time it gave its notice, and provided a penalty calculation in its administrative order.

DEQ provided a penalty calculation and
Violation 1 was of major extent and gravity;
Violation 2 was also of major extent and gravity;
Violation 3 was of major extent and gravity;

Violation 4 was of moderate gravity and major extent.

But the Hearing Examiner in his orders on summary judgment found that violation to be a Class 1 violation, which is defined in 17.30 of the rules at subchapter $I$ think it is 2001 .

He found that violation to be a violation of a permit's compliance schedule or plan. And $I$ believe he found that because there are many schedules in the general permit such as inspection requirements, and recordkeeping requirements, that Copper Ridge and Reflections did not comply with.

So DEQ is requesting that you deny
Copper Ridge and Reflections' motion to strike to the extent it applies to anything other than the penalties. We are not contesting, we have not filed any arguments contrary to the Hearing Examiner's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and we're not contesting her reduction in the number of days that would reduce the extent of Violations 2, 3, and 4 .

Unless you have questions, I have nothing further.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Bowers.

Board members, do you have questions of either of the parties, Ms. Marquis or Ms. Bowers?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I have one for Ms. Marquis, please.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Counsel, what is it about this material that is redundant, scandalous, impertinent, or otherwise meets the standard for granting a motion to strike as opposed to simply disposing of it on its merit as part of the final order in this case?

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, Board Member Tweeten. Certainly the Board could do either. I think procedurally it is important that the motion to strike be decided and that the Department be prevented from arguing that the violations have any nature, extent, and gravity other than that which has been proposed in the Hearing Examiner's proposed order.

The procedure here is important. The Hearing Examiner issued a proposed order, and all parties had an opportunity to file exceptions to that proposed order. Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge were the only parties who filed exceptions to that order. Therefore, we put the

Department on notice of what our arguments were against the proposed order.

The Department did not file any exceptions, and did not put us on notice that they would be raising this argument that the violations can be characterized as anything other than what is in the proposed order.

It would be unfair for them to come before this Board now, and to argue as if those violations can be classified as they desire them to be classified, and not as in the proposed order, given that they didn't file exceptions to the proposed order. They didn't provide an exception briefing that would allow this Board to make a full and fair decision on the merits of that particular issue in this case.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Further question, Madam Chair.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Is there
something in the briefing with respect to Hearing Examiner Clerget's proposed final disposition that leads you to believe that the Department plans to make arguments that are contrary to those portions of Ms. Clerget's proposed decision to which the

Department has not taken exception? Is that a clear question?

MS. MARQUIS: Yes. Madam Chair, Board Member Tweeten. I've identified in our motion to strike the exact portions of the Department's response brief that we request be stricken from the record.

And in its response brief, for example, at Page 34, at the bottom of the page, the Department argues that the Violations 2 and 3 are major extent and gravity, and that is in direct contradiction to what the proposed order in front of the Board today proposes.

Likewise on Page 35 at the top, the Department argues that Violation 4 was of major extent. Well, in the proposed order that's in front of you for a decision today, the Hearing Examiner has proposed that Violation 4 is actually of minor extent. That's on Page 37 of the proposed order.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Thank you, Ms. Marquis. Madam Chair, can $I$ pose a question to Ms. Bowers, please?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, please do.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Thank you. Ms.

Bowers, does the Department assert that in this case it is entitled to make arguments that are contrary to Hearing Examiner Clerget's proposed final order in this case, final disposition in this case, including the findings, and conclusions, and all those things, to make an argument that's contrary to something that is in those findings, and conclusions and final order proposed by Mr . Clerget that the Department has not taken exception to?

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, member Tweeten, no. DEQ does not propose to make any arguments that are contrary to the Hearing Examiner's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, or the orders on summary judgment in this case.

And $I$ want to point out that one of her conclusions of law is that DEQ provided legally sufficient notice of violations under the Montana Water Quality Act, including 611 Sub (2), 75-5-617, and ARM 17.30.2003.

And the pages in DEQ's response to Copper Ridge's exceptions that Copper Ridge is pointing to, $D E Q$ is only pointing out that the order determined the violations were Class 1 or of
major extent and gravity for purposes of adequate notice that was provided, not for purposes of penalty calculation.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions from Board members of either of the parties on the motion to strike?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, I'm inclined to not allow the motion to strike, because when $I$ looked back through the documents, I really couldn't find anything that wasn't already in either the summary judgment or the Hearing Officer's order, and I think $I$ would prefer to let these documents speak for themselves.

And $I$ don't think we need to belabor this particular issue further to have an adverse impact on our decision. And so $I$ would like to allow these documents to be given the weight that they are in the packet that we have, and in the conclusions of law, and the findings of fact, and the exceptions, and DEQ's response to the exceptions, and therefore $I$ would move to deny the motion to strike made by Copper Ridge.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I agree with you wholeheartedly. I didn't catch -- Did you move to deny the motion to strike?

CHAIR DEVENY: I did. I have moved to deny the motion to strike.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'll second your motion.

CHAIR DEVENY: There has been a motion and a second. Do we have Board discussion on the motion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, I'd like to take a vote on the motion. All those in favor of the motion to deny the motion to strike made by Copper Ridge, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I believe everybody was in favor of the motion, so the motion passes, and the motion to strike has been denied.

So next I believe we want to go to the oral argument on the summary judgment, and the proposed findings of fact.

MS. CLERGET: Would you like to take that together, or would you like to take it separately by issue?

CHAIR DEVENY: I would like to -- I believe there is another issue that we need to talk about before we really move to everything.

And $I$ think a fundamental issue in this case before we proceed is for the Board to decide the owner/operator issue that was brought out and was raised by the Hearing Examiner. And I'd like to give Copper Ridge and DEQ another chance to just specifically focus on that for oral argument.

Again, $I$ 'm doing that because these decisions are sort of layered. One depends on another. And $I$ think if we don't settle the owner/operator issue up front, it really impacts how we move on to the rest of the case today. So let's try to see if we can take care of this issue before we break for lunch. Do Board members understand that, or think that that's an okay way to proceed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing no argument, I'm going to go ahead with that. So I'd like to give each of the parties five minutes again for oral
argument on this particular issue, and Copper Ridge, would you like to start.

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. I think this is a very important pivotal issue. Would it be possible to have ten minutes?

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay.
MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. An
owner/operator is defined as, quote, "A person who owns, leases, operates, controls, or supervises a point source." That comes from the statute Montana Code Annotated 75-5-103 Subparagraph (26).

And when we think about the point source, it is important to note that for stormwater discharges associated with construction activity, it is the disturbance that is caused by the construction that is the regulated point source.

And $I$ think if you look in the briefing, you'll see that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge and the Department are actually very similar on this topic. We both cite to the same rule, and say that construction activity is the regulated point source that must be permitted.

It is important to keep in mind here,
because at the time that these violations were charged, Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge were not conducting the construction activity that resulted in the discharge, and we know that for a variety of reasons.

We know that the Copper Ridge and
Reflections at Copper Ridge were in compliance with everything they had to do under the Subdivision Act. We know that they had a construction stormwater permit for their development activities, which included road building and installation of utilities.

We know that they did everything that they needed to do to comply with those permits because there weren't any violations charged under those permits, and those permits were in fact terminated by the Department.

At that time, if the Department had felt that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge needed any more permit coverage, they could have told them that, but they didn't. They said nothing. And they waited. And six months later, the City of Billings voices some concerns about stormwater discharges within the subdivisions.

It is important when we think about the
subdivisions to think about that the line drawn around a neighborhood is a subdivision. It doesn't mean that Copper Ridge Development Corporation and Reflections at Copper Ridge own everything within that boundary area.

Indeed there comes a point in time when they begin to sell off individual lots for development by third parties, people who are not connected to either Copper Ridge Development Corporation or Reflections at Copper Ridge.

It is at that point in time that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge no longer had control. They no longer met the definition of an owner/operator. They don't own the land, they don't lease the land, they don't operate the land, they don't have any control over the land, and they don't supervise anything that's going on on that land.

It is also important to note that the Hearing Examiner provided evidence in her order on Pages 34 and 35 . She cited to Exhibit $Y$, and she said, "Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge did provide evidence that they did not own or at least some of the lots on which DEQ noted a lack of BMP's," end quote, and, quote, "It is entirely unclear to the Hearing Examiner whether or not BMP's ever could be put in place based on Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge's ownership access." So recognizing that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge have no control over those individual lots.

Even if you look at the order on summary judgment, the Hearing Examiner based his decision on some facts and assumptions. Even if you take all of those facts and assumptions as true, none of those add up to support a conclusion that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge owned or operated any point source within the subdivisions.

NOW, DEQ has argued, and in their response brief, they point to a couple points in the transcript that they point to as proof that Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge owned 100 percent of the property.

But it is important to go back to the transcript and read those questions, because those questions were asking Mr. Lees about the property at the time it was developed or before it was developed. And he says, "Yes, as we developed our property, at the time we're developing, we own it

100 percent." That's what he said.
And he's right. At the time that they developed it, at the time they put in the roads and the utilities, they owned 100 percent of that property, and they had the proper construction permits. And then later on in that part of the transcript he says they subdivided, "and then we start selling lots." Once they sell those lots, they no longer have control over those lots.

This is a very important point because if this Board wants to affirm this order, essentially what you're saying is that a private corporation that is no longer connected to a piece of property must somehow control what happens on that property. The private corporation can't do that unless you also delegate some regulatory authority to that private corporation.

And I don't think the Department or the Board are willing to do that, and in fact, there is no basis for that in the law or the rule.

Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge clearly did not own or operate the individual lots where the home building was occurring. There's testimony that says that's not their deal. They develop it and they sell it off
and let somebody else build the houses.
We've also cited to a trespass case and a subdivision case that raised concerns for us. If this Board affirms the order and says that the subdeveloper after they've sold the property has to go back and do things on that land, they can't without causing a trespass and creating a claim of action that the landowner would have against the subdivision. That can't be possible. It can't be right.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. May I interpose a question at this point?

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Because I don't want to -- (inaudible) --

Ms. Marquis, your argument suggests that once the property passes out of the hands of the developer and the lot is sold to the new owner who proposes to build, then any adverse effects such as stormwater runoff from that particular parcel are beyond the ability of DEQ to regulate; is that what you're saying?

MS. MARQUIS: I'm saying that it's not something that the developer can regulate because
the developer no longer has control over that piece of property, and the development --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I understand that. I'll get to that in a second. But just respond to my question. Does DEQ have the authority to take any action with respect to the purchaser?

MS. MARQUIS: If DEQ finds that the purchaser has discharged without a permit, I believe that's the same violation, and I don't know why they couldn't cite the individual lot owner for that violation, instead of citing my client who no longer owns that property.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. So my second question then is: Would it not be possible for the developer in conveying the lot to the new owner to include in that conveyance some sort of covenant on the part of the new owner to allow the developer to supervise to assure that there aren't any violations of the permits that have been issued with respect to the subdivision regarding, say, stormwater runoff?

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, Board Member
Tweeten. The Subdivision Act is fairly clear on the responsibilities between the developer and the
individual lot purchasers, and the Subdivision Act requires that they inform the individual lot owner where the stormwater system is located. If there are covenants, conditions, or requirements, they also inform them of those.

But at the point that the property is purchased by a third party, those requirements become requirements on that third party. It is no longer the developer's requirement to comply with those. And that's what the case of Eastgate Village Water and Sewer Association versus Davis stands for. It says once you purchase property that has conditions and terms and requirements on it, it is the property owner's responsibility to comply with those. You can't hold the developer responsible for those.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: SO as far as you're concerned then, there would be no reason why DEQ could not, in the event you prevail in this matter, $D E Q$ could not turn around and cite the property owners for violations.

MS. MARQUIS: I don't know why the violations that were cited in this case couldn't have also been cited against an individual property owner. That's true. The violations were
for discharging without a permit -- that can be charged against an individual -- and for placement of waste where they may cause pollution. Those are the two main violations connected to this storm event, and those could be charged against an individual landowner.

And let's not forget also the important piece here is that the stormwater system in the subdivisions is connected to the City of Billings stormwater system, and so it is not like there isn't another public entity involved that couldn't regulate the individual lot owners. In fact, it was the City of Billings that originally voiced concerns to the Department.

So to the extent that the Department would want to delegate or have another public entity involved in regulating, the City of Billings is already there, and it is already connected to their system.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I see. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis, could you wrap up your oral argument on this within the next couple minutes.

MS. MARQUIS: Yes, certainly, Madam

Chair, Board members.
Board Member Tweeten went to my next point exactly. That was a great segue. And I just want to close with this, and reiterate that if the Board affirms this order, what you're saying is that a private corporation that does not own lease, operate, or control the source of the discharge must somehow control that discharge.

But what regulatory authority does that private corporation have, and what regulatory authority will you delegate to that private corporation to enforce that requirement? That's a scenario that the Montana Water Quality Act does not support and cannot support. The subdivisions are not the owners or operators after they've sold the lots. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Marquis. I'd like to ask Ms. Bowers to present DEQ's oral argument, and again, we'll give you ten minutes, and probably time for a little questioning.

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. I think as Ms. Marquis pointed out, there are areas where we agree. We agree on what the definition of owner/operator is, and that that's a person who owns, leases, operates, or controls a
point source.
In the case of construction, a point source is created when the developer opens up the land and creates a conduit for stormwater to run towards waters of the State, and that discharge must be controlled by a permit.

I think something that is missed in
Copper Ridge's arguments are that they did maintain some control here. They were responsible for the original development.

They, as they admit, they owned 100 percent of the property before they initiated the development. It was all agricultural land. So they went in, and they planned roads, they planned the lots for residential home building, they installed infrastructure including storm sewer infrastructure, and they did get permits for the initial road building and installation of utilities.

Those permits were issued to contractors who signed as owners or operators because they were in control of their discharges, and they filed with the DEQ notices of termination. DEQ terminated those permits. And then Copper Ridge began to sell lots. But what they didn't do is
they didn't plan for stormwater permitting as the property developed and lots were sold.

DEQ does not go out and tell people how to permit their development. There are many options for doing it. Copper Ridge and Reflections could have transferred the permit that their road builders held. They could have extended that permit to cover the residential lots, and then transferred it to home builders, either individually, or a home builder who could be in charge or oversee the construction, and make sure that the stormwater pollution prevention plan was complied with.

But the problem is Copper Ridge and Reflections did nothing to ensure that the site was permitted, that all phases of the development was permitted, or that there was at least a plan to permit the site.

So I think the argument that they are just no longer connected to lots when a home builder comes in and starts building. Maybe just on pure ownership, title, ownership of the property, they have an argument there, but they had to have a plan for permitting the construction activity.

Also $I$ think the trespass argument is a little over blown, because many BMP's can occur in the right-of-way to protect the storm sewer system. There are many BMP's that occur at curb side or around the storm drain to control discharges to that system.

Also Copper Ridge and Reflections provided no evidence in this hearing or in briefing that they ever asked a lot owner to access the lot to install BMP's. There is absolutely no evidence that they asked and were denied, and it was just impossible for them to do.

To respond to Board Member Tweeten's questions, yes, $D E Q$ could regulate individual home builders. The problem here is there was no permit. There was nothing. There has to be some sort of plan by the original owner/operator, the person in control of designing a subdivision, specifications, modification of specifications. I mean all of those things evidence control.

And $I$ think that's in part what the Hearing Examiner in his order on summary judgment pointed to, was that Copper Ridge and Reflections did have some control over the original development, and that they were proposing too
narrow a definition of owner to just the person who owns the property.

And additionally, the Hearing Examiner on orders for summary judgment also was persuaded by the fact that when Copper Ridge and Reflections did get their notices under the general permit for stormwater -- I'm sorry -- under the general permit when they submitted their NOI's and did permit the sites, they signed as owner/operators of the development. I think the Hearing Examiner was somewhat persuaded by that evidence that they did eventually permit the sites as the owner/operator.

Unless there are questions, $I$ don't have anything else.

CHAIR DEVENY: Are there questions by Board members of Ms. Bowers?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any further questions by Board members of either of the parties?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I guess I need to connect the dots here a little bit better, and I'm not familiar enough with the record to do this, so I'll ask Counsel to enlighten me.

Is there any way to segregate the stormwater runoff between those properties that continue to be owned by the developer on one hand, and those properties that have been sold to private owners on the other?

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, and Board Member Tweeten, that's a really good question.

The construction activity that's being regulated under general permit for stormwater construction, it's really the disturbance to land that's being regulated, and it is possible to stabilize certain portions of a development and then terminate the permit that covers that portion of the development, and then permit the development in phases, which $I$ think is what most developers do, so that --

And $I$ think $I$ understand your question correctly, so that you're not just -- you don't have the site that's opened up, and then people coming in doing various activities, and maybe causing more disturbance that is no longer subject to a permit.

MS. MARQUIS: Can $I$ respond if you're done?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Let me just follow up briefly before you do, Ms. Marquis, if you would indulge me.

So I'm assuming that at some point, the infrastructure for the subdivision is connected into the City of Billings' stormwater system, whatever their storm sewer system is that carries off stormwater; am $I$ correct in that assumption?

MS. BOWERS: That's correct, and in this case, the subdivisions were connected to the MS4, the municipal separate storm sewer system. So yes, that's true.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: That was operated under a separate permit that was taken out by the City of Billings, correct?

MS. BOWERS: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: And in this case, the Department $I$ gather alleges that there was some stormwater discharge from this property, or these properties $I$ guess, that discharged into Montana waters without going through that City of Billings storm sewage system; is that correct?

MS. BOWERS: That's correct. Actually there were discharges that both flowed over land and went directly to waters of the State, and
there were discharges that went to the MS4.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: And I would assume that any discharges that went into the City of Billings system would not be a violation of any permit; is that correct?

MS. BOWERS: No, that's not correct. The owner/operator of a construction site has to have a permit. They can't just discharge uncontrolled stormwater discharges directly to the MS4. So they have to have BMP's in place that control those discharges. That's the treatment. That's --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Presumably the owners, the individual owners of lots that had been purchased are entitled to rely on the City of Billings stormwater discharge system, correct?

MS. BOWERS: You mean after they're fully developed or --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: No, I mean after they're purchased, after a private owner takes ownership of a lot. Any discharges from that property, are they still covered by the construction permit, or are they subject to the City of Billings permit for their stormwater system?

MS. BOWERS: Those discharges should be covered by a construction permit until they're stabilized, and the Department issues a notice of termination.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: So by stabilize, you would mean that the lot had been sodded so that the top soil would no longer run off with the rain water, for example; would that be right?

MS. BOWERS: Yes. For example, they have to grow some grass or something on -- they can't have bare ground anymore.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: They have to pave those areas that they're going to pave and so forth.

MS. BOWERS: Correct.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: The Department's argument is that until those activities are undertaken, the construction permit still controls, even though the land has been passed into private ownership?

MS. BOWERS: That's right. There should still be a construction permit in place to control discharges from lots that are just exposed bare ground, or lots that have construction debris, or fill that's been stockpiled that shouldn't be just exposed to stormwater without some protection. BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: What exactly did the permit in this case, if anything, with regard to this question?

MS. BOWERS: At the time of the violations, there was no permit in place.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: So how did that -- Did the permit expire of its own force, or did DEQ issue some sort of a document indicating that the permit had been terminated?

MS. BOWERS: The prior permits that were issued were for road building activity and utility installation, and those permits were terminated, and they were terminated because DEQ received a notice of termination.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: So did the developers submit that notice of termination?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, the permittees which were road builders under contract with Copper Ridge and Reflections.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: So once that happened, there was no permit in place --

MS. BOWERS: That's right.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: -- with respect to stormwater.

MS. BOWERS: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Has DEQ alleged that that's a violation in this case?

MS. BOWERS: Yes. That's Violation 2, discharging stormwater without a permit.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Ms. Marquis, can you respond to this subject for me, please. I'm just trying to figure out how this works.

MS. MARQUIS: Sure.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: The Department seems to take the position that your clients were responsible for maintaining a stormwater discharge permit on this property, $I$ guess theoretically until all of the individually purchased lots were stabilized in some way, either through the raising of a grass lawn, or pavement, or some combination of those two. Can you address that allegation for me, please.

MS. MARQUIS: Certainly. Madam Chair,
Board Member Tweeten. The Department has said that the construction activity is a regulated point source, and that it must be permitted; and that may be true, but because it must be covered, it does not mean that $D E Q$ can just look to essentially the biggest target in the
neighborhood, or the sign at the entrance to the neighborhood and say, "Tag. You're it. You need to get the coverage."

No, point source in this case is the disturbance that's caused by the construction activity.

And you had asked about segregating lots to ones that were developed and were not developed. There is really no need to do that, because in this case the proof is that my client's disturbances were completely stabilized, and that's the only condition, that that condition had to have been met for their permit to be terminated.

So they had stabilized their construction activity. Any other lots in the subdivision that they may have owned were not under construction. There is evidence in the record that says they don't do the home building. They leave that to someone else.

So whatever lots they owned had either never been disturbed, or if they had been disturbed due to any construction activity that my client may have done, they had been completely stabilized to the satisfaction of the Department,
and that permit had been terminated.
That's important because what it says to my client is that, "Okay. You're good. Keep going. You're good." It is obvious to everybody that a subdivision is there to build individual houses. Everybody knows that that's the next step. And the Department never said, "Okay. So where is your individual home building permit?"

The Department didn't do that, and they terminated those development permits in December of 2012, and they waited almost a full year until there was a big storm, and they saw the impacts of that storm, and that's the first time they came to my client and said, "Well, look. You need a permit for home building activities."

And you can imagine my client gets a violation letter in the mail that says, "You're in violation, and you need to do $X, Y$, and $Z$ to come into compliance. You're in big trouble" essentially. And so my client does $X, Y$, and $Z$, fills out the paperwork, submits the NOI, and gets the permit.

And now the Department and this Hearing Examiner want to use that compliance action that my client took, because the Department said they
had to, now they want to use that as the hook to say that they're the owner and operator. Well, that can't be right, because that's a later action that my client took to come into compliance at the direction of the Department. There is simply no way that those later signed NOI's indicate that my client is the owner or operator.

It is also important to know that while we're talking about discharges, there really is no evidence in the record of an observed discharge, and it can't be the case because by all
admissions, everybody says the storm occurred on September 7 th, and the Department did not do their inspection until two days later. The water was gone. There was no discharge that was directly observed. So that's an important point to keep in mind.

And again, the arguments about whether the stormwater needed to continue to be controlled goes to the construction activity, and it goes to the owner/operator issue, because if my client is not doing the construction activity, they have no control over it. They don't own it or operate it or control it.

They've done everything that they're
supposed to do under the subdivision laws. They've sold the property. They can't go on the property without trespassing. And the Department has said here today, well, they could have asked to go on the property and install some BMP's.

But okay, so let's play that
hypothetical out, and say they go and they ask if they can go on the property and install some BMP's; but as soon as they leave, whoever owns this property tears out the BMP's and does whatever they want with them. Well, now what recourse does my client have?

And this goes to the regulatory
authority. They have no authority to require the individual homeowners to do anything about stormwater. The minute they sold the property, whatever stormwater requirements there are became the burden of the individual lot owner, not my client.

And you had asked about the violation that was charged, Board Member Tweeten, and there was a violation that was charged for conducting construction activities prior to submitting an NOI.

That was the first violation the

Department charged, and that violation was essentially dismissed by the previous Hearing Examiner. Because of those notice violations that we talked about earlier, that violation didn't meet the threshold for a violation that the Department can seek a penalty for without completing the notice provisions.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis, I'd like us to stick to the owner/operator topic here while we're at it.

MS. MARQUIS: Certainly. I think there was some confusion about whether the Department had charged a violation for an unpermitted discharge, if they charged a violation for construction activity without a permit. I just wanted to make clear that they charged both of them, and one of those was already dismissed.

CHAIR DEVENY: I have some questions of DEQ, Chris, unless you had further questions of Ms. Marquis.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: No, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers, Ms. Marquis alleged that there were no discharges coming from the property that was owned by Copper Ridge, that
it was all from the property that was owned by the other property owners, not in the context of owner/operators, but of landowner owner/operators. Is that accurate in your --

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. That really gets to the type of activity that's regulated under the general permit for stormwater associated with construction activity. And it regulates all activities, not just home building. It is clearing, grading, excavation, any activity that results in a disturbance that's equal to or greater than one acre of total land area.

But for purposes of the rules, it also applies to activities, construction activities that may be less than one acre if they're part of what's known as a larger common plan of development or sale.

And that's what we had here. Copper Ridge and Reflections were the initial developer of a larger common plan of development or sale.

And this in part addresses Ms. Marquis's allegation that $D E Q$ just went after the biggest target. DEQ went after the entity that they believed was the owner or operator of the larger
common plan of development or sale, and that was based on signs that the inspector saw at the subdivision that said "Copper Ridge," and showed all of the lots laid out, and also some advertising by the company.

And the reason for that definition of larger common plan of development or sale is so that you can't just divide up a big development into little lots, and avoid permitting obligations, because the little lots are obviously less than an acre, and the whole subdivision could avoid permitting if that were the activity regulated.

CHAIR DEVENY: And another question, and this is: In the hypothetical development of the subdivision, you have subdivision rules that apply, and you have the permits that are required under the Subdivision Act, and then when they're terminated, the stormwater permit comes into effect under the water quality regulations; am I getting that sort of straight? I guess they're related.

MS. BOWERS: There are a whole host of permits that a developer has to take out, and the stormwater permit is just one.

CHAIR DEVENY: So I guess what my question is is: As a subdivision is being developed, and they reach a point where they have done the Phase 1 development, and they're ready to sell the lots and move in, is it typical that a subdivision developer would then move into getting those next set of permits?

MS. BOWERS: Oh, you mean -- I'm just trying to understand your question, Madam Chair. Are you concerned with the fact that the developer got a permit that just covered roads and utilities, and then went into the home building phase, and -- Are you asking if typically they would have gotten a permit for that phase, a separate permit?

CHAIR DEVENY: Well, I guess I need clarification on why the original permit was terminated, and at that point why another one wasn't sought.

MS. BOWERS: Well, for DEQ's part, the original permits were terminated because the permittee provided a notice of termination, and in that notice of termination, they state that the site is now stable. And so DEQ, in their administration of the permit, they terminate
permits where there is stabilization, and no longer a need for a discharge permit.

And the problem here was that then that left the rest of the development without a permit because that road building permit was very specific to just the road building activity. There are a lot of ways that the site could have been permitted. The road building permit could have been extended to include the other activities, but it didn't happen.

CHAIR DEVENY: Is that typically what would happen? Would the permit be extended, or would people apply for a new permit in that case? MS. BOWERS: There are a lot of ways to permit a site. I have some DEQ people here I could ask, but $I$ think that it's fairly common that the road building permit is extended to include the other activities. Dan Freeland is here, who was the inspector, if you want to ask him a specific --

CHAIR DEVENY: Not at this point. I don't want to introduce any new kinds of evidence. Other questions right now of Ms. Bowers while she's here?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this
is Chris. I have one.
Ms. Bowers, there has to come some point in time where the developer's responsibility to get and maintain permitting ends; isn't that correct?

MS. BOWERS: When the site is fully stable, there is no need for a stormwater permit for construction activity.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: So it would be the Department's position then that until every single lot in this development was stabilized, the developer has some obligation to maintain a stormwater discharge permit, correct?

MS. BOWERS: If not maintain the permit themselves, transfer the permit to another owner/operator who can maintain control of the site.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, who would that be? Who could that potentially be? It seems to me the only potential other party that could be subject to such a permitting requirement could be the purchaser; is that right?

MS. BOWERS: The permit could be transferred to home builders, who would be purchasers.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Where do the statutes or regulations address this particular question of the hand-off of the responsibility for stormwater permitting?

MS. BOWERS: There are provisions for permit transfer in Administrative Rules of Montana Title 17 Chapter 30 Subchapter (13); and Subchapter (11) pertains more to general permits and stormwater discharge permits. BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I guess my question, though, is: Is there somewhere in all of these regulations in which it is clearly stated that somebody has to have responsibility for stormwater permitting from one end of the process to the other, or is it solely a matter of determining who the owner/operator is?

MS. BOWERS: Well, let me just step back a minute. There is a requirement to cover a discharge of a pollutant, and so as long as there is an addition of pollutants from a point source to State waters, there has to be a permit to cover that discharge.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Right, and then there is an over-arching permit held by the City of Billings that deals with the subject of
stormwater runoff, and it's my understanding that the City's permit must have necessarily been extended to this subdivision at the time that the subdivision hooked on to the City system, correct?

MS. BOWERS: Well, the MS4 permit is little bit different. I mean the City does have an infrastructure through which stormwater flows, and then it flows eventually to State water, and the City is also subject to some best management practices and some inspection requirements in order to comply with their permit and control stormwater discharges to their system.

The stormwater discharges that are associated with construction activity are subject to separate controls and separate permitting; and the City, within their MS4 they also have some enforcement authority, and can require permit coverage.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: But is it not correct that the construction activity with respect to which the developer had been permitted -- that would be road building and so forth -that construction activity was already over, wasn't it?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, it was.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Their permit had been terminated for that purpose, so one can only assume that that construction activity was over.

Now, $I$ would assume there is no gap with respect to stormwater coverage, so any discharges that happened from water running down the street and into the storm sewers and into the city of Billings system is not the subject of any of these complaints against this developer, correct?

MS. BOWERS: Well, stormwater that was contributed by construction activity within the subdivisions that flowed onto streets, sidewalks, and into the storm drain without controls is part of this enforcement action.

MS. CLERGET: Madam Chair, may I
interrupt here for a second. And Chris, I'm going to point you to a place in the summary judgment order that $I$ think offers you the analysis you were looking for of the applicable ARM and statutes, and that's Page 13 to 14 in the summary judgment order. That's in your packet at page 235 to 236 . And that walks you through the statutory analysis, $I$ think what you're struggling to find.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Right. Okay. So
I don't want to ask any more questions for now and
let other people have a chance.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: This is Dexter.
I've got one quick easy question.
CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Dexter.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: On these lots that have been sold and there is construction activity, is that not covered under the building permit for those lots, the runoff?

MS. BOWERS: The stormwater discharges, no, they're not covered under building permits.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Interesting, because the ones $I$ have had had a clause in there that you had to control runoff.

MS. BOWERS: This is Kirsten Bowers, Member Busby. And $I$ think some local governments are adding that language to building permits.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Because I'm not sure that isn't where the responsibility lies for the individual lots that have been sold.

MS. BOWERS: This is Kirsten Bowers again. One concern there is those lots are smaller than an acre, and so the construction activity that's regulated under stormwater permitting is activity that disturbs more than one acre, or a smaller area if it is part of a larger
common plan of development or sale.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I don't disagree with what you just said, but the construction on an individual lot which is under one acre, which would not fall under State control, falls under the City of Billings control in this case.

MS. BOWERS: Okay. That's kind of beyond my knowledge.

MS. MARQUIS: Can I respond to that for one minute?

CHAIR DEVENY: No, $I$ want to continue with Ms. Bowers here for a second. Hold your point. I guess my question hasn't yet been answered as to: Does DEQ have evidence that the wastes, stormwater wastes, coming off into the streets or into the sidewalks that were observed did not come solely, or did or did not come solely off of properties that were owned by individuals, or that were still undeveloped lots owned by Copper Ridge developers?

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. The answer to your question is the actual point of discharge is not pinpointed, and I'm going to argue that it doesn't have to be, because it is the whole common plan, it is the whole
development that's subject to permitting.
Even if stormwater ran upgradient from a totally different development onto the Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge development, they have to have a permit because they have to control that stormwater. It can't just flow without any control over their stockpiles, over their concrete washout area into the storm sewer system, or directly into waters of the State. They have to have the controls in place, and they did not have those.

CHAIR DEVENY: Further questions of Ms.
Bowers?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Further questions of Ms. Marquis?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis, I'll give you an opportunity to answer Dexter's question, but I'd like you to simply focus on that.

MS. MARQUIS: Thank you, Madam Chair, Board Member Busby. You've mentioned the City, and $I$ think that is an important consideration here, but it is also important to note that there isn't any evidence before us of what the City does
and does not regulate. So to say that the City can't regulate something is not a question that should properly be before the Board right now.

And the other issue is that the entire discussion of construction activities on less than an acre, that's the necessary level at which the Department can require someone to get a permit. It is really important here, and this is what $I$ was trying to explain earlier.

To focus on the violations that are at issue, the violations that are at issue are a discharge without a permit, so we have to meet the elements of that statute, 75-5-605. We have to prove that there was a discharge, and that there was no permit for it, not that somebody needed a permit and didn't have a permit. We have to prove that a discharge happened, and that there was no permit.

Ms. Bowers argued that the subdivision didn't have any controls in place, and again, this goes to the same thing. The violation is not that there weren't any controls in place. The violation cited was that there was a discharge, and that there was a placement of waste.

Those are the violations that have to be
proven, and you can't prove those without showing who was responsible for that discharge, and who was responsible for the placement of waste, and our position is that the evidence is not sufficient in the record to prove that our client discharged or placed any pollution.

And we have additional argument. I know there are other issues before the Board that we would like to argue, particularly the burden of proof.

CHAIR DEVENY: We'll get to that later. We need to decide on the owner/operator before we proceed.

I'd like to point Board members to the order on summary judgment where Hearing Officer Haladay wrote that, "Copper Ridge and Reflections admit that they entered into at least one contract that required all excess material from pipe and bedding displacement be left on site."

Therefore, he concludes that, "Not only did Copper Ridge and Reflections have supervision and control over the actions of third parties, they acted on their ability to instruct others how to engage in stockpiling of materials, which is an act expressly contained in definition of
construction activities."
"And this puts Copper Ridge and
Reflections in a position of either control or supervision with regard to the term of sale of any of the individual lots for construction of residential homes, and any argument to the contrary ignores the common sense and practical reality of the development of a residential subdivision."
"The mere fact that neither Copper Ridge nor Reflections exercised supervision or control over the contractual terms of the sale of land does not change the fact that they had the power to supervise or control land with regard to the stormwater discharges."

So I think my read of that is that Hearings Officer Haladay felt that Copper Ridge was aware that they could, and actually did in some cases have authority and control over the construction activities.

I'm wondering if this might be a good place for us to stop and have lunch, and $I$ think we'll do that. We'll go ahead and break for a half hour, and why don't we come back at 1:00. Are the Board members still on line?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Yes, Madam Chair, this is Chris. I'm in a bit of bind here. I'm about to go get on a bus, and travel up to Mission Valley. And $I$ hope $I$ can get back on in a half hour, but I'm not able to make a guarantee that $I$ can. It all depends on my ability to get an internet signal. So $\quad$ will get back on if $I$ can. CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, without you, we don't have a quorum.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I understand that, but $I$ don't have any -- I'm pulled in two different directions here, and $I$ have to do both. CHAIR DEVENY: There is one more option that the Board has, if we could ask the parties. John Dearment is here, but has asked to be recused. If the parties would agree to have him hear, participate in hearing the oral argument and making the decision, we would have a quorum if Chris is not able to come on. Do the parties have a --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, I don't know what your thoughts are about this matter, but $I$ have a hard time thinking that we will have thoroughly sorted this matter out enough to make a final decision this afternoon. There
are lots of issues that we just spent virtually an hour on that we need to sort out, and then there are other relatively thorny issues to sort out as well.

If you wanted to continue the hearing and hear argument on all of these matters, and then carry over the decision until our next meeting, you certainly could do that, and then the absence of a quorum wouldn't really matter because you wouldn't be taking final action.

So if I'm not able to get on, you always have the option of carrying this matter over to the next meeting.

CHAIR DEVENY: I guess that is an option, according to Sarah. But $I$ would like the parties to respond to my request about having Mr. Dearment on this case so we are able to move along today.

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, it is our understanding that Mr. Dearment was the Division Administrator at the time that this enforcement action was initiated, so we are not willing to waive our objection.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. So why don't we take $a \operatorname{break}$ and see if you can get back on,

Chris, and we'll make a decision at 1:00. Does that sound all right, Chris?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Let's take a break for lunch.
(Lunch recess taken)
(Board Member Tweeten not present)
CHAIR DEVENY: Let's reconvene.
Lindsay, can you take roll call and see who all with us.

MS. FORD: Chris Deveny.
CHAIR DEVENY: Here.
MS. FORD: John Dearment.
BOARD MEMBER DEARMENT: Here.
MS. FORD: Dexter Busby.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'm here.
MS. FORD: Tim Warner.
BOARD MEMBER WARNER: Tim Warner is here.

MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
(No response)
MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
(No response)
MS. FORD: At this time, we do not have a quorum. It does look like there is someone else
on the line. There's three people on right now. Is there someone else on the line?
(No response)
MS. FORD: Anyone else there?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: So would the parties be amenable to us continuing this without a quorum?

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, of course this causes a lot of frustration for my client and I. These trips to Helena are fairly expensive, and we had anticipated to resolve this in one trip, and it seems that now regardless of what we do, we will be making two trips.

So our preference -- and we've talked to the State and to Ms. Clerget about this -- would be to continue this, and perhaps provide additional briefing on the owner/operator issue, and then resume in February with a new Board who has access to the transcript from this hearing, and we could argue again at the next Board meeting; or perhaps a special Board meeting.

Does that characterize what we've talked about fairly?

MS. BOWERS: Yes. Madam Chair, members
of the Board, DEQ is in agreement that we would prefer to proceed with a quorum, and either at the February meeting or a special meeting.

CHAIR DEVENY: So you don't want to us to proceed today with anything?

MS. BOWERS: Not with less than a quorum, no.

CHAIR DEVENY: Well, $I$ guess we will decide whether to hold a special meeting then or postpone this to february. I don't know that we can set a January date right now. Let's try to pursue a January date if we can find one that will meet all of the schedules of all of the Board members, as well as you folks. If not, we will then move on to the February meeting. And Sarah, I'll ask you to work with Lindsay to coordinate that.

MS. CLERGET: Yes. And what is your preference with the additional briefing that the parties requested? Do you want additional briefing on the owner/operator issue, or would you like the special meeting or the next meeting to be based only on the record as it exists in front of the Board now plus the transcript?

CHAIR DEVENY: So your additional
briefing on the owner/operator, you wanted to continue that without the quorum; did I understand that correctly?

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, that was one of the stipulations that Ms. Marquis and $I$ discussed in the hall with Sarah is that DEQ and Copper Ridge would propose doing some additional supplemental briefing on just the issue of owner/operator. We could file the brief simultaneously, and then respond simultaneously so it's not a long briefing schedule. If you think would be helpful.

CHAIR DEVENY: I think it would be very helpful. I would appreciate that. It seems to be an issue I'm not really clear on, and $I$ really want the Board to be clear when we make a decision. So yes, please do that.

MS. CLERGET: Can you allow me to set a deadline for the briefing based on the dates that we reach for the next meeting?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, please do. Do we need to have a motion?

MS. FORD: Madam Chair, I did just get an email from Chris Tweeten that he is on the bus, and it's a bit noisy, but he's hoping he can make
it work. Do you want me to see if he's on the line again before we --

CHAIR DEVENY: I don't think so. I think there is too much risk that he'll get out of service, and then we'll be kind of stuck where we are now. So $I$ think it is best to quit today while people can still get back home during the light hours. And $I$ apologize to everybody that the Board members weren't able to make it today. We thought they were all able to come.

So $I$ would so move then that we ask the parties to submit continued briefs just on the owner/operator issue, and that we postpone and continue this case review, $I$ guess I'll call it, in January, if we can find an amenable date for all parties and the Board members to be hopefully present in person, and to have Sarah work with the parties to set a date for submittal of the additional briefs; is that right?

MS. Clerget: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: So moved. Could I get a second?

BOARD MEMBER WARNER: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Tim. It's
been moved and seconded. All those in favor, say
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Opposed, please say nay.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'm not opposed. I can't hear you guys. I'm getting so much background.

CHAIR DEVENY: Basically, Dexter, we're postponing the continuation of this case to either a special day in January or to the next Board meeting in February because we don't have quorum.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'm not opposed to that.

CHAIR DEVENY: And we're also having Sarah work with the parties to allow some additional materials to be submitted to the Board on this whole owner/operator issue.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Okay.
CHAIR DEVENY: Sarah is going to set a date for the parties to do that. That was the motion. So it's been moved and seconded. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion passes. Thank you everybody.
(The proceedings were recessed at 1:08 p.m. )
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