BEFORE THE BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

BOARD MEETING ) JANUARY 24, 2020 )

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Heard at Room 111 of the Metcalf Building 1520 East Sixth Avenue

Helena, Montana
January 24, 2020
9:00 a.m.

BEFORE CHAIR CHRIS DEVENY; and BOARD MEMBERS JOHN DEARMENT, CHRIS TWEETEN, DEXTER BUSBY, HILLARY HANSON, and DAVID LEHNHERR
(By telephone)

PREPARED BY: LAURIE CRUTCHER, RPR
COURT REPORTER, NOTARY PUBLIC

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had and testimony taken, to-wit:

CHAIR DEVENY: Good morning, everybody.
Welcome to the special meeting of the Board of Environmental Review. I'd like to call it to order, and Sara, would you please take a roll call to see if we have a quorum, and find out who joined us.

MS. NELSEN: Chris Deveny.
CHAIR DEVENY: Here.
MS. NELSEN: Dexter Busby.
(No response)
MS. NELSEN: Dexter Busby.
(No response)
MS. NELSEN: Hillary Hanson.
MS. HANSON: Here.
MS. NELSEN: John Dearment.
MR. DEARMENT: Here.
MS. NELSEN: Chris Tweeten.
MR. TWEETEN: Present.
MS. NELSEN: David Lehnherr.
MR. LEHNHERR: Here.
MS. NELSEN: And so we do have four
Board members or more for a quorum either by phone
or in person.
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Great. Welcome, Board members. Happy New Year.

Let's go ahead and go around the room here, and check in, have introductions, and then we'll have introductions by phone if there are other people that have joined us. So we'll start with Sarah.

MS. CLERGET: Sarah Clerget, Board attorney.

MR. DAVIS: Tim Davis, DEQ liaison for the meeting.

MS. NELSEN: Sara Nelsen, interim Board secretary.

MS. SCHERER: Sandy Scherer, legal secretary, DEQ.

MR. PETTIS: Aaron Pettis, DEQ Legal.
MS. CLARK: Rachel Clark, supervisor of the Public Water and Subdivision Section.

MS. COLAMARIA: Angie Colamaria, Chief Legal, DEQ.

MR. HAYES: Ed Hayes, Deputy Chief Legal, DEQ.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Great. Thank you.
Are there other people on the phone that have
joined us this morning? If so, would you introduce yourselves.
(No response)
(Mr. Busby present)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any members of the public that want to chime in?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. It looks like
we'll go ahead and get started. We are here today solely to consider the adoption of rule amendments to ARM 17.38 .106 , and just a reminder that the BER jurisdiction is only for that, and not for the new rulemaking that is also part of this. At this point $I$ would turn it to $D E Q, T i m$ Davis.

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, Members of the Board, Rachel Clark, who is our Public Water and Subdivision Section Supervisor, is going to give a presentation on the Board rules, the rules before the Board, as well as the amendments that came out in response to comment.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Clark.
MS. CLARK: Thank you. Good morning.
My name is Rachel Clark, R-A-C-H-E-L C-L-A-R-K, and I'm the Supervisor of the Public Water and Subdivision Section of the Engineering Bureau.

The rule package you have before you today modifies the subdivision and public water and wastewater fees, and adopts New Rule I, which establishes eligibility requirements for municipalities and county water sewer districts to use the Sanitation Act exemption.

The subdivision fees and New Rule I are Department rules, so the only portion of the package up before the Board today is the public water and wastewater fees under Administrative Rule 17.38.106.

The Board and the Department conducted a public hearing for the proposed rules on September 16 th, and no member of the public attended the meeting or gave testimony during the hearing. The Board and Department also accepted written comments on the proposed rules from August $23 r d$ through September 20 th, and received five written comments. Those comments are addressed in the notice of amendment and adoption.

The only major change proposed to the Board rules in response to public comments was that the fees be phased in over several years, instead of a flat 40 percent one time increase.

> In addition, the Environmental Quality

Council under their rule review authority objected to the rule package at their meeting in September. The EQC lifted their objection in January with the condition that the fees be scaled back to a one time 25 percent fee increase.

The Department recommends the Board adopt this proposed change to ARM 17.38.106, with the understanding that should the 25 percent fee increase not be sufficient to fully support the program, additional fee increases may be proposed in a future rulemaking.

The Department also recommends that the Board adopt an effective date of March 1st, 2020 to give the regulated community advance notice of the proposed rule change.

In addition, the Department is proposing two other changes to the Department rules. Number one would be to have the subdivision water distribution fees match the public water fees; and also we propose to eliminate the requirement for a growth policy in New Rule I.

In summary, the Department recommends that the Board adopt the proposed changes to Administrative Rule 17.38 .106 as modified in the draft notice of amendment. The Department also
recommends that the Board adopt the stringency, takings, and small business analysis, as well as the small business supplemental memorandum.

Thank you for your time, and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Clark.
Why don't you just stay up here because $I$ think we might have a couple questions.

In your recommendations, do we also need to include the March 1st effective date change, if there were to be a motion?

MS. CLARK: Yes. It's in the draft notice of amendment. Yes.

CHAIR DEVENY: So it's in the draft, so it doesn't need to be a separate statement.

MS. CLARK: Correct.
CHAIR DEVENY: Do members of the Board have questions of Ms. Clark? One at a time. Go ahead, Dexter.

MR. BUSBY: I didn't catch when the last rate increase was passed. Could I get that info?

CHAIR DEVENY: They're looking for it.
I believe it has been many years.
MR. DAVIS: 2012; isn't that right,
Rachel?

MS. CLARK: I think so. Yes, I believe it has been since 2012.

MR. BUSBY: So it was eight years ago.
MS. CLARK: On the subdivision fees, and 2010 for the public water fees.

CHAIR DEVENY: I remember you saying it had been ten years, I believe, when we first looked at this rule.

Any other questions from Board members?
MR. LEHNHERR: This is David. I have a question.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, David.
MR. LEHNHERR: Actually $I$ had two questions, but Dexter's question answered one of mine.

My second question was regarding the 25 percent increase. That increase apparently will not allow, is not sufficient to allow additional hiring of staff; is that correct?

MS. CLARK: That is correct.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions?
MS. HANSON: This is Hillary. I guess I kind of had the same question. It was mentioned that you're going with 25 percent instead of the original 40 percent, and that you'll look at it to
see if it's sufficient to cover the costs.
I'm assuming there was already some cost analysis that came with this to get to the 40 percent increase, so $I$ guess $I$ 'm just curious on what the follow-up will be if this fee increase goes in place to analyze and see what it's doing in terms of covering costs.

MS. CLARK: We had estimated the
original 40 percent increase would have taken the Department through to 2027 for our expected costs associated with the program. With this 25 percent fee increase, we expect it will take us through to 2023.

Of course it depends on how many files come in the door, and that's not something we have control over, but $I$ think it would be reasonable to expect this to last for around three years.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Clark, I'm aware that the EQC has asked the Department to give regular updates with the data that you collect, to see what kind of increases in subdivision developments there are, and how your fees are holding up in terms of meeting that development growth. I would like you to also update the Board of Environmental Review with any data that you collect along the
way on probably the same frequency that you do the EQC.

MS. CLARK: Of course. Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions from Board members?

MS. HANSON: This is Hillary. I have one more question.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Hillary.
MS. HANSON: Just I guess I'm curious, and this would be for $D E Q$ fees across the board. Like for future smaller, incremental, more frequent incremental fee increases would be a better option, so $I$ guess it's not even a question as much as a comment across the board of like how we can get away from doing big jumps like this, and maybe see these fees more frequently.

MS. CLARK: Certainly.
MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, can $I$ address that?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
MR. DAVIS: Hillary, this is Tim Davis.
We have looked at that. That was one of the options for potential future phasing. In response to comment received about phasing the fee, we're essentially adopting, proposing to adopt the 25
percent fee increase, which eliminates a shortfall in the program, and gives us time to look at other options on -- which would be potentially what you're proposing -- smaller incremental fee increases.

MS. HANSON: Thank you. And I'm not actually saying that $I$ have an issue with this big piece, as much as $I$ just think across the board you're going to get more support, not just from this Board, but from the public and others if you look at that.

MR. DAVIS: We'll do that. Thanks.
MS. HANSON: And not get in a scenario where you're 40 percent behind.

CHAIR DEVENY: I think that's a good point, Hillary. Thank you. Other questions or comments from Board members?

MR. BUSBY: This is Dexter.
MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair.
CHAIR DEVENY: Let's hear from someone who hasn't spoken yet. Did I hear Chris? MR. TWEETEN: Yes, you did.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris, and Dexter, you're next. MR. TWEETEN: I wonder if Ms. Clark
could summarize for $u s$ the grounds for objecting to the rule at 40 percent, and the discussions that led to a reduction to 25 percent. I'm curious.

MS. CLARK: I was not at the EQC meeting where this objection first came up, but my understanding is that they thought that the fee increase was too high, too much, and clearly they were willing to accept a smaller fee increase. So as far as $I$ know, they had no objection to New Rule $I$ or anything else except the 40 percent fee increase.

CHAIR DEVENY: Mr. Davis, could you kind of expound on that, since $I$ know you were at the EQC meeting.

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, I'd be happy to. So yes, $I$ think it was simply at the prior -So the EQC meeting, Environmental Quality Council meeting, which was only last week, the Council discussed the 25 percent versus 40 percent, and they voted to lift the objection based on the change, and the proposal that we would phase the fee increase over time, that this would be -- and if we were going to phase, we would have to come back with subsequent rulemaking; that this is just
the first phase. It actually passed overwhelmingly to let us go forward.

So to answer Chris's question, I really think it was just the sticker shock of the amount, the 40 percent; but once we were able to address their concerns, and answer their questions in front of the last Council meeting, they voted to let us proceed with the 25 percent as a first phase.

And then as the Chair pointed out, they requested that we come back on a six month basis to provide updates to timelines for our reviews, fees. And so as you requested, Madam Chair, we could bring that same report back to the BER going forward.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, does that answer your question?

MR. TWEETEN: Yes. Just a follow-up to clarify. So in effect what you've done is to adopt the phasing approach, but going through serial rulemaking as opposed to some phasing that's in the rule itself; is that correct? MR. DAVIS: That is correct.

MR. TWEETEN: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter, you had a
question?
MR. BUSBY: Yes. This is for Tim. Have you been running in arrears or in the red for the last couple three years, or what's the status?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, Dexter, we have. So this erases the shortfall. We have had to subsidize the program, so it raises the shortfall, and gives us -- as Ms. Clark pointed out -- it gives us a buffer to then look at what, if we need to do additional fee increases over the next couple years, what those might be.

MR. BUSBY: The other thing $I$ noticed in my reading is that you have an efficiency study going, or plan to undertake one. Can you explain that a little bit.

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, Members of the Board, we've been working for really the last three years to increase the efficiency of our program, to improve communication. Two years ago we were not meeting statutory timelines for numerous reviews. We have not missed a statutory timeline in roughly two years.

So the fee increase allows us to maintain our existing staff, but we are undertaking, we have been and we are undertaking a
number of different efforts to make our reviews more efficient.

And the next step is comprehensive rule review of our subdivision, primarily our subdivision rules, to ensure that they are easily understood by the regulated community, so that they can get us applications that ideally we can review faster and easier.

And so that's kind of the next stage that we're looking for, and then we will be reporting back on -- and $I$ think just this might address what you're asking, too -- but we will be reporting back on our timeline, and getting to a greater granularity on how long our reviews take, and how we're using fees.

Does that answer your question?
MR. BUSBY: Yes, that goes a long ways to answer it. I've got one real quick other question, and that's: How many subdivision reviews do you do in an average year, and is the rate changing or the numbers changing dramatically, or are we pretty constant?

MS. CLARK: We consistently do between 400 and 500 review files here at $D E Q$, and then our contracted counties do another approximately 300
to 400 a year.
MR. BUSBY: Is that changing at all? Is it going up, down, or holding steady?

MS. CLARK: It is probably steady from 2018 to 2019. Prior to that, as I'm sure everybody in Montana knows, we had a giant glut of new files in 2007/2008, and then it went steeply down for many years, and has been gradually picking up.

So I hope the levels that we are at today -- which haven't exceeded the number of new lots approved like in 2007 -- I hope that level is sustainable, so we don't over build too much and then crash again.

MR. BUSBY: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Do Board members have any other questions or comments regarding the rule amendments today?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Is there any public comment about the rules today that anybody would like to make?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, $I$ would
like to move then that the Department adopt the
rule amendments to ARM 17.38 .106 as modified in the draft notice of amendment, as well as adopting the stringency and takings analysis, and the small business impact analysis and supplemental memorandum.

MR. LEHNHERR: This is David. I'll second.

MS. CLERGET: You just said Department. I want to be clear. It's the Board that's adopting that.

CHAIR DEVENY: I will clarify my motion that it's the Board of Environmental Review that is adopting these rule amendments. Thank you, Ms. Clerget.

I believe this motion has been moved and seconded.

MR. LEHNHERR: Second the motion as modified.

CHAIR DEVENY: Is there a second on the modified motion?

MR. LEHNHERR: I'll second that. This is David.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been seconded. All those in favor of -- Any discussion on the modified amendment motion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none --
MS. HANSON: I just wanted to make the note that $I$ 'll be abstaining from voting. Our Health Department is a contractor with the subdivision program.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Thank you,
Hillary. No further discussion, we'll have a vote on the amended motion. All those in favor of amending my mistake of stating the Department instead of the Board of Environmental Review, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: The amended motion passes. Now we will vote on the regular motion. First, is there discussion on the original motion that's been amended?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing no discussion, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion carries. Thank you, everybody, and we will now open this meeting for any general public comment, if there is any, on other issues besides what was on the agenda today.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Seeing and hearing none, this meeting is adjourned.
(The proceedings were concluded at (9:25 a.m. ) * * * * *
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