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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR DEVENY: I believe we're ready to move on to the case, and $I$ know we're going to need some time to set up.

MS. CLERGET: I think that they can probably -- Can you guys just come up and set up at your tables, and $I$ can do a little talking while they do that.

So the case before you guys -- I apologize for the memo being late. I frankly just completely forgot it until a few days before the Board meeting. So you have the memo from me which is the standard memo that you see every time with your menu of options for what to do with a contested case.

Again, just to go over that, remember that you have -- facts and law are treated differently, so you have the facts. You can only modify if you find that the Hearing Examiner's findings are not based on substantial evidence, and then the entire Board has to review the entire record in order to modify facts.

> In order to modify law, you can do
whatever you want with the law, you can modify it without having to review the whole record. So that's all laid out in the memo.

I met with the parties this morning briefly, and the FOFCOL that you have in front of you, based on the exceptions and response from the parties has some mistakes in it, which are mine. And in order to rectify those, $I$ met with the parties this morning, and $I$ provided them with the same thing that I've handed out to you.

And I apologize to Chris and Hillary because $I$ don't have that, but maybe if Aleisha emails it to Lindsay, Lindsay can email -- or I don't know if Aleisha can email it to you directly. Either way we'll get it to you in email.

But essentially what it is is Pages 4, 7, and 12 to 13 of the original FOFCOL, there are some red-line changes. On the first page of each of those pages you see the red-line version; and then on the back of the pages, there is the non-red-line versions, the final version.

And this is an attempt to correct on Page 4 the typo in the ARM; on Page 7, the fact that the motion to vacate was jointly filed, not
filed by Copper Ridge; and then on Page 12, the corrections regarding Lot $7-B$, which required changes to Findings of Fact 14 and 15 . And then because of that change also a change to 17 for the first -- to make it the first, second, third filings of Reflections, and the second, third, and fourth filings of Copper Ridge.

So those are what $I$ would deem mistakes, and therefore -- and $I$ think the parties have agreed that the way to proceed with this, so that the Board doesn't have to review the entire record to modify these mistakes, that I'm going to withdraw my proposed, my original proposed FOFCOL and resubmit it with these changes, so that -- And again, this is with the stipulation of the parties -- so that the FOFCOL before you for decision is the FOFCOL that includes these changes. Does that make sense to everybody?
(Nods heads)
MS. CLERGET: I'm not seeing any
questions. Can the parties just put on the record that we've agreed that we've talked about this and you agree.

MS. MARQUIS: Yes, Copper Ridge and Reflections agreed to the changes that you've just presented.

MR. HAYES: I wasn't involved personally in the communications. Kirsten just ran to her office to pick up --

MS. CLERGET: Okay. Well, Kirsten -Here she is. Kirsten, can you just agree that DEQ, on the record that DEQ is okay with these changes.

MS. BOWERS: Yes. I reviewed them, and DEQ is okay with the changes.

MS. CLERGET: So $I$ want to be clear that the FOFCOL that you guys are reviewing for acceptance or modification today is the FOFCOL with these changes in it, so you can essentially replace Pages $4,7,12$ and 13 with the final pages that are provided to you on the back side of this packet. And $I$ think that's all $I$ have by way of intro.

CHAIR DEVENY: Just give Board members a minute here to digest this new information. Me maybe.

MS. CLERGET: And Chris and Hillary, it should be in your email, Aleisha tells me.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Did you send out a new email?

MS. CLERGET: No. I'm just sending it to -- or Lindsay and Aleisha are just sending it to Chris and Hillary right now so that they'll have it.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I don't have a printed copy. That's why -- of your -MS. CLERGET: Of the actual FOFCOL? BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Yes.

MS. CLERGET: That's the full one.
(Provides document)
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris and Hillary, are you prepared to move on? Are you comfortable with what you were sent, if you received it, or what you heard over the phone?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm fine, Madam Chair. This is Chris.

CHAIR DEVENY: Hillary, how about you? BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Yes. I'm good, too. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: How about those of us present in the room?
(Nods heads)
MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, would it be possible to take a quick break?

DEQ would like to project some information during its presentation, and we also have some hand-outs, but the Board members on the phone would not see our hand-outs unless we project them.

CHAIR DEVENY: Sure. Why don't we take -- would this be a good time to take a break? Let's take a fifteen minute break, no longer, at this time.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR DEVENY: Let's go ahead and
reconvene. Lindsay, would you take the roll call.
MS. FORD: Chris Deveny.
CHAIR DEVENY: Here.
MS. FORD: Dexter Busby.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Here.
MS. FORD: Hillary Hanson.
(No response)
MS. FORD: Hillary Hanson.
(No response)
MS. FORD: John Dearment.
BOARD MEMBER DEARMENT: Here.
MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
(No response)
MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
(No response)

MS. FORD: Melissa Hornbein.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Here.
MS. FORD: David Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Here.
MS. FORD: All Board members in the room are present. The two Board members on the phone are still on break, it appears.

CHAIR DEVENY: Could you check with them somehow. And while we're waiting, we asked members of the public to identify themselves, and I think maybe some other additional people have come in. So if there is anybody here that hasn't identified themselves, if they could.

MR. WEISS: I'm Ryan Weiss with the Department of Environmental Quality.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Is there any member of the public on the phone that would like to identify themselves?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris or Hillary, are you on yet?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: We could go ahead and proceed. John Dearment is recused from this case, so we do have a quorum with Melissa, David,

Dexter, and myself, but I'd like to just give a minute or two to see if we couldn't get our other two Board members on.

MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten, are you on the line?
(No response)
MS. FORD: Chris or Hillary, are you on the line? Are you able to hear us?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: This is Chris.
BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Yes, Hillary is
here, too.
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Great. We had a hard time getting you, but you're both on now, and we've reconvened to continue with the case of Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge versus DEQ. So we have a quorum with six Board members available to work on this case.

So just as a little background, because we have two Board members who were not here at our, $I$ think it was the November meeting when we heard this case, and we remanded this case back to our Hearing Officer to clarify the issue of owner/operator, and that's where we need to start today, because everything is really kind of dependent on our decision regarding
owner/operator.
So today we're going to allow the parties to make oral argument relating to the remand issue, and we will hear that, and then proceed with the case. And Sarah outlined in the procedural memo what our options are, so I think you're all clear on that.

And with that, I'd like to ask the parties to give oral argument, and I'd appreciate it if you could limit it to no more than fifteen minutes. We will have time for questions afterward from Board members. So I'm trying to decide who the best -- Between the two parties, do you have a preference as to who starts? DEQ, would you like to --

MS. BOWERS: Yes, since we have the burden.

MS. CLERGET: How long, Chris?
CHAIR DEVENY: Fifteen minutes. So if
you could give the parties like a five minute notice, and then a one minute, that would be great. So Ms. Bowers, please proceed for DEQ.

MS. BOWERS: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Just to add to the introduction, the purpose of the June 13th, 2019
hearing on the Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge contested cases was to allow the parties to present additional evidence for final administrative determination whether Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge were owners/operators with respect to their subdivisions, and responsible for obtaining MPDES permit coverage for storm water discharges associated with construction activities at those subdivisions.

At the February 8th, 2019 hearing before this Board, Copper Ridge and Reflections asserted that lots within the subdivisions that were still owned by Copper Ridge and Reflections were not disturbed by construction activity.

For example, in the transcript of those proceedings, in your materials it is at Bates Page No. 410, Board Member Tweeten asked, "Did the developer have any controls of runoff water in place on those lots that had not yet been sold? Because $I$ don't think there's any question that they were owner/operator with respect to those lots, is there?"

And the answer by Counsel for Copper Ridge was, "With respect to the lots that had not
been sold, those lots were not disturbed. Those were stabilized. And so the point source again here is construction activity. There was no construction activity on those lots that remained in their ownership that would trigger the need for permit coverage."

Then later on Bates Page Nos. 441 to 442 , Board Member Tweeten asked, "Well, the Department says that all the lots were disturbed because ground preparation, and grading, and so forth had taken place even on those lots that hadn't been sold; is that right or wrong?"

The answer from Counsel for Copper Ridge was, "There was no evidence in the record that any of the lots that the developers owned and had not sold for individual home building had any disturbance on them whatsoever. In fact, any disturbance that my client would have caused would have been in conjunction with road building and utility installation.
"Again, that occurred in 2012, was completed. Everything they disturbed was stabilized. They sent in the notice to terminate. The Department agreed, and allowed the permit to terminate, essentially saying, 'Okay. You're good
to go. You don't need permit coverage anymore. You've done what you need to do for construction activity.'"

And then Board Member Tweeten asked, "So the record shows that except for road building activity which had already been deemed stabilized by the Department, there was no ground disturbance of any kind on any of the lots that the developer still owned? Does the record show that?"

And the answer was, "The record is fairly devoid of exactly which lots the disturbance is on, or the Department is alleging that there was a violation."

Board Member Tweeten then asked, "I understand that, but did you put in testimony from the developer that with respect to those lots that we hadn't sold, they were still in effectively their natural state with no ground having been disturbed to level the lots, or remove boulders, or whatever, remove vegetation, whatever other activities might be undertaken in preparation for selling?"

And the answer was, "There is evidence in the record that my client as a developer planned a subdivision, essentially drew the lines
on the lots. There is evidence on the record of construction activity they did do, and that was road building and utility installation, which was appropriately permitted and appropriately terminated. There is no evidence that any of the individual lots that they may have retained ownership of were disturbed. Again, this goes to the burden of proof which we believe is on the Department in this case."

After putting the condition of their lots within the subdivisions in question, and whether those lots had been subject to ground disturbance associated with unpermitted construction activity, Copper Ridge and Reflections moved to exclude broad categories of relevant and material evidence probative to determine which individual lots remained under ownership and control of Copper Ridge and Reflections, and what construction activities occurred on those lots at the time of the alleged violations.

Citing principles of equity and estoppel without any supporting legal analysis, the Hearing Examiner prevented $D E Q$ from presenting photographs that were not publicly available, previously
produced in discovery, or attached to the September 23 rd, 2013 violation letter, and the September 9 th, 2013 compliance inspection report, or any maps that were created from such photographs. Thus the Hearing Examiner excluded four out of six photos in DEQ's proposed Exhibit 36. Can you put Exhibit 36 up.

MS. MARQUIS: I'm going to object to this exhibit. The four photos were deemed inadmissible in a ruling on a motion in limine. The Department's exceptions document did not challenge the ruling on the motion in limine. It's inappropriate for the Department to now bring these photos in front of the Board.

You assigned this hearing to a Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner made a ruling. And the Board, it's not clear. The Board should not see the photos now without making the decision to reopen the entire record and go through everything again. The photos have already been deemed inadmissible by the Hearing Examiner. That ruling wasn't challenged in their exceptions, and so the photos should not be put in front of this Board.

MS. BOWERS: The question of
admissibility is a question of law, and the Department did challenge the admissibility on -it is in your Bates number Page 71 in our exceptions.

CHAIR DEVENY: So I'm going to stop you right here. I guess Melissa and Chris, as attorneys, $I$ guess I'd like your opinion about this without putting you on the spot. Putting you on the spot.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Chris?
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: (No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris Tweeten, are you on?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I am. I was planning to defer to Melissa on this.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I mean if this
is a question of a disputed evidentiary ruling, I'm hesitant to say that we can view the photographs without seeing what was filed with regard to the motion in limine regarding this evidence specifically.

Sarah, do you have anything to add?
MS. CLERGET: I do believe that DEQ argued in their exceptions that the motion in limine, they believe the motion in limine ruling
is wrong. And they did -- Although they didn't make an offer of proof at the hearing regarding Exhibit 36 , they did file Exhibit 36 as part of their proposed exhibits.

So Exhibit 36 is in the record of the -and $I$ think -- although $I$ could be wrong, so everybody can tell me if $I$ 'm wrong -- but my assessment is that since the photographs are in the record, and the question is whether or not the Hearing Examiner correctly or incorrectly excluded that evidence, you could consider the record evidence to make that determination. I don't think it is extra-record evidence.

I also think that if the Board determines that it was properly excluded, they can disregard the evidence that they see. I think you are all capable of doing that. So it is up to you, and if I've got it wrong -- everybody, Chris, Melissa, Copper Ridge -- can disagree, but that is my assessment.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I think that's right.

CHAIR DEVENY: Based on that, I'm going to allow --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: ExCuse me. Let
me conclude. I think given the way that DEQ's argument is laying out, we probably ought to rule on the exception dealing with the motion in limine first.

So perhaps Ms. Bowers can direct us to that portion of her argument, and we could hear from Copper Ridge in response to that particular issue, and the Board could make a decision on that exception.

If the photographs, we find that the photographs were properly disallowed into evidence, then we wouldn't want to see them in any event. So $I$ guess it seems to me logically that the easiest way out is that we should deal with the motion in limine first.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Sarah, could you refer us to where the motion in limine is in our packet.

MS. CLERGET: The motion in limine is not included in your packet. The FOFCOL relies on the motion in limine for the discussion of what is relevant. So if you want, we can pull up the motion in limine which is in the record, or $I$ can direct you in the FOFCOL to where $I$ believe it operates.

But $I$ think the -- correct me if $I^{\prime m}$ wrong, please -- but $I$ think the argument from DEQ is that the FOFCOL's estimation of what was relevant during the remand hearing, which is incorporated in a number of different places in the $F O F C O L$, is what they're taking issue to.

So the motion in limine is not attached as an exhibit. It is incorporated within the FOFCOL. Does that make sense?

CHAIR DEVENY: Could you steer us to the place in the FOFCOL --

MS. CLERGET: Sure. DEQ might be better able to do that, since it's their argument. I don't want to be arguing for the parties. But there is -- $I$ will just point you to -- There is a discussion of relevance on remand. Well, first, there is a discussion in the procedural history; then there is a discussion on the relevance in remand in the discussion section, which starts on page --

MS. BOWERS: In your proposed FOFCOL, it is on Page 40.

MS. CLERGET: Thank you. Actually it starts on Page 39 , the relevance on remand section.

And then in the conclusions of law, $I$ think it is inherent in $12,13,14$, and -- well, probably 12 through 19. It's inherent in those. MS. BOWERS: In DEQ's exceptions to the proposed order, in your packet it's Bates number Page 71. DEQ takes exception to the Hearing Examiner's exclusion of the photos because they're relevant additional evidence which we believe the Board asked for, and it greatly constrained the DEQ's ability to present evidence requested by the Board, and there was really no reasoning or legal support for the equity and estoppel reasoning given by the Hearing Examiner.

And furthermore, if the motion in limine ruling was correct, during cross-examination, Counsel for Copper Ridge opened the door by asking questions of our witness about his investigation in the northern part of the Reflections at Copper Ridge Subdivision.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, could you steer us through your suggestion that we look at the motion in limine? I mean not being an attorney, I'm a little bit stymied with how we should proceed with your suggestion.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, Madam

Chair, it seems to me that to the extent that you can view -- want to argue from the evidence that was excluded at the hearing. The evidence was properly excluded if --

CHAIR DEVENY: I'm sorry. Chris, you're kind of breaking up. Can you get closer to your phone? Our Court Reporter is having a hard time picking you up.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, I'm getting some feedback. Basically my own statements are coming back to me a second after I make them. So --

CHAIR DEVENY: Lindsay says there is nothing she can do.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: He might be able to disconnect and call in again.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, in that case I'll just deal with it. Let me start over.

I gathered from the direction that Ms. Bowers was headed this morning that DEQ would like to argue from the evidence that was excluded pursuant to the ruling on the motion in limine. And if the motion in limine was correctly denied -- excuse me -- correctly ruled on, let's say, and the evidence was properly excluded from the
hearing below, then $D E Q$ does not get to make those arguments, because the evidence is not in the record.

And I'm a little uncomfortable, I guess, hearing argument on the merits relying on evidence that was excluded below without having first made a ruling as to whether that evidence should have been admitted or not.

And $I$ know we're presumably able to disregard that which is not admissible. We are not like a trial jury. We're more like a trial Judge. And therefore, reference to evidence that would ultimately be inadmissible is not highly prejudicial in this matter. It seems to me that -- go ahead. I'm sorry.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers.
MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten and members of the Board, we're not really asking you to weigh the excluded evidence. We're asking you to reconsider the Hearing Examiner's ruling on the admissibility of that evidence, which is a question of law.

And first off, if the exclusion was based on estoppel, there was no demonstration of all the elements that would support estoppel.

There is no showing the Department made any representation of material fact, that the truth of the facts was known to the Department and not known to Copper Ridge and Reflections, that our conduct was intentional or with any expectation that it would be relied on, and no evidence that Copper Ridge and Reflections actually relied to their detriment on exclusion of the photos.

In the June 13 th transcript of the hearing, the Hearing Examiner states, "The photos are excluded because they weren't turned over by DEQ in discovery."

And here the failure by the Department to turn over the photos was also not intentional, and was harmless. In the initial proceedings DEQ was focused on its inspection report, and that report focused on the downgradient portion of the Copper Ridge Subdivision because that showed impacts to state waters.

All photos associated with that inspection report were timely disclosed. The four photos that are in question here were not attached to the original inspection report, and when the Board asked for additional evidence that Copper Ridge and Reflections were owner/operators, DEQ
realized the importance of the additional photos taken at the northern end of the subdivision and disclosed them.

So I don't know if you want to actually see the four excluded photos, or just consider their admissibility based on a question of law.

CHAIR DEVENY: I don't want to see them until we clarify that this is something that we should be looking at, and that the Board needs to do that.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, I think from my perspective, Ms. Bowers has just summarized their argument on the motion in limine, if I'm understanding things correctly.

And if that's the case, then if we could
hear from Copper Ridge with respect to their response to those arguments as to why the motion was properly ruled on by the Hearing Examiner, then $I$ agree that it's a question of law, and the Board would be in a position to then rule on that aspect of DEQ's exceptions, and from that point forward we would know the status of those proposed exhibits one way or the other.

MR. HAYES: This is --
CHAIR DEVENY: Mr. Hayes, do you have
something to add?
MR. HAYES: Yes. This Ed Hayes representing DEQ. At the beginning of the conversation on this matter, $I$ think the Hearing Examiner made correct observations that the photographs were part of the record, and that the Board had the ability to actually view the photographs.

And I think that's a valuable thing not to make a decision regarding the Hearing Examiner's ruling on equity and estoppel without seeing the actual evidence and the content of the evidence that she indicated was inadmissible. So I think it's imperative for the Board to have a complete understanding of the evidence that was before the Hearing Examiner and the Hearing Examiner's ruling that the Board actually see the four photographs that DEQ produced in response to the Board's request for additional information and evidence, to fully evaluate the Hearing Examiner's ruling.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Marquis, would you limit your remarks to the motion in limine issue.

MS. MARQUIS: Yes, certainly. Madam

Chair, members of the Board, my name is Vicki Marquis. I'm with the law firm Holland and Hart. I'm here today representing Copper Ridge Development Corporation and Reflections at Copper Ridge.

With respect to the motion in limine, the Hearing Examiner made the correct decision. This is a case that, as you'll remember, began in September 2013. There was a remarkable huge storm event. It's very uncharacteristic at that time of year; made the front page or the headlines of the Billings Gazette. Some of the quotes that citizens from other parts of the city had to say --

CHAIR DEVENY: Could you just -- I know this background is --

MS. MARQUIS: Okay. There were 2.1 inches of rain that fell in 45 minutes. The entire city experienced the effects of that. People in other areas had mud covering their back yards.

Now, DEQ admitted during the hearing last year that they didn't identify or write down specific lots during the inspection. And they also admitted during this most recent hearing that
the focus of their investigation was not land ownership or vacant lot disturbance. That's in the transcript at Page 91.

They didn't note any issues, they did not note issues on vacant lots. That's in the transcript at Page 40 . They were focused on sediment in streets and the discharge. After their inspection, they issued a violation letter to Copper Ridge. And this is important because it included an inspection report with a set of photographs.

Now, you'll remember the statute, Montana Code Annotated 75-5-617, requires notice of a violation. What does that notice have to look like? If you look at the statute 75-5-611, it tells you that the notice and order must state the facts alleged to constitute the violation.

These four photographs that the Department now seeks to put in front of you were not provided either in the violation letter, and they weren't referenced in the administrative compliance and penalty orders that were issued in March 2015.

So there's been no notice that those four photos would serve as the basis for new
violations to be alleged against my client. There was no notice of those back in 2013, there was no notice of those in 2015, and so they're not violations that the Department can seek a penalty for anyway.

Another important point: In discovery we asked the Department for all of the evidence that supports the alleged violations. They had an opportunity to provide those photos to us at that time in 2015, and they did not.

We took three depositions of Department employees, and we asked repeatedly about the evidence that they relied upon to support the violations, and the evidence that they relied upon to support the allegation that Copper Ridge and Reflections were owners or operators, and they only answered that it was the sign at the subdivision entrance.

These photos were never talked about, and they were never discussed. So for that reason alone, the Hearing Examiner's ruling is correct on the photos.

And here's another important point. The photos don't even show construction in Copper Ridge or Reflections.

And you can tell, as outlined in our response to the Department's exceptions, based on the photo locations, they said they were taken looking south or east. Those photos are at the edge of the Reflections subdivision. They can't possibly show anything in the Copper Ridge Subdivision, and they're faced looking at the Falcon Ridge Subdivision, which is next door to Reflections.

Also an important point is, as we heard at the hearing, that area of the Reflections subdivision was covered by a general storm water construction permit. The notice of termination was submitted on February 19th, 2014. So that area had permit coverage for the road construction and the utility installation that Reflections was doing. That's at Findings of Fact 26 .

MS. BOWERS: I don't think this argument is confined to your motion in limine.

MS. MARQUIS: This all supports why the photos don't matter, even if they were to be considered, but they were properly excluded because that area was never noticed to Copper Ridge or Reflections, and the Department has had six years to litigate this. They've never produced the photos. We never saw them until May, just a few weeks prior to the hearing. So it is not fair for them to now bring the photos in front of the hearing and now in front of the Board.

And in terms of the Department's argument about equitable estoppel, the Department is trying to rely on those photos for the exact purpose that they said it is okay to enter them. They want to rely on them to say that there is construction activity in the subdivisions. They're relying on those, and it is not fair to us.

We have relied upon the representations that the Department made to us throughout discovery, in the depositions, and the notice that they provided to our client. Is it detrimental to us to now be confronted with additional evidence? Of course it is.

We saw the photos when they were first produced to us in May. We said, "These aren't in the subdivision. They shouldn't come in anyway." And there are a ton of legal arguments for why they shouldn't come in, beginning with they weren't properly included in the notice of the violations.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'm going to ask that you stop there. Thank you.

MS. MARQUIS: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: And Board members, do you have suggestions on how we should proceed with the issue of the photographs?

MS. BOWERS: Can $I$ reply just briefly to arguments by Copper Ridge Counsel?

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers.
MS. BOWERS: First of all, on the notice, notice is provided in the violation letter and the inspection report attached to that violation letter. Notice, the violation letter, and the Department's administrative order may be likened to a complaint. You can amend a complaint if there is additional evidence.

In this case the Board asked for additional evidence, which the Department provided. I don't think there is any question that the four photos at issue are relevant and probative, and there has been no determination on the record that the photographs are -- that the value in the photographs is outweighed by unfair prejudice to Copper Ridge and Reflections.

And in fact, the photos do not unfairly
prejudice Copper Ridge and Reflections because they should be aware of what land they own, and what the condition of that land was, and what construction activity was occurring.

CHAIR DEVENY: Back to the Board.
MS. MARQUIS: I'm sorry.
CHAIR DEVENY: I'm going to wait. I want to have a discussion among us. Thank you. Board members, any thoughts on this?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Sarah, is it correct that you viewed these photographs in your determination on the motion in limine?

MS. CLERGET: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I think that if we are revisiting the Hearing Examiner's decision on the motion in limine, we should have before us the same evidence that she had before her in making that decision.

CHAIR DEVENY: And that means we should look at the photographs?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: If that's what we're doing. If we are reviewing her decision on the motion in limine, then yes.

CHAIR DEVENY: Would there be other things we would have to review as well? Sarah,
can you advise us on that?
MS. CLERGET: I'm thinking. I will
leave it up to the parties to argue and to your discretion. I think the parties have argued that the motion in limine is a conclusion of law, and $I$ think whether or not --

Well, it's up to you guys whether you want to review the record that was before me at the motion in limine stage. The record that was before me when $I$ made the motion in limine included more than the photographs that $D E Q$ wants you to look at now. It's up to you whether you want to review all of that, or whether you are comfortable making a determination on -- a legal determination without reviewing all of that.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, your thoughts?
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, Madam Chair, I'm having a little trouble hearing Melissa when she speaks, but --

CHAIR DEVENY: Did you want Melissa to repeat that?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I guess I'm
inclined at this stage to think, first of all -CHAIR DEVENY: We can't hear you again. BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: First of all, it
appears to me that Sarah, even had the photographs been admitted, Sarah would not have found them particularly probative with respect to the issues that she ultimately decided. Perhaps we ought to -- Well, I'll just lay that out for the good of the order.

I tend to agree with what I understood Melissa to say, which is that in order to ultimately decide whether the photos should come in, the Board ought to look at the photos. Summarizing that.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Yes, that's correct. I mean $I$ guess my point was that if we are revisiting the Hearing Examiner's decision on the motion in limine with regard to this piece of proffered evidence, we should have before us what she had before her; but she made the further point that there is additional material besides the photographs, presumably briefing by both parties on this issue.

So I don't know that we can take that evidence piecemeal. I suppose the underlying question is: Is that what we're doing? Are we revisiting that ruling, or are we simply going to make a decision on whether to view this piece of
evidence in the context of this hearing, because it is correct that its exclusion was a conclusion of law which we have the ability to alter.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this
is Chris again. I guess $I$ understood from the packet of materials that we got some weeks ago that the briefing that was submitted below was included in that packet, was it not?

MS. CLERGET: Chris, I think Melissa is referring to the briefing on the motion in limine, which was not included in that packet. That's part of the record.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay.
CHAIR DEVENY: So Board members, any suggestions for how to proceed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. Thanks for hearing me one more time on this.

It's important to remember that the Hearing Examiner's decision on this was as a matter of law. It was not based on any facts or anything that the pictures show. It was as a matter of law.

They say a picture is worth 1,000 words, so there is prejudice to see the pictures without the contrasting evidence that our side would have offered had they been admitted. To confine this to what the decision held, it was a matter of law, so I think that decision could be reviewed without looking at the photographs.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers, do you have a brief statement?

MS. BOWERS: Well, DEQ disagrees, and we urge you to look at the photographs and make a determination on admissibility.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Madam Chair, could I ask a question of Board Counsel?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: My understanding is that the record was essentially reopened after the remand from the Board to allow for additional evidence solely on the owner/operator issue, correct?

MS. CLERGET: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: So when DEQ
submitted this proposed additional evidence, did Reflections have an opportunity to respond to that submission?

MS. CLERGET: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: And could they have submitted additional evidence to contradict DEQ's evidence?

MS. CLERGET: Well, back up to the timeline. So the photographs were produced in the simultaneous exchange of exhibits before the hearing, and then the motion in limine came. So Copper Ridge didn't have a chance before exhibits were submitted for the hearing to see these photographs.

When they were submitted as a potential exhibit, Copper Ridge moved in limine based on the legal arguments that they have laid out for you that they weren't produced in discovery; they were not attached to the notice; they were not attached to the violation letter. So those legal arguments were laid out in the motion in limine.

That motion in limine was briefed by the parties, so both parties had an opportunity to argue that law, and based on that law, I made a ruling in limine about the evidence that was proposed for the hearing exhibits.

So I guess I want to be clear because what $I$ just heard from DEQ was different. There
was a ruling on admissibility at the hearing. That's an evidentiary ruling that $I$-- So they offered exhibits, and $I$ excluded them. That's an evidentiary ruling at the hearing based on the Rules of Evidence.

There is also legal argument in the motion in limine, and $I$ ruled on the motion in limine based on the legal argument. All of that is in the context of all of the evidence that's presented both in the proposed exhibits and ultimately at the hearing. Does that make sense?

So you just need to be careful what it is that you're reviewing at any -- Are you reviewing the evidentiary ruling? Are you reviewing the motion in limine? Are you reviewing the actual evidence? So $I$ think that what you're considering may differ based on what question it is you're considering.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I have a question, if $I$ might.

CHAIR DEVENY: Just a second, Chris.
David has a question here.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: For Sarah.
Sarah, did you see the photographs?
MS. CLERGET: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you. CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, a question for Sarah. I'm a little confused, and maybe $I$ shouldn't be, but anyway, you didn't issue a separate written order on the motion in limine? It is just in the proposed findings, correct?

MS. CLERGET: No, I did issue a separate order on the motion in limine. Part of it is actually excerpted. There's a Footnote 3 on Page 40 of the $F O F C O L$, and $I$ excerpted part of it there, but $I$ did not include the full text of the order.

But yes, I did issue a written order on the motion in limine, and then DEQ attempted to enter the evidence at the hearing as well, and I made an evidentiary ruling at the hearing in addition.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: And that written order on the motion in limine is not in the packet; is that correct?

MS. CLERGET: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm a little at a
loss to understand how we can rule on the propriety of this order on motion in limine when
they haven't -- I mean $I$ realize the order is in the record, but the material that's been provided to the Board members, that includes the order. So all we have -- I gather from what Sarah said -- is a summary of what the order said that's in the proposed findings, and a footnote, I guess. Is that right?

MS. CLERGET: At the risk of totally derailing this -- and the parties can disagree if they do -- but $I$ think DEQ is arguing that if this evidence was improperly excluded, then the entire FOFCOL is suspect, and therefore -- am $I$ wrong about that?

MS. BOWERS: No.
MS. CLERGET: So the point is that you're actually -- Although we've taken a rabbit hole down this motion in limine, what you're actually talking about is the whole FOFCOL, because the whole FOFCOL is based on my determination of what was relevant at remand.

So I think you might hear all of the argument and all of the FOFCOL together, and you might get some more clarity on this, because if you find that these photographs were improperly excluded, in other words, if you find that my
decision in the $F O F C O L$ based on what was relevant at remand is improper, then you're going to have to review the whole record anyway. Does that make sense?

So I think you're going down a rabbit hole, but in fact you need -- If I'm understanding DEQ's argument correctly, the entire FOFCOL is what they're concerned about, and this is one thing that makes the FOFCOL suspect because of my determinations on what is appropriate or not appropriate on remand.

So it's part and parcel of what the entire $F O F C O L$ is, $I$ guess. The response to Chris is why the motion in limine is not in there is because it's inherent. The entire FOFCOL depends on the entire understanding of what was important on remand.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, this is Chris. I'm inclined to think we should just hear what the parties have for us today, but if it's true that Sarah's entire proposed order and findings and conclusions granting or denying of the motion in limine, at some point we have to see her order on that, it seems to me.

And I know the parties are here, locked
and loaded as far as today is concerned, and I guess it seems to me that the better course is that the argument that has been -- ready to present today, and once they've presented their arguments, we can take stock and decide how we want to proceed.

I'm concerned $I$ guess that the motion in limine is somewhat central to this case, and yet we've got a packet of 500 and some pages of stuff. MS. CLERGET: So if $I$ might interject here again, Chris.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Just let me
finish. We've got a packet of -- and the material dealing with the motion in limine is not here. So I don't know if I'm alone in being concerned about that, but --

MS. CLERGET: So the other option is the order on the motion in limine is eight pages long, so we can give it to you guys, and you could review it at lunch potentially is an option; or we could take a break. The point is it's not very long. So you can have it, and review it, and then the parties can make arguments on it if they want to. It's part of the record, so that's an option.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this
is Chris again. I think we should go ahead and let the parties argue, and $I$ think we should accept Sarah's offer to get copies of the order on the motion in limine.

CHAIR DEVENY: So Chris, with your suggestion that we continue without settling this issue of the photographs, do we leave -- we don't allow DEQ to present those photographs at this time? Is that what you're suggesting?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: No, I think I've got confidence in the Board's ability to hear this case with or without the photographs. As I said, we're not a trial jury. I'm not worried about our prejudices being employed by accepting these photographs. I think we can look at them, and if it turns out we're not supposed to consider them, we can decide the case without considering them. I'm confident in the Board's ability to do that. I don't necessarily accept the argument that it's prejudicial to Copper Ridge.

CHAIR DEVENY: I feel we're making some progress.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I agree with
that. I believe that we should allow the parties to present their arguments, $D E Q$ should be able to
include the photographic evidence in its argument.
And I am still a little uneasy with the idea of making a decision with regard to the motion in limine seeing only the order and not the briefing that supported it, but $I$ believe we can proceed with the arguments, and make that decision later. And if the decision is that the evidence was properly excluded, then just like the Hearing Examiner, we can disregard that evidence in making our decision.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Board members comfortable with that? David?

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Here's what I'd like to do then. We will ask you to get the materials for the motion in limine to have those available.

MS. CLERGET: And just as an offer, we can do -- the briefing on that is eight pages for the original brief, 31 pages for the response, and eight pages for the reply, so we can make all of those available at lunch. And again, it is not a lot. So $I$ think you can have all of it available with my order over the lunch break.

CHAIR DEVENY: Have that available if we need it, and then we will continue with oral
argument. Take five minutes off your fifteen, we will allow the photographs to be projected at this point. And the Board needs to keep in mind that at some point there is a possibility that we could be asked to disregard those.

So with that, if you would adjust the times. Ms. Bowers has ten minutes left.

MS. BOWERS: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. So I'd like to show you what is labeled DEQ Exhibit 36 . And the first photo is a photo that was attached to our DEQ inspector's report, and it's Photograph 13 attached to the inspection report.

The next photograph is just a different view of that same photograph. That photograph was not attached to the inspector's report, and that's one of the four excluded photographs.

And then the next photograph on Page 4, this is a photograph that our DEQ inspector took at the northern edge of the Reflections at Copper Ridge Subdivision, and he's facing kind of southeast.

And then the next photograph, the DEQ inspector is facing more south. It is taken at the northern end of the Reflections at Copper

Ridge Subdivision.
And then the next photograph on Page 6 is taken facing more southerly, also at the northern end of Reflections at Copper Ridge Subdivision.

Then the last photograph was attached to the DEQ inspector's report, and it is labeled Photograph 14 attached to that report. So it's just the four photographs between the first and the last that were excluded.

Then next I'd like to refer you to DEQ's Exhibit 23. This exhibit was admitted. It's an aerial photograph. The photograph is available to the public. And at the hearing, Susan Bawden testified to her extensive work experience in reading aerial satellite images, and education in mapping and geographic information systems.

And the Hearing Examiner erroneously discounts the evidence provided by this photograph. On the right northern -- on the northeast edge of the subdivisions, it shows the condition of Reflections at Copper Ridge.

Ms. Bawden testified that she could tell the difference between disturbed and undisturbed land based on the photograph, and that's in the
transcript of the hearing at Page 112.
And then the next photograph I'd like to show you is DEQ Exhibit 26 , and this exhibit was admitted by the Hearing Examiner. It's a Google Earth image that was acquired on October 25 th, 2013, so shortly after the violations at issue.

And $I$ just want to note that the previous photograph was taken in June of 2013, so it was taken before the violations. This one was taken after.

And as to this photograph, Ms. Bawden testified that she could differentiate lots that were disturbed and lots that had sod on them. She specifically looked at Reflections at Copper Ridge Subdivision, and she pointed to two parcels which are shown in the northern edge of that subdivision that were sodded, and then contrasted that the area around them had not been sodded. She further characterized this area as having been cleared and not stabilized.

Additionally Exhibit 26 shows the difference between lots that are disturbed and some undeveloped agricultural land to the south and east of the subdivisions.

And then next I'd like to show you DEQ's

Exhibit 33. This exhibit was admitted. And this is an overlay showing the lots that were owned by Copper Ridge between September 23, 2013, which was when they received notice of their violations, and December 23, 2013, which was when they obtained their ability to discharge under the general permit for construction activity.

At the hearing, Mr. Leep admitted that this exhibit accurately depicts lots Copper Ridge owned.

Then next I'd like to show Exhibit 34 . This exhibit accurately, Mr. Leep testified accurately depicts lots owned by Reflections between September 23 rd and December 23 rd of 2013. The Hearing Examiner erroneously discounts this evidence, including photographs taken by DEQ's inspector and his field notes, which are made contemporaneous to his inspection of the subdivisions on September 9th, 2013, which documented stockpiles on at least one lot, Lot 15, which was owned by Reflections.

And regarding Lot 15 and Reflections, which is depicted on Photograph 1 and Photograph 13 which is attached to DEQ's Exhibit 2, Dan Freedland testified that area had disturbed ground
and no vegetative cover. In addition, he testified that Lot 15 contained a stockpile of material near the curb line, and that vehicles had tracked sediment from the lot to the adjacent roadway.

Further Mr. Freedland testified Lot 15 is on the corner, and the lot in Photograph 13 is on the corner. That's Photograph 13 attached to Exhibit 2.

Inspector Freedland further testified that he went to the northern part of the subdivision where he observed the lots that had been graded and cleared of all vegetation. And Mr. Freedland further testified that the northern end of the subdivision is upgradient from Cove Ditch, a water of the state, which was impacted by sediment transported by storm water from the subdivision.

Copper Ridge and Reflections were owners or operators within the meaning of 75-5-103 because they owned unsold lots within the subdivisions at the time of the alleged violations, and these unsold lots were disturbed by construction activity as that term is defined by Administrative Rules.

The picture that's shown now is Lot 15 and Photo 13 attached to Exhibit 2.

The Hearing Examiner erred as a matter of law by focusing on a narrow definition of construction activity, limiting it to home building and active construction, which is inconsistent with the definition in the Board's rules.

Construction activities include clearing, grading, excavation, stockpiling earth materials, and other placement or removal of earth material performed during construction projects.

Construction activity for purposes of the Montana Water Quality Act storm water permit requirements include ground disturbing activities that create a conduit for pollutants to enter State waters, and not limited to active earth moving or construction.

Copper Ridge and Reflections admitted at the original hearing in February of 2018 that at the time the subdivisions were built, they owned the whole thing, and that they planned and permitted construction of roads, retainage ponds, utilities, and parks.

Further Copper Ridge and Reflections
admitted they planned the residential lots, and that they sell land that's vacant and undisturbed, and also admitted they graded and contoured some of the residential lots. And that's in the February hearing transcript on Page 110 .

In December of 2013 Copper Ridge and Reflections submitted DEQ Notices of Intent to be covered by the general permit. The NOI associated with construction activity at Copper Ridge is entered in this matter as Exhibit 3, and the NOI for Reflections at Copper Ridge is Exhibit 5.

In the order on summary judgment Page 19, the Hearing Examiner said that Reflections at Copper Ridge cannot rely on the defense that they're not an owner/operator as of December 17 th , 2013 because they agreed to follow the terms and conditions of the permit. And it's undisputed they entered the NOI's and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans, and undertook obligations contained in the general permit.

Therefore, even if you accept that they're not an owner/operator, the violation for violating terms of the general permit could still proceed because they agreed to abide by the terms of the general permit. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Bowers. Ms. Marquis.

MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. I'd like to start where Kirsten ended off. She mentioned those storm water permits that my client was required to apply for and receive as a result of the violation letter.

Those permits were submitted under protest. There is testimony at both hearings to that effect. And those permits cannot be used as a basis for the violations that the Department alleged here. Why? Because those permits were submitted as a required corrective action. The Department required them to submit them. They were submitted under protest, and they were submitted after the alleged violations.

There is nothing in there that admits that Reflections or Copper Ridge are an owner/operator associated with these alleged violations.

In fact they've appealed this enforcement decision, and they've defended themselves against it from the very beginning. So it is obvious that they disagreed that they were an owner/operator with respect to the home
building construction activities that the Department alleged in the violation letter and their administrative order.

Now, let's go back to, if we could, please -- I'm not sure who's running the screen. Can we start -- Let's start with the aerial photo. I believe it was Exhibit 23, the one from USDA.

MS. CLERGET: Okay. Is it for you guys? We have them, too, but since you have them up, can you run them for Copper Ridge? Is that okay?

MS. BAWDEN: Okay.
MS. CLERGET: Thank you.
MS. MARQUIS: Now, what the Department did not tell you about this photograph is that this photograph is an aerial photograph taken by USDA. They typically do aerial photographs so they can track large parcels of land in agricultural use, not to track subdivision development, certainly not to track vegetation on individual lots.

The other thing that the Department failed to tell you about this photograph is that this photograph was taken in June of 2013, months prior to DEQ's inspection at the subdivision. You guys know summer in Montana is short. It's prime
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construction and growing season. So things changed dramatically in the subdivision between June and September. And there is testimony to that effect in the record from Mr. Leep.

The other thing the Department has failed to tell you is that the construction work that Copper Ridge and Reflections did -- and I believe Ms. Bowers spoke about this, that at the hearing they admitted that they had cleared and graded, and done some work on the lots.

Well, of course they did, because they put in the roads and the utilities. And part of that project involves constructing right up next to and sometimes overlapping onto the rights-of-way of the lots. There is testimony in the record to that effect.

All of that work was appropriately permitted, and the permits are outlined in the proposed FOFCOL beginning at Finding of Fact No. 17.

> So the construction work that

Reflections at Copper Ridge did was road building and utility construction. It was appropriately permitted, and it was all completed before September of 2013.

That's important, and we have not only testimony to that effect, but we also have documentary evidence. We submitted documents between the contractors and subcontractors and the developers showing that they had reached completion of all of their construction activities prior to September of 2013. They took all of their construction equipment and they left the subdivisions. Their work was done.

Mr. Leep testified that his companies don't own any construction equipment. They wouldn't know what to do with it. They don't have it. They're not in the construction business. They develop and they hire contractors to do the construction, so there was no way for them to do any construction activity after their contractors left.

So the work that was done was permitted, it was all completed before September 2013. After it was completed, there was no way for Copper Ridge or Reflections to do any construction activity, and they had no reason to do any construction activity. Their portion of the project was done.

Now, if we could talk about Lot 15 for a
minute, please. I'm sorry, Ms. Bawden, do you mind pulling up the Photograph 13 that was admitted?

Now, DEQ testified at the first hearing, and they testified again, that they weren't out there to specifically note specific lots. They did not note specific lot locations. That's in the transcript from both the hearing in February 2018 and the hearing that we just had in June of this year.

Now DEQ comes and says that this portrays Lot 15 , but we don't know how they know that because we have testimony from DEQ witness Dan Freedland who said he didn't know where the property lines were, and the property lines were not marked when he was out there.

He also testified that this was on the corner, but if you recall from the aerial photograph that we just looked at, there are no corners in the Reflections subdivision. Everything is on a curve. So where the property line is on the curve, we don't know. There is no straight edge that you can delineate a property line from.

What we do have in the record that is
credible evidence is testimony from Mr. Landy Leep that this photograph is not Lot 15 . It is not the property that Reflections owned. Ms. Bowers has said earlier that they expect Copper Ridge and Reflections to know what property they own and the condition of that property. Mr. Leep knows that. The companies that he worked for, they owned the property, and they were selling the vacant lots for residential home building. This was not his property.

We also have testimony that their construction was done in 2013 or 2012 , and the storm water permit for their construction work was terminated, and that termination was confirmed by the Department on December 19th, 2012.

There is no credible evidence in the record that anything portrayed in this photograph is on any property owned by Copper Ridge or Reflections.

Further, there is no credible evidence in the record anywhere that Copper Ridge or Reflections did any construction activity in the subdivisions between September and December of 2013. You can see that in the Findings of Fact. Mr. Leep's testimony is pretty clear. I
asked him several times, "What did you see? Did you see an excavator?" No, he didn't. "Did you see any construction equipment?" No, he didn't. "Did you see active construction activities, someone digging, someone trenching?" No, he didn't. He thought he might have seen someone trenching.

I'm sorry. Mr. Freedland. I said, "Did you know where that was? Where was that activity occurring?" He said no. What he did testify to was that he remembered there was a lot of activity to the east in a different subdivision.

And if we could please go, if you don't mind, Ms. Bawden, to the four photographs that were not admissible. You can go the next one, please.

This is the start of the photographs that are actually showing construction in the Falcon Ridge Subdivision. I just want to note for you. This is the exhibit, the one that I'm holding up, that the Department used to show their photo locations at the first hearing that we had in February 2018. This area is up here. It is not even on this aerial photograph. And there is testimony at the June hearing to that effect.

MS. CLERGET: We're going to put up 16 , which is what you're just holding up.

MS. MARQUIS: Great. Thank you.
MS. CLERGET: We're going to put it up so the Board can see it.

MS. MARQUIS: Perfect. Thank you.
MS. CLERGET: Keep going if you want, but we'll get it up there.

MS. MARQUIS: So this photo shows big equipment, a lot of activity. This is totally counter to Mr . Leep's testimony and the documentary evidence in the record that proves that Copper Ridge and Reflections were done with their construction activity, and that the Department had agreed to terminate their construction permit prior to these photographs.

The only explanation for these photographs, and had they been admitted at the hearing, and had we provided testimony to explain these photographs, my client and likely others would have testified that these photographs show road building in the Falcon Ridge Subdivision, not in the Reflections Subdivision.

Again, $I$ would direct you to Findings of Fact No. 17. That outlays a good timeline of when
the work was done in the subdivision, when it was permitted, and when those permits were terminated, and when that termination was confirmed by the Department. In all cases the construction activity was completed prior to September of 2013. In the very north end of the subdivision -- which was new evidence to us because the Department had never looked up there before, never provided us notice up there -- in that north end of the subdivision, that storm water permit was still active, but the construction was done, and the Department agreed to terminate that permit. One final point. If you go through Exhibit 2, which $I$ believe is also in the packet that the Department provided to you, it's clear in the verbiage from their violation letter which is Exhibit 2, and their administrative compliance and penalty orders, that they were concerned about home building activities. Their photographs are of home building activities.

Copper Ridge and Reflections at Copper Ridge do not build homes. We have testimony in the record from the City of Billings -- they checked their records, because all of these homes required a permit from the City of Billings -- and
the City of Billings testified that neither Copper Ridge nor Reflections had any home building permits in that time period.

So I believe Exhibit 16 is up here on the opposite side of your screen. And could I approach the exhibit? Do you mind?

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead.
MS. MARQUIS: For a frame of reference -- and you can compare this to the other aerial photographs -- but what you'll find is that this road here is the Reflections Subdivision, and this over here is Copper Ridge. This stuff over here is the Falcon Ridge Subdivision.

And so this photograph you'll see, January of 2018, they had roads in there. And in that photograph you can see those roads being built. This area is Reflections, this area is not. The area in those photographs is up here. It is not even shown on this photograph.

This is the photograph that the Department relied upon in the hearing that was held in February of 2018, doesn't even show the area where they would now like to find violations. And that's why we get a little worked up about this, because we had no notice of those
photographs, and we feel that they cite to different violations that weren't noticed appropriately, and they're not even in the right subdivision.

So again, just to emphasize, the work that Copper Ridge and Reflections did was permitted, it was completed well before September of 2013, and you should uphold the Hearing Examiner's proposed findings and conclusions. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Marquis. I think let's have a break, ten minutes, and we'll have rebuttal when we return.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR DEVENY: I think we'll go ahead and get started. Let the record show that we have all the Board members back as well as the parties. And what I'd like to do then is to have five minutes for rebuttal, and wrap up, and then the Board will take it from there, and we'll probably have a lot of questions.

MS. BOWERS: Okay.
CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers.
MS. BOWERS: Thank you, Chair Deveny, members of the Board.

First of all $I$ want to address Ms. Marquis's first point that the NOI's were taken out under protest. And they were not protested until after the administrative order issued, and that would have been March of 2015. The NOI's were actually taken out in December of 2013, and there is nothing on the four corners of the NOI that says it was taken out under protest.

I next want to talk a little bit about Exhibit 23. That is the aerial photograph that's acquired by the United States Department of Agriculture. And Ms. Marquis said, "Well, that's a busy construction season, that's why it looks that way, and also we had a big storm." Well, this photo is dated June of 2013, and the big storm was in September of 2013.

And next I'd like to show you Exhibit 26, the Google Earth image. That image was acquired by Google Earth October 2013. That shows that much of the property in the northern end of Reflections is still cleared.

Also I'd like to refer you to Photo 13 attached to Exhibit 2. That's the photo that depicts Reflections Lot 15. And Ms. Marquis pointed out that that was not designated in the
inspection report as Lot 15 or any particular lot within the Reflections at Copper Ridge or by an address.

But Inspector Freedland identified that lot by GPS location on his phone, and he was quite clear where he was standing when he took that picture.

Also I'd like to go to the excluded photos that are in DEQ's Exhibit 36 , and starting with Photo 3. That photo is taken -- Photo 3 in Exhibit 36 . Not Page 3. The next one. Sorry. The next one there is Photo 3. That photo was taken looking southeast toward the Falcon Ridge Subdivision, on the north side of Western Bluffs Boulevard, and to the east of Carrier Lane.

The photo shows construction equipment working in or near Carrier Lane. They may be in Falcon Ridge. But the foreground shows vacant lots in Reflections at Copper Ridge Subdivision, and these lots have been cleared and graded.

There is also an excavation ditch running through the lots, and there's sediment tracked out onto impervious surfaces of Western Bluffs, with sediment accumulated at the curb line.

The next photo, Photo 4, is taken facing a more southerly direction. The excavator and other equipment are working in an area that is likely part of Falcon Ridge Subdivision, but the cleared graded lots are in Reflections Subdivision.

And along with the excavation through the lots, the immediate foreground of the photo shows a cleared driveway of a Reflections lot. And it also shows sediment accumulated and tracked out onto Western Bluffs.

And then Photo 5 is taken facing south, and that's toward lots that are owned by Reflections. The background had a skid steer working, there are stockpiles of rock and soil. The equipment at the excavation through the Reflections lots can be seen on lots owned by Reflections, and there is tracked and accumulated sediment seen in the streets.

In that photo we're looking at Lots 32 ,
33 in the foreground, Lots 20 , 21 in the background, and the house under construction is Lot 19 of Reflections. And Reflections didn't own Lot 19 .

One other point I'd like to make is
about the road building permits, the NOI's that covered road building. Those permits did not cover all activities in the subdivisions. And also the one at issue here was terminated in December of 2012 . So the road building permits do not cover the full scope of activities occurring in the subdivisions, only a small fraction associated with roads and utilities. Thank you. CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Bowers. Ms. Marquis, would you like to wrap up. MS. MARQUIS: Yes, please. Ms. Bowers just told you that the permit at issue here was terminated in December of 2012, while this picture is on the screen behind you. That misrepresents the evidence and the testimony in the record, and it's not true.

The photograph behind you is in that north part of the Reflections Subdivision. It is part of the third filing. And in the proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law, you'll see at Finding of Fact No. 26 that in fact the notice of termination for the permit that covered this area was not submitted until February 19 th of 2014 .

So the case with these photographs is
that the construction was completed in July of 2013. There is a period of time where they have to stabilize the area, and then they submit their notice of termination to the Department. That happened in 2014. So this area in this photograph was permitted at the time that this picture was taken.
I'd like to talk a little bit about

Photo 13, and the Department is now alleging that that shows Lot 15. In discovery again -- this was all going on throughout this case -- we asked for all of their evidence that supported their alleged violations.

One piece of evidence we received was a photograph taken of this same area, but from a different angle. And $D E Q$ witness Dan Freedland confirmed that that photograph was of this same area taken at a different angle; and DEQ witness Dan Freedland confirmed that the address provided on that photograph from DEQ was 3028 Western Bluffs, 3030 Western Bluffs, and 3032 Western Bluffs.

Lot 15 which was owned by Reflections at the time, the street address was 3036 Western Bluffs, it's a different street address, and those street addresses are supported by the warranty deeds in the record that will, or they do show that Reflections did not own 3028, 3030 , or 3032 Western Bluffs, which are the addresses that were on the photograph received from DEQ.

Lot 15, which they did own, is a different street address entirely, and it's not shown in this picture.

DEQ has also agreed that the lots that Reflections at Copper Ridge owned were vacant lots. There was no home building construction going on on the lots. They were vacant lots. What DEQ saw when they went out there was home building construction, and the results of a severe storm event, unprecedented and unexpected. And several people in areas throughout the Billings area struggled with the result of that storm.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the aerial photograph. If we could please pull up -I'm sorry. Ms. Bawden, if you could please pull up the one from October. It's the Google Earth aerial photograph.

And again, now even though the Department's violation letter and their administrative orders were centered on sort of the
lower southern part of the subdivisions, now the Department is looking at that northern part. The northern part towards the top of the screen, again, that's the area that was covered by a construction permit for the road building and the utility installation that was in effect until February of 2014.

And what does it show? Does it show that the areas are cleared or graded, or does it show that there is ground where maybe some seed has been put down, and the vegetation hasn't grown up yet? We don't know.

What we do know is there is testimony in the record that the green patches you're looking at up there are irrigated with an irrigation system, and they were sodded, so they were going to grow vegetation. The other areas weren't sodded, and they didn't have irrigation systems in there. So what that shows is what you would expect -- a permitted area where they're waiting for the vegetation to take hold.

And the Department has implied that the permit does not extend to or cover the whole area, but that's contrary to the evidence in DEQ's own files. And you can see this again in the Findings
of Fact, and the exhibits, Exhibit BBB, does show that the area disturbed and the area covered by that general permit and the BMP's that were put in place do extend to cover all of the individual lots, not just the roads. That wouldn't make sense. So the permits applied to the whole area.

That's all $I$ have. Again, the findings and conclusions are correct, they should be upheld. Happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. How I thought we'd proceed, unless the Board members have other suggestions, would be to go through the Findings of Fact, and then as we have questions with those, ask questions of the parties, unless anybody has a burning question right now that they had of the parties. Hillary, Chris, does that sound okay to you?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, just one questions, $I$ guess, for --

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Hillary.
BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I just was going to say that's fine with me.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thanks, Hillary. Go
ahead, Chris.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Ms. Bowers, you would agree with me that in order to find those various Findings of Fact that you've identified and challenged in your exceptions, the members of the Board would have to review the entire record, and then make a finding that each particular Finding of Fact -- (inaudible) -- evidence on the whole record. Do you agree with that?

MS. BOWERS: Board member Tweeten, members of the Board, yes, I agree with that, and I think that's consistent with the memo that your Board attorney sent you.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Right. I guess I'm a little concerned because I'm afraid I don't see briefing, a detailed analysis, finding by finding, of the state of the record, and why it is that each finding is not supported by substantial evidence. You've argued that you think there is more persuasive evidence on one side of a finding than on the side that -- (inaudible) -- down on.

But it would have been helpful, I guess, if we understood why -- You know, the Supreme Court, as you know, has provided some fairly detailed guidance in what it means for a Finding of Fact to be supported by competent substantial
evidence. And $I$ think your argument is talking about competent substantial evidence, and why there was not an absence of competent substantial evidence.

By that absence, are you suggesting that all of the members of the Board who are going to vote on this are going to have to take time to review not just the transcripts that have been provided to us, but all of the exhibits that have been admitted, and so on and so forth, and look at all of that evidence before we can find in your favor on these Findings of Fact?

MS. BOWERS: Well, Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board, $D E Q$ did, in its exceptions to the Findings of Fact, we did describe why we thought certain findings were supported by substantial evidence.

I do understand that to change a Finding of Fact you would have to look at the entire record, so we pointed out what we think our problems are with the findings.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. But clearly the Board is not going to be able to make a ruling on this in your favor today because as it stands now, at least $I$ for one have not read the
entire record, and $I$ suspect none of my colleagues on the Board have, so we would be able to carry this over to a future meeting while my colleagues and $I$ go through the record document by document, and page by page, and make sure that we agree with you that there is an absence of substantial evidence for a particular finding.

MS. BOWERS: I understand that.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. With that, if we could all refer to the Findings of Fact again on Page 9 of the FOFCOL, and --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: This is Chris. Are we referring now to the document that was attached to the email that Aleisha sent around this morning at 9:28 a.m.?

MS. CLERGET: Yes, Chris.
CHAIR DEVENY: We are with the procedural history.

MS. CLERGET: Well, it is not just the procedural history. Those pages of the document that Aleisha sent supplement the pages in the FOFCOL. So it is both. You're looking at that document that she emailed, and the original

FOFCOL; and those pages in the document she emailed replaced the pages in the FOFCOL. Does that make sense, Chris?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: It does. It is not going to be easy to keep track --

CHAIR DEVENY: It's the red-lined version, and $I$ have a hard copy in front of me. I think $I$ can point out any changes. I don't believe we need to go through the procedural history because $I$ believe the parties kind of agreed those areas were all right. Would you just nod your head if that's the case, the procedural history.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: So one of those changes, Chris, was in the -- or a couple of those changes was on the procedural history. So --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I do see that the document that Aleisha sent around this morning has some changes and red lines, so $I$ think we're looking at the same document.

CHAIR DEVENY: The first one that we will be dealing with that's red-lined would not be until Page 12. So let's go ahead and proceed with the Findings of Fact. Let's look at one through
four on Page 9. Does anybody have any issues with those facts?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Seeing none, let's continue on with five, six, seven, eight, nine, and ten.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Madam Chair, I'm wondering. This is -- I'm not a regulatory person, and I'm not an attorney, so this would be a basic question. I'm just wondering if there is someone out there that can in a nutshell explain the permit system.

We've talked about a permit for the road building, and where a permit was acquired and then terminated at the end of the road building, and then other permits issued during this process.

I'm just wondering. Does a permit grant, allow certain activity and certain, say, discharges, or certain events to occur in association with construction, or road building; and then once the project is completed, the permit is terminated; and whoever, say, put in a road is absolved of any consequences of whatever they did in the future. If someone could in a nutshell explain that process.

CHAIR DEVENY: Could someone from DEQ explain the general permit that Billings has, and then the general permit that the storm water discharges have, and what those are for, and how those are terminated.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. There are two general permits that are pertinent in this case. The first is what's known as the MS 4 permit, and that's issued to the cities. The City of Billings has an MS 4 permit. And that's for their whole storm drain system, and they're subject to certain terms and conditions under that general permit.

The other general permit is the general permit for discharges, storm water discharges that are associated with construction activity. That permit is available for construction activities that disturbs an acre or more. And the permittee applies for a permit, and they submit what's called a Notice of Intent to be covered under the general permit. And that may be for -- In this case first they permitted roads and utilities, and then later they conducted work over the subdivision.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I understand
that, but $I$ 'm wondering what the permit allows or doesn't allow. And if a someone has a permit, does it say what you're expected to construct within certain guidelines? And if you have certain discharges during that period, we understand that. But once the permit is terminated, we've certified that, for example, your project meets certain standards, and whatever happens after the permit is terminated is not your responsibility, for example.

MS. BOWERS: Yes. So when an NOI is submitted, the applicant describes what their activity is going to be. And since the permit is general, if their activity fits under that permit, they have to comply, they have to give us what's called a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and they have to meet certain requirements. They have to install best management practices to control runoff from their activity.

And then once their activity is
complete, and they stabilize by revegetating or by black topping roads, then they apply for or they submit a Notice of Termination, and it's accepted by the Department. It requires that if they stabilize through vegetation, they have to meet 70
percent of the preconstruction condition, or they can stabilize, like I said, by other means through paving roads.

MS. MARQUIS: Could I just point out there is a copy of the general storm water permit at Exhibit 1.

And we, of course, disagree with some of the Department's interpretations about the general permit, and we've outlined those on Pages 6 and 7 of our response. But the general permit is one of the exhibits.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: And once a permit is terminated, then the parties that had the permit are no longer held liable or responsible for whatever may happen at the site?

MS. BOWERS: Right. The permit is terminated, and the permittee is no longer liable under the permit.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: I would like to move, make a motion that the Board approves the Findings for Facts for the background which is numbers one through ten.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I second that motion.

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I'll second.
CHAIR DEVENY: There is a second. And is there discussion by Board members? Any concerns about that?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: We'll put the motion up on the Board so all members know what we're voting on. One through ten.

So the motion is on the board if people need to look at it. And all those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIR DEVENY: I think that was an aye from Hillary, or were you opposed?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I was in favor.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. There is just a little time delay, and I'm not giving you enough time before $I$ asked for the second round. Thank you.

Moving on, let's talk about ownership and construction activities September through December 2013 in the FOFCOL. No. 11. We have warranty deeds, visual inspection with aerial
photograph. I have ownership records overlaid after the remand.

Let's look at 11,12 , and 13 as a group, because $I$ think we might have some discussion on 14. So at this point $I$ would move that we accept Findings of Fact 11,12 , and 13.

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

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on those three Findings of Fact?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, I'm assuming -- Are you guys are ready to vote, or do you want to wait until it's printed? It's up there. Okay. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, the motion passes.

Let's look at No. 14. This is the one that we had some red-line changes that were given to us this morning. So look at that red-lined page. It actually printed out blue on mine. Blue-lined.

So the lots which we have ownership information, according to these findings of facts, are described under "A" through "E."

MS. CLERGET: "A" through "F."
CHAIR DEVENY: "A" through "F" in the
red-line. Any concerns with that?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Does anybody want to make a motion regarding No. 14?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I'll move then that we accept Finding of Fact No. 14 .

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion about Finding of Fact 14? Do people need more time?

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, that's with the correction, with Sarah's correction?

CHAIR DEVENY: That's right. Hearing none, all those in favor of accepting Finding of Fact No. 14, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, that motion passes.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. Can $I$ just to clarify for the record? CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Based on what was made this morning, the parties did not object to the red-lined corrections that are found in this document we're looking at; do $I$ understand that correctly?

MS. CLERGET: Yes. Chris, this is Sarah. Yes, the parties stipulated to these changes.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Can I ask that the parties further stipulate that we may accept these red-line changes without review of the entire record?

MS. CLERGET: Yes, Chris. They've already stipulated to that. So we agreed this morning that these changes -- I withdrew the original FOFCOL and resubmitted the FOFCOL with these changes, and the parties agreed that they did not object to that, and that therefore the Board would not have to review the entire record
in order to make these changes, because $I$ had already submitted them as corrected FOFCOL before the Board.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Is that in writing?

MS. CLERGET: It was on the record this morning with the Court Reporter.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I heard what went on on the record. I didn't hear a particularized acknowledgment by the parties that these could be adopted without a complete review of the entire record.

MS. CLERGET: Can the parties -- I believe that was part of our discussion this morning. Can you confirm that that's your understanding.

MS. MARQUIS: Yes, that's our understanding, and we agreed to that.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Marquis.
MS. BOWERS: Yes, I agree.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Bowers.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Thank you. I
just wanted the record to be clear, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Let's go down to

No. 15. I guess the parties had agreed to this previously, so that one should be fine. Let's vote on No. 15. I would move that we accept Finding of Fact No. 15.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I'll second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and
seconded. Any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion carries. So now we're moving on to No. 16 which deals with the evidence of construction activity between September and December of 2013. We do not have any red-lined information here. The Finding of Fact states that the evidence consisted of the testimony of Dan Freedland and aerial photographs from October 25 th, 2013 and one from June 15 th, 2013. Are the Board members okay with that one? MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, DEQ did take exception to $16(b)$, and that's the language that says the Google Earth image was
possibly taken on October 25th, 2013.
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. That point is
taken. "Possibly taken" in my mind means it could have been, and $I$ think for the matter of the record we've been talking about it, so I'm not sure $I$ would have any issue needing to change that Finding of Fact because of that.

Anybody else have any comments?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: So I'll move that we accept Finding of Fact No. 16.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'll second that.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and
seconded. Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those in favor of approving Finding of Fact No. 16 signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, motion
passes. We're approaching noon. Can we continue with this? Let's keep working then.

Let's look at No. 17. We should be able
to approve that because that was red-lined, and both parties agreed that that was okay. So I'm going to move that we approve Finding of Fact No. 17.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: So $I$ believe we have gotten through all the red-lined areas.

MS . CLERGET: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: And now we're moving on to No. 18, which deals with the additional testimony regarding ownership and construction activity. Do Board members have any thoughts on No. 18 or questions of any of the parties? Do we need to take a minute to kind of review this?

Could I ask DEQ. Did you have
exceptions to No. 18 in your written materials? And if you did, could you refer us to that.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, DEQ did take exception to Finding of Fact No. 18, and it's in your materials. It's Page 60. Essentially we take exception because the Finding of Fact --

CHAIR DEVENY: We can read it, but thank you for referring us to that. The objection that DEQ had here had to do with the definition of construction. And then Ms. Marquis, could you refer us to your written material.

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. Certainly. On Page 5 of our response document under the heading FOF-18 is our response to DEQ's exception to Finding of Fact 18 .

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Do Board members have any discussion about the issue of the definition of construction that was used in the Hearing Officer's record?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers and Ms.
Marquis, could I ask you each to just maybe in thirty seconds briefly describe why this would be a factual issue for us to reject.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. DEQ's exception takes exception to the findings because it relies on active
construction activity, which is not consistent with the definition of storm water discharge associated with construction activity at Administrative Rules of Montana 17.30.1102.

And that is a very broad definition that includes clearing, grading, excavation that results in disturbance. And disturbance is really what we're looking at when we go out and look at a site, disturbance of soil, placement of stockpiles which are sources of pollutants.

The construction activity, there was evidence of construction activity. DEQ's position is that there was evidence of construction activity on the lots. And we object to the finding, or we take exception to the finding because it relies on actual construction, earth moving, having construction equipment out at the site. And our definition of construction activity is not so limited.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. Finding of Fact 18 is a summary of testimony given by Mr. Landy Leep. In his testimony he used the word, the terms construction, construction activity, and
construction work. There is nothing in the transcript that would indicate that he meant anything other than the same term "construction activity" that's used in the rules.

Further, the rules speak in present tense terms -- grading, excavating -- and they specify at the time of the construction project. So the rule indicates present tense, which is in line with the Board's ruling on this matter just a few months ago where they were specific about wanting evidence at the time of the alleged violations.

The main point again here is that this Finding of Fact summarizes Mr. Leep's testimony, and he used the words construction, construction activity, and construction work. There is no indication that he meant anything other than what is indicated in the rule.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do Board members need any clarification on the concerns that the parties had about the terminology of construction? Chris, Hillary, are you still with us?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Yes, I'm still here.

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Yes.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Would anybody like to entertain a motion on No. 18 so $I$ can not have to talk so much?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I would propose that we adopt Finding of Fact 18.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded to adopt Finding of Fact No. 18. All those in favor -- any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Yes. Aye.
CHAIR DEVENY: Motion carries with five affirmed, one opposed.

Let's go on to No. 19, No. 19 and 20. DEQ, did you have objections to that? And could you point to that.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. We did take exception to Finding of Fact 19.

CHAIR DEVENY: And the page number?
MS. BOWERS: It's on our exceptions,
it's your page No. 60.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you.
MS. BOWERS: And essentially our exception is that the finding is only relevant to construction activities associated with road building and utility installation, if that's what is meant by Copper Ridge and Reflections' correspondence with its contractors. If those are -- Then $I$ think we're probably okay with that finding.

CHAIR DEVENY: All right. What about 20 and 21, while we're at it? You kind of grouped those together in your testimony.

MS. BOWERS: Yes. And our exception to 20 is that the cited MPDES permits which are in Exhibits $A, B$, and $C$, those are all for subdivision street construction, and water and sanitary sewer. And the permitted areas of the disturbance are small compared to the whole site.

For example, Exhibit A permitted 5.3 acres, not the whole 17.7 acre site; and "B" permitted 5.3 acres also, but not the whole 21.8 acre site; and "C," which was the one for Reflections at Copper Ridge Subdivision third filing, that permitted a 3.5 acre of disturbance,
not the whole 8.27 acre site.
CHAIR DEVENY: And Ms. Marquis, could you refer to your response on that.

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. Our response begins on Page 6 of our document under the heading "FOF's 19 through 21."

This is where we disagree with the Department on how the general permit is interpreted. The smaller acreage numbers that they provided are the disturbance area that's included in the Notice of Intent and the permit; but there is a larger number that is required to be provided that is the acreage of the site.

And so the permit does cover the site, and there is testimony in the record that the maps provided have a boundary area that includes all of the lots. The BMP's that were shown on those maps include all of the lots, and the Department hadn't cited any problems with that permitted work. MS. BOWERS: And we disagree with that. The SWPPP may show BMP's that extend into the lots, but the area of disturbance is the smaller area.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do Board members have further questions or discussion of this?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I have one easy question.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'd move we adopt --

CHAIR DEVENY: Just a second, Chris. I think Dexter got ahead of you in the queue here. Just a second.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Just a real quick question for Sarah. Your word "substantial" in No. 19, what do you mean by substantial? They're either done or they're not done.

MS. CLERGET: There was testimony in the record about what "substantial completion" means there. That's a term of art in contracting. And so substantial completion had to be done, had to be reached before they were released under the contract, so that's what $I$ meant by that.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay, Chris. Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, I move we adopt 19,20 , and 21.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I would second that.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Do we have discussion by Board members?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, by way of discussion. It appears to me that DEQ's objection is not for whether these Findings of Fact are accurate or not, but is directed more toward what they do and don't prove, which I think it seems pretty clear that these are accurate as far as they go, so $I$ move their adoption on that basis.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do other Board members have any comments, questions?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, there is a motion before the Board, and it's up on the board, to approve Findings of Fact 19 through 21. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Aye.
CHAIR DEVENY: One in opposition and five affirmative.

Moving on. No. 22, 23, have to do with -- was included in CMG Construction. That's no big deal, $I$ don't think. The permit was initiated by construction, confirmed by DEQ.

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, did we skip $22 ?$

CHAIR DEVENY: We haven't done that one yet.

MS. BOWERS: Okay. Thanks.
CHAIR DEVENY: DEQ, you had an exception to 22, if you'd like to briefly talk about that.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. DEQ's exception to Finding of Fact 22 is that it consolidates all the construction activity associated with roads and utilities that was permitted under MTR104993 with the construction activity conducted on residential lots and later permitted under MTR105376.

CHAIR DEVENY: And the problem with that?

MS. BOWERS: Well, the area in the north end of the Reflections subdivision was not all permitted under MTR104993, only the road construction and utility installation.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis, do you want to speak to that?

MS. MARQUIS: Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Our response to the Department's exception begins on Page 7 of our
document.
And again, we point out that the Department is referring to some construction activity later conducted by the subdivisions, but they don't cite to any evidence of what that later construction activity is or when it happened. So in terms of -- we've been through this. What our subdivisions did out there was the road building and the utility construction that was covered by a permit with boundaries that extended to include all of the individual lots.

The Department is again relying on those later permits that they required as a corrective action from the subdivision. Those permits were submitted under protest. They were after the alleged violations. And this is the same argument that they brought before you in regards to the summary judgment order that has already been remanded, and that's why we're here today.

CHAIR DEVENY: Further Board questions or discussions on this?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Yes. I have a question for DEQ. You reference MTR105376 for construction of single family homes and necessary landscaping. Is that one of the permits that

Reflections was required to get under protest, or --

MS. BOWERS: That's the permit that they submitted an NOI for in December 2013.

CHAIR DEVENY: Further questions or clarifications?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: But was that one of the permits they were required to get by DEQ's order?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, they were required to permit their activity by DEQ's order. That's right.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Findings 22
through 28 as a group, there are only exceptions to 22, 24, and 28 -- (inaudible) -- look into 23, 25, 26 , and 27 , because neither party has taken exception to those findings. As far as 22, 24, and 28 are concerned, again, the findings are accurate as far as they go to --

CHAIR DEVENY: I'm sorry. You faded out on us, Chris. Could you go back to where you said "The findings are accurate."

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I think they're accurate as far as they go. It simply says that this area was previously included in permit MTR104993. DEQ's answer to that is, well, that was a permit for road construction. Okay. That doesn't mean that the finding is inaccurate, because the property was in fact included within the scope of that permit.

24 is to the same effect. The permit boundary extended to include the entirety of the individual lots around Reflections Circle, and a portion of Western Bluffs Boulevard. Again, their objection is, well, that's a road building permit. Okay. The finding is correct, though, that the boundary did include those properties. 28 is basically the same. So Madam Chair, I would move that we adopt 28 --

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, may I be heard?

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, we didn't hear what your motion was.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm sorry. The motion was to adopt 22 --

CHAIR DEVENY: We still couldn't hear you. The motion was to adopt 22 and 28 , or 22 through 28?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: 22 through 28 -24, 25, 26, 27, and 28.

CHAIR DEVENY: There is a motion before the Board. Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'll second that.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. We'll have some discussion. Ms. Bowers, you had a comment.

MS. BOWERS: Yes. The Findings of Fact 22, 24, and 28 incorrectly include the construction activity on residential lots in the road building permit MTR104993.

And Exhibit C, part of Exhibit C is the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan which includes a map, and that shows the area that was included under that permit MTR104993, and it's just the roads and an area that slightly extends beyond the roads, but not the residential lots. And that's DEQ's exception to those findings.

MS. MARQUIS: And if I may, that's contrary to the Department's testimony at the hearing where we looked at the maps. Exhibit BBB is the same map. It's the larger version of it. And the Department agreed that the boundary was
drawn on the exterior of all of the individual lots.

CHAIR DEVENY: So based on the -- Could I ask a question of our attorney?

MS. CLERGET: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Did you consider -- When you wrote these, you would have considered both those testimonies in writing this?

MS. CLERGET: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: So it was your finding that is what we're seeing here in the Findings of Fact after you considered the two --

MS. CLERGET: Yes. And the testimony, yes.

CHAIR DEVENY: And the testimony. Okay. Thank you. Is there any further discussion by the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, there is a motion to approve Findings of Fact No. 22 through 28. It's been moved and seconded, we've had discussion. Members of the Board, all in favor, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those opposed, please
signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I couldn't hear Chris or Hillary's votes. Let's do a roll call vote.

Lindsay, would you do that.
MS. FORD: Chris Deveny.
CHAIR DEVENY: Yes. Aye on the motion.
MS . FORD: Dexter Busby.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Aye.
MS. FORD: Hillary Hanson.
BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Aye.
MS. FORD: Chris Tweeten.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: (No response) CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, we need a vote from you.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: (No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: We seem to have lost Chris. Why don't you continue taking the roll call.

MS. FORD: Melissa Hornbein.
BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I can hear him. I don't know why you guys can't.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Yes.
MS. FORD: David Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Aye. Can you hear me now?

MS. FORD: That's four to two.
CHAIR DEVENY: The motion passed four to two.

We're now on Finding of Fact No. 29. DEQ, do you want to speak to your objection to this Finding of Fact.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. And this Finding of Fact we take basically the same exception that the consolidation of construction activity under the road permit MTR102807 with that activity that was later permitted under MTR105377 is incorrect; and the permitted area of disturbance is only 5.3 acres, not the whole 17.7 acre site, and should not extend to the residential lots.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, our response is essentially the same, that there is no -- The Department has said that it mischaracterizes or lumps together the different types of construction activities that were done by Copper Ridge and Reflections, and that's not true, because the only construction
they did was the road building and the utility installation that was appropriately permitted, and the permit boundaries are clear in the exhibits, and $D E Q$ has agreed that those permit boundaries did extend the full extent of the individual lots.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do Board members have any questions of the parties? Any further discussion on 29? I think we could take 29, 30 --

MS. CLERGET: There is no objection until you get to 34 , so you could do 29 through 34.

CHAIR DEVENY: So we could do 29 through 34--33. Excuse me. Is there interest by members of the Board to approve Findings of Fact? BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I move we approve the Findings of Fact 29 through 33.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'll second it.
Discussion? Concerns?
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Madam Chair, I
have a question for the parties. It seems that there is some factual disagreement about the extent of these permits that are referenced in the Finding of Fact, specifically with regard to this Exhibit BBB, which Reflections asserts DEQ agreed to previously. And I would love to get some
background on that.
MS. CLERGET: We have it, too, if you would like to see it.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I would like to see it, yes.

CHAIR DEVENY: We're putting the document exhibit up on the Board. Could somebody explain it. Ms. Marquis, would you explain that, and then we'll have $D E Q$ respond. Feel free to come up and point out --

MS. MARQUIS: Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board.

This is the north part of the third filing of Reflections. So this maybe doesn't portray very clearly, but the testimony at the hearing we pointed out this thick black line that you see going around upward to the edges of the individual -- these are individual lots here. Obviously these are the roads, and the individual lots.

And this thick black line you'll see here, it is called a boundary area. I think that's the only place where it's identified as a boundary area. But it extends to the entire outer reaches of individual lots. And the testimony --

I was going to pull that up quickly in the transcript for you.

So this exhibit was I believe admitted, and this is my cross -examination of DEQ witness Mr. Dan Freedland. And $I$ had asked him, "Drawing your attention to the boundary area which is noted in the top left of Exhibit $B B B$, the map in the top left, there is a note that says boundary area, and it refers to a dashed line." He answered yes.

I asked, "So does that boundary line extend so that it includes the entirety of all of the individual lots?" His answer was, "And around Reflections Circle, and yeah, some of them, yeah."

And then $I$ asked him -- and this is on Page 59 of the transcript. I apologize if I didn't mention that before. I asked him, "Drawing your attention to the green line," and I asked him if his was a colored copy, too, and he said yes, it did.

And $I$ said, "Is a swale or a berm gravel knocked down a BMP?," and he said -- I said, "It's a BMP, correct?" And he answered, "A swale berm, that would be a BMP, yes."

And I asked, "And it extends the entire width of that area; is that correct?" And his
answer was, "On the south side, yes."
So the Department agreed that the boundary areas and the BMP in place extend the entire width of the subdivision, including all of the individual lots.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Could you provide the Bates number for that testimony.

MS. CLERGET: You don't have that transcript.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: We don't have that transcript.

MS. CLERGET: No, that's a hearing transcript. The transcripts you have are from Board meetings.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Okay. Got it.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Marquis.
Does DEQ --
MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. The referred Exhibit BBB is a map that was in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, or attached to that plan for MTR104993, which is the permit for road building and utility installation in Reflections third filing.

The finding is based on a map which shows location of the best management practices
installed pursuant to the permit. It's not the area of disturbance.

And if you read Dan's testimony, Dan Freedland's testimony further, when he's asked a question, "And it goes along the entire back edge of the individual lots; is that correct?," he says, "Yes, but they're identifying the area of disturbance differently." And that's because this map is showing best management practices. It is not showing the whole area of disturbance permitted under that permit.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Madam Chair, can I ask a follow up question?

CHAIR DEVENY: Please.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Is there anything in the record that indicates the area of disturbance permitted under this permit?

MS. BOWERS: Yes. There are maps attached to the Storm Water Pollution Plan that show the area of disturbance, and $I$ would have to dig through the record to find that, but that could be done. It would be Exhibit $C$, $I$ believe. CHAIR DEVENY: Maybe this would be a good time to take a lunch break. We don't have a motion to consider right now. And if you'd like
to go back into the record and find that.
MS. BOWERS: Yes, I can do that.
CHAIR DEVENY: Sarah.
MS. CLERGET: You have a pending motion.
CHAIR DEVENY: Oh, we do. I'm sorry.
So we do have a motion. Can we postpone the decision on that? Would the Board prefer to proceed?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I think it would be nice to just finish up this chunk.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Madam Chair, can I ask a question?

CHAIR DEVENY: Sure.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Is that Exhibit C referenced by DEQ available for us to view?

MS. CLERGET: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Can you bring it up now.
MS. CLERGET: It is big, so if we could have some idea of what page you want in it, because $I$ don't know where the map is in it.

CHAIR DEVENY: Hillary, Chris, we're working on getting a document up for us to look at.

MS. BOWERS: There is the SWPPP.

MS. CLERGET: Do you know what page of Exhibit C, though? It's Page 27, and that was the one that was cut off, so that's why Exhibit BBB exists because 27 in "C" is cut. So you can show them. 27 in "C" is cut off. Somebody folded it when they copied it. So we entered Exhibit BBB, so that replaced Exhibit C page 27.

MS. BOWERS: I'm not sure BBB is the same, though.

MS. CLERGET: We can go back through the record, but that was the representation at the hearing. This is what Exhibit C -- this is the map in Exhibit $C$ in the record.

CHAIR DEVENY: So the record does not have the accurate one either?

MS. CLERGET: So this is DEQ's Exhibit C, because this is the Exhibit $C$ that DEQ submitted --

MS. BOWERS: No, Exhibit C is not DEQ's exhibit.

MS. CLERGET: I'm sorry. Copper Ridge's exhibit that is in the record. So that is what it is in the record. And then the representation was that Exhibit $B B B$ replaced that page because it was folded over, is my understanding. And we can go
back through the transcript and confirm that, but the record is what it is with regard to the exhibits.

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. I think there is a map showing disturbance, not just the BMP's, and $I$ can try to find that on the break if you want to look at it. BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Sure.

CHAIR DEVENY: Let's give DEQ a chance to find that document, assuming it was part of the record, and we'll take a lunch break and reconvene at 1:20.

MS. CLERGET: Sorry. Before we
reconvene -- the motions and the order on the motions in limine have been emailed to the entire board, so Hillary and Chris, you should have those in your email, and we've got hard copies for everybody here. So we'll pass those out now, or we'll put them together and pass that out while you're having lunch.
(Lunch recess taken)
CHAIR DEVENY: I'm going to reconvene.
Both Hillary and Chris have checked in, and all of us are here in the room, so let the record reflect that all six Board members are present.

So we left off with a motion on the table, and DEQ had wanted to show an exhibit. MS. BOWERS: Well, $I$ was partly mistaken. Exhibit $C$, the map that's represented $I$ believe it is on Page 27 , and that was later admitted as Exhibit $B B B$, that did replace the map in Exhibit $C$ which is a map showing BMP's.

In Exhibit $C$ on Page 10 , there is a description of the area of disturbance, and that's 3.5 acres out of the total eight; and there is a description of the activity permitted, which is road building and utility installation.

CHAIR DEVENY: Melissa, does that answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: (Nods head)
CHAIR DEVENY: So could you put up the motion, Aleisha, please.

MS. SOLEM: (Complies)
CHAIR DEVENY: The motion before the
Board is to approve Findings of Fact 29 through 33. Does the Board have any further discussion or questions of the parties, any Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I'm hearing none. Let's vote. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I'm sorry, Madam Chair. I just have $I$ guess an observation. The disputed Findings of Fact are ones that $I$ cannot agree to adopt. We decided to include up to 33 because a number of those were not disputed. So I just want it to be clear that when $I$ vote nay, it is with regard to the disputed Findings of Fact and not the others.

CHAIR DEVENY: So noted. So there is a motion on the table for approval of Facts 29 through 33. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those opposed.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Aye.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Aye.
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, $I$ don't believe we got a vote from you.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Aye. Madam
Chair, if $I$ might explain. For some reason I'm trying to follow along on speaker phone, because I actually have three electronic devices going at one time, and for some reason my speaker phone is not picking up my voice, so $I$ have to turn off the speaker, hold it up to my ear, and say aye.

That's the reason why --
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. I'll give you time to do that. Thank you. So what was the vote on that motion?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: It was yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: So we have a four to two affirmative vote on those facts, so we will continue on with No. $34,35,36$ and -- I've lost my place with DEQ's objections, so --

MS. CLERGET: It's Page 8 on DEQ's exceptions, and they group $34,35,37,38$, and 39 objections together.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'll let you talk about those. Could you let me find them for a second, please.

MS. BOWERS: The exceptions are on your Page 63, DEQ's exceptions.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Go ahead, Ms. Bowers.

MS. BOWERS: And DEQ takes exception to Finding of Fact $34,35,37,38$ and 39 , and that's because they rely on a definition of construction activity that is not consistent with the rule, 17.30.1102(28) or with case law.

And that's because construction activity
for purposes of the Montana Water Quality Act and the Clean Water Act includes ground disturbing activities that create a conduit for pollutants, and it is not limited to just active construction or earth moving activity.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. Again, our argument is that -- this is based on testimony from Mr. Leep who testified adequately about the construction activities, and that there is no reason for them to continue doing construction activities after the roads and utility work is done and installed. DEQ presented no evidence to the contrary. There is no evidence to contradict that at all.

And DEQ, the case law that DEQ relies on doesn't apply here because in that case, the construction began without a permit, and then they stopped the construction, and then they had to go in and get a permit, and the issue was how many days of violation would they charge, was there an ongoing violation that entire time.

That's not the case here at all because all of the construction activities that Copper Ridge and Reflections performed were permitted,
and then the Department accepted the Notices of Termination and terminated those permits. So that case law doesn't apply in this instance.

CHAIR DEVENY: Further discussion by the Board? Thoughts on this?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, can I ask Ms. Marquis a question?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I don't have the transcript of the hearing in front of me, but my question is: In the course of questioning Mr. Leep, these matters that are covered by these findings, with respect to what his understanding of the term construction activities was --

MS. MARQUIS: I'm sorry, Board Member Tweeten. So is your question essentially whether Mr. Leep elaborated on what the construction activity would be?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: What he meant by -- I mean the argument here, as $I$ understand it, is over the definition of the word "construction activities." Construction activities. And the Department, as $I$ understand it, is arguing that -(inaudible) -- testifying in reference to construction activities, he was not referring to
that term as it's elaborated upon in the Administrative Rule 17.30.1102 sub (28).

So I guess my question is: During the questioning of Mr . Leep, was this regulation brought to his attention? And was that construction activities in the sense that it's used in the regulation?

MS. MARQUIS: I have to go back and check. I'm not sure that in this transcript at this hearing we went into in detail his understanding of that regulation. It's certainly been a key component throughout this case, and Mr. Leep has been involved in this case and reviewed all the briefing, and I'm certain he's seen the regulation and the rules before. We've discussed it several times.

But whether or not it appears in this transcript, it's going to take me a few minutes to find that.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I guess my concern is that if his sense of the term was construction activities referred to the erection of houses, and not to the various earth moving, grading, excavation, stockpiling actions that are referenced in the rule in his testimony. So
that's the reason why $I$ 'm posing the question. If you could shed any light on that, I'd appreciate it very much. Madam Chair, if I might ask Ms. Bowers a question?

CHAIR DEVENY: Just a moment, Chris.
Ms. Marquis has a response.
MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, Board Member
Tweeten. The line of questioning was all in the context of the completion of the construction work that the subdivisions had done for the road building and the utility installation, so it wouldn't have been limited inappropriately to home building construction. It would have been much broader than that. It certainly, in the series of questions, referred to the home building and the utility installation.

For example on Page 169 of the transcript on Line 22, I asked Mr. Leep, "What is the date of substantial completion for the construction work that you had contractors do in the first filing of Reflections?" His answer was, "The last date on this one is July 9th, 2008."

I next asked him, "Are you aware of any construction activity by Reflections or its contractors after that July 9th, 2008 date?" His
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answer, he had asked, "In the first filing of Reflections?," and $I$ said yes.

His answer was, "There would be nothing else to do once the contractors are done. We don't own tractors. We don't own tools. They take their equipment away. We have no way of doing additional work, and there is no work to do. We're done. The streets are in, the curbs are done, the water lines, sewer lines. The park is in in this case. There is nothing else for us to construct."

Is that what you were looking for, Board Member Tweeten?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: That's helpful. Thank you. If $I$ might ask Ms. Bowers a question.

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: In your exceptions, you argue that the regulation is construction activity --

CHAIR DEVENY: You faded out on us again, Chris. Can you speak up or --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'll try as best I can. Ms. Bowers, let me try again. Can you hear me now?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, I hear you.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: The part in the regulation --

CHAIR DEVENY: You've dimmed out, you've gotten really dim on us again, Chris. Is it possible for you to get closer to your speaker on your phone?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: What about now? Is that better?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Board Member Tweeten. I hear you now.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. The term in the regulation is "storm water discharge associated with construction activities." And as I understand the rule, a cause and effect relationship between a discharge in storm water and construction activities including clearing, grading, etc.

Now, as $I$ understand what you've said in your exception, you've asserted that the discharge of storm water, for example from this September 2013 event, would constitute a storm water discharge from construction activity if that storm water made it into the waters of the State through some conduit that was created because of the construction activities undertaken by Copper Ridge
at any time, correct?
MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board. That's correct. The activity that's regulated is ground disturbance, and it is the ground disturbance that creates the conduit. So if the lots are left bare, that's the type of activity that's regulated.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: What was the conduit that allowed this storm water to discharge -- in the September 2013 incident that allowed this storm water to discharge into the waters of State of Montana? What conduit did Copper Ridge create at whatever time that allowed this storm water to discharge to waters of the state?

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board. The conduit is bare or disturbed ground with no best management practices in place to control runoff.

Without some sort of BMP's in place to mitigate runoff, the water will just go downhill to Cove Ditch from the development. And so that's the regulated activity is the creating ground disturbance and leaving it, or leaving stockpiles of pollutants such as gravel or fill.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. But the
conduit then would be the failure to adopt Best Management Practices?

MS. BOWERS: Yes. Leaving the ground bare without any BMP's to mitigate storm water discharge.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. Refresh my recollection. What ground disturbing activities did Copper Ridge undertake other than the installation of the streets, curbs, and that sort of thing?

MS. BOWERS: Well, Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board, the evidence of ground disturbance is in Mr. Freedland's inspection report, Exhibit 2, and the photos attached to that report including the photo of Lot 15 which is Photograph 13 -- and $I$ know we have some disputes over that -- as well as the photographs of the northern part of Reflections at Copper Ridge that you saw today. And also Dan's testimony, Mr. Freedland's testimony.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay.
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, are you speaking?
Because if you are, we can't hear you.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, I don't know what else $I$ can do, Madam Chair. I've got
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the phone right up against my ear. I'm speaking right into the bottom of it, so --

CHAIR DEVENY: We're hearing you now.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm trying as best I can to make this work. I suppose I could take the case off my phone and see if that helps. But did you get the gist of my question? My question was: What conduit did they create?

CHAIR DEVENY: We got that, and you heard Ms. Bowers' response.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: And the problem I'm having is that $I$ don't have the photographs that were up on the screen, $I$ don't think, unless they're somehow -- (inaudible) -- You know, I have to have an electronic device to pull them up on anyway. -- (inaudible) -- pictures show what constitutes ground disturbing activity by Copper Ridge.

CHAIR DEVENY: We're still getting garbled sound from you on this end. I'm not criticizing. I'm just letting you know how it is. BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I can hear him better. He said he can't see the pictures, and so he was curious on the pictures what on the pictures showed that -- or constitutes disturbance
by Copper Ridge.
MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board. I guess you weren't able to see the pictures that we had up earlier.

MS. CLERGET: You guys, that was sent in an email. Lindsay sent it in an email to you this morning, so you should have those pictures. I apologize for all of the emails. I know that it's probably confusing. But it should be in your emails, so that you can look at them.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: The problem I'm having is that I've got the proposed findings on one screen, I've got the exceptions on one screen, and I've got the cell phone in my hand, and I don't know where else to put to look to -- what else to use to bring up these pictures. I don't have another screen, is $I$ guess what I'm saying. So let me work on that.

But just indulge me for a minute and explain to me what those photos show.

CHAIR DEVENY: While Chris is getting his technology rearranged, do other Board members have questions of the parties or want to discuss something relevant to this?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I've got a couple
for Ms. Bowers.
CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Dexter.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Ms. Bowers, their construction permit or storm water permit was -should $I$ say -- not in effect on September 13 th , is that correct, the Copper Ridge and Reflections? MS. BOWERS: I think one permit was in effect. I think the permit on Reflections third filing MTR104993 $I$ believe was in effect.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Is that part of the area that we're concerned about, or is the area that had been terminated the area we're concerned about?

MS. BOWERS: Well, Board Member Busby, members of the Board, we're concerned about both of the subdivisions. But the pictures that you've seen are mostly related to Reflections. The four you saw -- that were excluded -- this morning, those are in the third filing of Reflections at Copper Ridge, which was subject to MTR104993 for road building and utility construction.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: That one still was in effect?

MS. BOWERS: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: On the ones that
were not in effect, had you issued a completion order on that, or a completion determination, and their 70 percent or whatever coverage?

MS. BOWERS: I know for 102807 , that one was issued an NOT. I think the other one was to -- Vicki probably knows. I believe, yes, those were both issued NOT's.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: There is no requirement in the NOT to maintain that 70 percent, or -- I think it's 70 percent, is it not?

MS. BOWERS: At the time the Notice of Termination issues, they're supposed to have achieved the 70 percent. There is nothing prohibiting DEQ from going out and making them take corrective action if it's not achieved, but generally we don't.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Is there anything in the law that requires them to not only achieve it, but maintain it?

MS. BOWERS: Well, no, I don't believe there's any continuing maintenance. I think once it's achieved, the idea is that that would be sufficient to prevent erosion, that that would be sufficient vegetative cover.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: So if this was
terminated in 2008, I believe, and they had not watered it, and they had not done any maintenance work on it, it's possible that you only had a 20 percent coverage, isn't that correct, or less? More or less?

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Busby, members of the Board, $I$ guess anything is possible. But generally once 70 percent vegetation is achieved, it will grow. It's not going to just all die. And we generally require vegetation that, you know, that is right for the area. So if it's an arid area, it would be a vegetation that would withstand that. It doesn't have to be watered.

So I guess the expectation would be that it would not require maintenance, and the vegetative cover would stay in place.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: SO I'm having a little problem with your term conduit. If this was terminated, and we have no idea whether it was maintained or not, but if we had it in 2008 or whatever the date it was terminated, and we're now in 2013, I'm having a little problem with this being a conduit.

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Busby, members of the Board. DEQ wasn't concerned about areas
that had been permitted for road building that were later issued Notices of Termination. DEQ was concerned about construction activity outside the road building permitted area on the residential lots, and the type of activity we were concerned about was ground disturbance.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I understand that, but let's get back to the fundamental here. If it was terminated in 2008 -- and $I$ don't know that it was terminated in 2008, the exact date -- and this is now 2013, you weren't concerned about it between 2008 and 2013; is that correct?

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Busby, members of the Board. DEQ first became aware of this site after the big September storm in 2013. So I guess you're right. We weren't concerned about it before then. It was after the storm that we went and did the inspection.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: But there's no permits and no activity. Okay. Thank you. MS. MARQUIS: Could I respond for just a minute?

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Ms. Marquis. MS. MARQUIS: Thank you, Madam Chair, Board Member Busby, members of the Board. To the
last segment here, the City of Billings contacted DEQ in March of 2013. They had some concerns with the home building construction activities and the erosion in the subdivisions.

So DEQ was aware of it at that point.
There is in the record an email exchange between Dan Freedland and the City of Billings about that, where he indicated he would wait for storm event to document a violation.

The other part, Board Member Busby, you had asked about the termination of that permit for that one area that was shown, the gravel pile, and that termination was received and confirmed by the Department in 2012, and that's at the proposed Finding No. 88.

And the finally, the Department agreed, and this is found at Finding No. 68, that there is no requirement to maintain the vegetation after the permit has been terminated. There was testimony from $D E Q$ on that point.

MS. BOWERS: Can $I$ respond in part to the City of Billings notice to DEQ?

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay.
MS. BOWERS: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. That's correct. The City
had notified DEQ about their concerns about the subdivisions, and DEQ wasn't waiting for a storm to document violations, but waiting for a storm to see if the subdivisions discharged, because that's part of the permit requirement is preventing discharges to waters of the State. So Dan did wait to inspect the subdivision after there was a storm, so he could see if there were discharges. CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, are you back with us?

MS. MARQUIS: I'm sorry. Those are two separate violations. Construction without a permit is one violation, that was Violation 1. Discharge without a permit is a separate violation. So they are independent. There is no need to wait for a storm to cite someone for doing construction without a permit. That was Violation No. 1. I just wanted to clarify that.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Marquis.
Chris, are you back with us?
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, I don't know. Can you hear me?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. What
you're referring to about construction activity on
the north end of the project, I don't seem to have. So I'm sorry, but I looked at -- The only photographs I think $I$ have are the ones that were attached to the original Notice of Violation. Perhaps somebody could explain to me, maybe Ms. Bowers, what activity was occurring as shown in those photographs that you contend --

CHAIR DEVENY: Lindsay, are you checking on the emails to see if he had -- Chris, Lindsay is going to resend the email.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Which email was that attached to? I've gotten about four today or more. Some have attachments, and some don't. And I think I've looked at them all, and I don't see those, $I$ don't see anything like that, but maybe $I$ don't know what $I$ 'm looking for. That's entirely possible.

CHAIR DEVENY: Lindsay, what's the status there?

MS. FORD: I'm working on it. I'm just sending it to him again.

CHAIR DEVENY: Lindsay is sending it to you again, Chris, so we'll see how long it takes to get to Missoula.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I probably could
drive here faster. But $I$ guess in what context? Are they just free standing PDF's or jpgs or something, or are they attached to some document?

MS. FORD: They're PDF's. I just emailed it to you again.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, all right.
They're somewhere at this point. But please go on to somebody else at this point. Once I get the photographs --

CHAIR DEVENY: Melissa, did you have follow up to yours?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Yes. I had follow up on Board Member Busby's question. I'm a little bit confused about which permits were in effect or had been terminated. And what $I$ thought $I$ heard you say was that MTRO104993 was still in effect at the time of the storm event, and what $I$ think you're alleging is that the discharges occurred outside of the area where that permit allowed for disturbance; is that right?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Board Member Hornbein, that's right. That's correct.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: So with regard to the alleged disturbance in the area covered by

MTR104993, you are not alleging a disturbance in an area where there had previously been a permit that was terminated at that time? Does that make sense?

MS. BOWERS: Yes. In the area that was permitted by MTR104993, we're not alleging any permit violations related to that permit, or any -- those disturbances were covered by permit.

We're alleging violations related to disturbances outside of that permit on residential lots.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: For which there was no permit?

MS. BOWERS: That's right.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Got it. Thanks.
CHAIR DEVENY: While Chris is still
getting --
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay, Madam
Chair. I got the email.
CHAIR DEVENY: Can you see the photographs?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, I see some photographs. I don't know which ones are the ones that I'm supposed to be looking at to see this activity on the north end of the project that Ms.

Bowers was talking about. So perhaps someone could enlighten me further.

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board. The photographs are in what's marked DEQ Exhibit 36 . It consists of seven pages, and six of those are photographs.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Oh, I see. Okay.
MS. BOWERS: The ones that are at the north end of Reflections at Copper Ridge are Photographs 3, 4, and 5.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: All right. I'm assuming that that's Page 3 of 7,4 of 7 , and 5 of $7 ?$

MS. BOWERS: Actually Page 4 of 7 is the third photograph.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. All right. I'm with you now. What is it that this is supposed to show me with respect to a conduit?

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, the photograph shows -- it's looking southeast, and it's looking towards the Falcon Ridge Subdivision. And the photographer was Dan Freedland, DEQ's inspector. He's standing on the north side of Western Bluffs Boulevard.

In the foreground are vacant lots that
were owned by Reflections, and the lots are cleared and graded with no vegetative cover.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: So it would be the grading of those lots in the absence of vegetative cover that would be the conduit?

MS. BOWERS: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: What about the next one?

MS. BOWERS: The next photograph on Page 5. Mr. Freedland was facing a little bit more south. And again, the excavator is likely in Falcon Ridge, but the cleared graded lots in the foreground are owned by Reflections. And then the next photograph --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Then the next one is to the same effect?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, it's just facing a little bit further south, and that is looking at lots that are owned by Reflections.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. That's very helpful. Thank you.

MS. MARQUIS: Can $I$ respond briefly?
CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: This is why we argued to have the photos excluded, is because they can be
explained by attorneys to mean one thing, but when you talk to the people who know the facts, it becomes clear that they don't show construction activity completed or being performed by Copper Ridge or Reflections at Copper Ridge.

These are in the third filing of the Reflections subdivision. That's the permit that Board Member Hornbein just spoke about that was in effect until 2014. The testimony at the hearing was that Copper Ridge and Reflections were done with their construction in this area by July of 2013.

And in fact you can see that because the roads are paved and the curbs are in. Those permits covered the roads, and the utility installation, and the rights-of-way which necessarily go into a portion of the lots. The boundary of those permits covered the entire lots.

There is no clear marker in here where you can tell where Reflections ends and Falcon Ridge begins. Had these been admissible, we would have provided testimony and photo evidence showing where that boundary is exactly on these photos.

Generally $I$ think what you are seeing here is the front part, the foreground, are the
lots, but there is no construction activity on there. They're still permitted. The construction activity is done.

They haven't reached final stabilization yet -- that's true -- because the construction was done, but there was a permit in effect.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Madam Chair,
follow up. So if $I$ understand this correctly, the point of disagreement between the parties is the extent to which that active permit covered? You're asserting it covered the entire lot up to the rear lot line, and $D E Q$ is asserting that that entire area was not covered; do $I$ understand that dispute correctly?

MS. MARQUIS: Partially. Board Member Hornbein, Madam Chair. Our dispute is -- and a couple things.

There has been no evidence that there was any disturbance beyond the disturbance area described in the permits. There has been no evidence of any other construction activity other than road building and utility installation. The maps that go with the permit refer to a boundary area and a site that extends to the entire lot as you described.

And the permit itself speaks in terms of the site, not the disturbance area. The general permit, which is at Exhibit 1, refers to a disturbance area only to determine if you need a permit. Beyond that it refers to the site which the permit clearly defines as an area larger than the disturbance area.

So we disagree that the permit is as limited as the Department has portrayed, and we also disagree that there was any construction area beyond that disturbance area. There has been no evidence of that in the record.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Ms. Marquis - Madam Chair, may $I$ - -

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, please.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Ms. Marquis, who was responsible for the removal of the vegetation that's depicted in these photographs? Your client was road building essentially. How is it that the vegetation on these lots has been removed?

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, Board Member Tweeten. In the photographs, for example page 6 of 7 , you can see -- To me they look like fence posts, but $I$ don't believe they are.

Those are part of the water lines and
part of the utility installation. So the disturbance area for that construction permit would have extended into those individual lots necessarily to install the utilities. And those permits did cover that work, and they covered work in the rights-of-way which extends into the individual lots.

Again, this photograph allegedly was taken in September. It's at the end of the season. It's dry. And then it is followed by a one hundred plus year storm event.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Ms. Marquis, do these Photographs 4, 5, and 6 out of 7 , they claim it's outside of the disturbance area that's covered by the existing permit?

MS. MARQUIS: I'm sorry. I'm not sure I understand your question, Board Member Tweeten.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, if I understand -- Can you hear me all right now?

MS. MARQUIS: Yes, I can.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I understand what was said, that what's shown in these photographs as areas that have been cleared of vegetation and so forth, and areas in which the revegetation has not yet grown in, those are all disturbance area
for the existing permit; is that right?
MS. MARQUIS: We don't have evidence -Board Member Tweeten, Madam Chair. There is no evidence in the record to define exactly where that disturbance area boundary is for those permits.

And again, we argued that those permits cover the entire site as that term is defined in the permit and shown as the boundary areas with the maps that goes with that permit.

And we dispute that those areas are completely cleared. It's September, it's dry, it was a one hundred plus year storm event that removed vegetation in all areas around Billings and within the city. So what removed the vegetation is unknown. It's likely it was the storm that occurred two days prior.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, if Ms. Bowers would like to respond to that, I'd love to hear it.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers.
MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board. Just looking at the photo on Page 6 of 7 of DEQ's proposed Exhibit 36, I think it is pretty apparent that the construction
activity is beyond the area that is just for roads and utilities, if as Ms. Marquis points out the poles sticking up are utilities. I mean you can see beyond the lots in the foreground to the next lot, and there is a big stockpile on the next lot.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: But do we know if that's in this subdivision or in the Falcon Ridge Subdivision?

MS. BOWERS: The photo on Page 6, that is showing Reflections at Copper Ridge. It's facing further south. That's not the Falcon Ridge Subdivision.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis, I see you shaking your head.

MS. MARQUIS: Thank you, Madam Chair, Board Member Tweeten. We dispute that. And again, these are things that we didn't have an opportunity to present testimony and contrary evidence to because they were properly excluded on a motion in limine. And so our expectation going into the hearing was that they would not be admitted into evidence.

Again, we didn't have any notice of these pictures when the violations were first noticed back in 2013 and in 2015. They weren't
disclosed during discovery. They weren't brought up in the first hearing in 2018. Now the Department brings them, and alleges that that construction in the background is Copper Ridge and Reflections. We dispute that, and adamantly say that it's not. It is Falcon Ridge.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, do you have anything to follow up with that?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Not at this time. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Can I say something, Madam Chair?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I just am clarifying here about the permit 102807 which covered roads and utilities. That was terminated in October of 2009 apparently? And it sounds like you are saying that the pictures -- which you don't think are relevant -- that show bare areas adjacent to the roads, were taken four years later, and you're saying that perhaps there was vegetation there until the storm?

MS. MARQUIS: Board Member Lehnherr, Madam Chair. The permit that you referenced MTR102807 was issued to the JTL Group. That was
not for the third filing of Reflections.
So this gets a little confusing because the subdivision doesn't go in all at once. It goes in in phases or filings. And in this case they generally started at the southern end. And the first phase or the first filing of Reflections was at that southern end, and it was completely put in.

And $I$ believe that's the area where that permit applied. Let me double check. I'm wrong. It applied to the second filing of the Copper Ridge Subdivision, and Copper Ridge is to the west of Reflections. So it is a different area. Let me make sure I've got that right. It is even confusing for us who have been living in it.

MS. CLERGET: Do you want the map Exhibit 47?

MS. MARQUIS: That would be helpful. Thank you. I think it is Copper Ridge. It was just on the first page.

So just to orient you to these maps. The aerial photos you looked at before, Copper Ridge would have been on to the left, and Reflections would be over here. So that north area that we've been talking about, and that is
shown in those pictures, that we've been arguing about a lot, is over here -- (indicating) -- in Reflections, which is a separate subdivision.

And Copper Ridge -- these lines here show you where the phases are, so this is Phase 1 in Copper Ridge. And Phase 2 you can see is this area here. And then we have Phase 4 and Phase 3 . And these phases weren't in existence at the time, or they were very early in their existence.

So the JTL permit that you talked about is Findings of Fact No. 29 and 30 , and those refer to the second filing of the Copper Ridge Subdivision, which is this area right here. So that's the area where that construction was completed earlier. Does that answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Yes, thank you. I was looking at Finding of Fact 34 and 35. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do we have a map that shows both of the subdivisions together?

MS. CLERGET: They're one page after the other, so we have to scroll.

CHAIR DEVENY: Is there one that would be of Reflections then?

MS. CLERGET: Yes. That's Reflections. CHAIR DEVENY: Is Reflections the one that has Lot 15 where the allegation was of the issue? Was that in Reflections or was that Copper Ridge? That's in Reflections?

MS. MARQUIS: That's in Reflections. I can point to it.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: (Indicating)
CHAIR DEVENY: There is another 15 on the outside, but this was the one on the inside?

MS. MARQUIS: That's what the Department has alleged, and of course we dispute it. But that is the lot that's in question is the one on the inside.

CHAIR DEVENY: So while we're talking about 15, I had a question of the parties, particularly DEQ.

You said that the inspector was able to use his phone to get a lat-long description, and that was -- so you were able to pinpoint that to a specific lot, but then --

MS. BOWERS: That's correct. Madam Chair, members of the Board. Dan Freedland, the DEQ inspector, he typically does record the metadata from his phone when he takes photos, and
it gives him a lat-long.
CHAIR DEVENY: So then you were able to go back and identify the lots, but the ownership apparently on Lot 15 , according $I$ believe to Copper Ridge, was it was not theirs; is that correct?

MS. BOWERS: Based on warranty deeds that DEQ obtained and are in the record, Lot 15 was still owned by Reflections at the time of the violations.

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, that's correct. Lot 15 was still owned by Reflections in September of 2013.

We dispute the location of the photograph. There is testimony in the record. He wrote down the lat-long in his notebook when he took the pictures, and the notebook page is exhibit $I$ believe it's 15. And the lat-long that they have ascribed to the photo location is not written down anywhere on that notebook page, so we're not sure where it came from.

And then additionally there is the testimony where he's saying that it's an estimation that it was Lot 15 , and he doesn't know where the property markers are. So we dispute the
photo location based on not just the testimony, but on the lat-long that was provided, but it's not in his notebook.

MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. Also if $I$ could call your attention to DEQ Exhibit 36 on Page 1. We provided the lat-long for each of the photos, and that was based on the data from Dan Freedland's phone, and taken contemporaneous with his photos.

CHAIR DEVENY: From his phone, but not in the inspection report?

MS. BOWERS: I don't believe it is in the inspection report. It's in his inspection notes.

CHAIR DEVENY: Were those notes part of the record?

MS. BOWERS: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: I'm sorry. His inspection notes are at Exhibit 15 , and the lat-long that the Department has assigned to that photograph does not match a lat-long that's on that exhibit.

MS. CLERGET: Sorry, they were talking about 15 , so $I$ decided to put it up, so it's up.

CHAIR DEVENY: So I don't care which one
of you would come up, but if you could point out where the lat-long was in the notes that match the picture in the paper, in the exhibit.

MS. BOWERS: Is it just the one page?
MS. CLERGET: Yes.
MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. I'm not sure that the lat-longs in Dan's notes is associated with these pictures in Exhibit 36 because $I$ think -- I would have to compare -but $I$ think it goes with the pictures that were attached to Exhibit 2 which was his inspection report. And he didn't include a lot of these pictures. These are the pictures that he didn't include.

MR. HAYES: If I may, Chairwoman Chris Deveny. I would direct the Board's attention to Dan's actual testimony at the hearing.

I know that opposing Counsel has tried to throw some shadow of doubt in terms of Dan estimating that he was at Lot 15 when he took the photograph, but there were specific questions posed to Dan.

I'm referring to Page 237 of the transcript and it was a question by myself to Dan. I asked, "So when you identified where photograph

13 was taken, did you identify that by a street address, or did you identify that? Were you able to ascertain that that related to a specific lot number?" And Dan answered, "We used the map with the lot numbers, as $I$ recall, that had the Lot 15 on the aerial map. I didn't use the address. I don't know the address of this property."

Then $I$ asked, "And how do you know that this is an accurate photograph of what we subsequently identified as Lot 15?" And Dan answered, "From where $I$ was standing, and from the other photographs $I$ took when $I$ was on the site that day, and $I$ verified the metadata on the photo from the iPhone that $I$ used to take the photos."

I asked one last question, "How certain are you that this is a photograph of what we subsequently identified as Lot 15?" And Dan answered, "I'm certain Lot 15 is in this photograph."

CHAIR DEVENY: That's not the picture that was called Lot 15 that we have in this exhibit; is that correct?

MS. BOWERS: There is a picture in your exhibit that is also attached to Dan's inspection report, and that's the photo on Page 2 of --

CHAIR DEVENY: Is that the one he's talking about? Is that the photograph that he's referring to?

MR. HAYES: That is the photograph $I$ was asking questions about.

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, if I could just respond briefly. I don't want to belabor the point. But it's as simple as the handout that the Department provided to you today. Photo 2 is that photo. And they provide the lat-long there. And if you compare it to the lat-longs that are noted on the notebook page that was up on the screen, you don't find that lat-long anywhere on that notebook page.

Again, Mr. Hayes has cited to a small portion of the testimony. There is more in the findings and conclusions. In fact that testimony was followed just later on that Page 238. I asked, "Can you tell me where the property line is?," and Mr. Freedland's answer was no, he couldn't.

And $I$ said, "Is it fair to say that this photo does not show the homes that were being built on either side of Lot 15?" He said, "Oh, correct. You can't see any building number on
that side."
I asked, "Do you recall there were homes being built on either side of Lot 15?" His answer, "Yes. I believe there was a lot. I think there was. I think this was a vacant lot. I know there was -- there was one next to me from where $I$ was standing."

It's clear from the testimony, and it's cited in the findings, that they were going after the fact to try to pin this on Lot 15 , but it is not certain. He says at one point that it was on the corner, and you can see that it was on a curve. So where is the property line on the curve? Mr. Freedland admitted he didn't know.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, did you have anything more to add or questions? Would you put the motion back up there, please.

MS. SOLEM: There is no pending motion.
CHAIR DEVENY: So we don't have a
motion. Board members, what's your pleasure on Finding of Fact No. 40?

MS. CLERGET: No, 34 to 39 .
CHAIR DEVENY: 34 to 39.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair.
CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, Chris.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm on. I was just thinking about what $I$ wanted to say. I'm sorry.

I'm inclined to overrule the exception -- (inaudible) -- because $I$ think the failure to lay some foundation with respect to what Mr. Leep meant by construction activity -- (inaudible) - the probative value of his testimony into some doubt.

But $I$ do think that the findings themselves, as far as they go again, are accurate. First part has to talk about construction activity, and talks about construction. So I think the exception doesn't really apply to 34 . Even if --

First of all, $I$ think "construction activity" speaks in the present tense in the regulation. $I$ think -- (inaudible) -- the prior term that's defined which talks about the discharge of storm water as a consequence of construction activity.

It's clear $I$ think that DEQ's point is well taken. Construction activity undertaken before the -- in September 2013 could very well have provided a conduit for that storm water in

September 2013 to discharge into the waters of the State. So I think DEQ's point is well taken as far as it goes.

But with respect to these -- The question is whether the testimony is relevant, and I think it is perhaps marginally relevant, but relevant nonetheless. And $I$ guess $I$ would tend to think we ought to leave them in and accept them, just because $I$ do think that they are -- $I$ think tend to prove that -- (inaudible) -- into the waters of the State of Montana as consequence of any construction activity that occurred after the contractors vacated the site.

So $I$ would think that we ought to adopt 34 through 39 , and that $I$ would so move.

CHAIR DEVENY: There has been a motion to adopt Findings of Fact 34 through 39 .

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'll second. Then I have a comment.

CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter, go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: When I read these about the last six times, I agree with Chris. I don't think there is anything in error in these, so they are statements of fact, and DEQ's point is well taken. If's historical construction, it
still falls under the construction thing. But this doesn't dispute that portion of it itself.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other comments from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, we'll vote on the motion. All those in favor of approving Findings of Fact 34 through 39 , please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those opposed to the motion, signify by saying nay.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, we didn't get a vote from you.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I was an aye.
CHAIR DEVENY: I didn't hear you. Thank you. We're moving on then.

No. 40, 41, 42. Let's finish up those three together. We'll finish that section. I don't believe we had any --

MS. CLERGET: DEQ has an objection to 40.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers, briefly do you want to say something about 40?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. DEQ's objection to 40 is that it states -- Basically the substance of Mr. Leep's testimony that they wouldn't leave stockpiles, or he was confident that there were no stockpiles of materials left on any of the lots Copper Ridge and Reflections owned after the contracted construction activity was complete, because it would not have been in their best interests to do that.

But it doesn't say why that testimony is more credible than the testimony of Dan Freedland who testified that he observed the stockpiles on at least one lot, Lot 15 , which is the one that's depicted in Photograph 13 attached to Exhibit 2.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'm going to interrupt you. It's also a fact that -- your point doesn't say, doesn't delete his fact that this is what he testified to. The fact that is just that he testified he was confident. It doesn't say that his testimony was any better than anybody else's. MS. BOWERS: Okay. And then -- Well, okay. Then $I$ guess my concern is that Mr. Freedland's testimony is not given the weight it's due considering that he has photographed, he has
documented his observations with contemporaneous notes and photographs. So I guess that's the substance of DEQ's exception.

CHAIR DEVENY: I don't think that affects the fact here. Any other questions -BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: He'd testified that.

CHAIR DEVENY: -- comments about that? (No response)

CHAIR DEVENY: So $I$ would move that we accept the Findings of Fact No. 40, 41, and 42. Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I second. This is Hillary.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I have a question.
Is there any other photographs other than this one labeled Page 2 of 7 of Lot 15 or assumed to be Lot $15 ?$

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Board Member Busby, members of the Board. This photo on Page 2 of 7 of Exhibit 36 is also Photo 13 that's attached to Exhibit 2, which is the violation letter dated September $23 r d, 2013$ in the inspection report.

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, if I might add. There is another photograph of that same lot, and you can see this in Mr. Freedland's testimony we talked about that photograph.

And it's cited at Finding of Fact No.
73, goes into the transcript, my cross-examination of Mr. Freedland where he agreed with me that the photograph $I$ had presented him was of the same lot, it was the same area but taken from a different angle.

And that photograph had been produced to us by the Department, and on that photograph, the street address provided for that photograph were 3028, 3030 , and 3032 Western Bluffs. Those are the three street addresses that correlate to lots that were not owned by Copper Ridge and Reflections.

And that can be found at Finding 73 through 78.

MS. CLERGET: Chris, I'm seeing there is only one photograph that's in the record. So if you're looking for either of those photographs, the one that happened during the cross-examination was not in the record. It was not moved for admission. And the photograph that was referenced by DEQ is the same photograph appearing in two different places. So there is only one photograph in the record.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: That's the --
MS. CLERGET: That's the one that you're looking at.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions or discussions on the motion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, all in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I believe that was unanimous all in favor.

Let's go on to Mr. Freedland's testimony and photographs. DEQ, you had some objections at all to any of these?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. DEQ had exceptions to Finding of Fact 44, and to Findings of Fact 46 and 47.

CHAIR DEVENY: Could you refer us to the pages in your document, the exceptions.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, it is your Page 66 .

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Could you briefly summarize your exceptions.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Well, Finding of Fact 44 misstates the evidence in the record because Exhibit 33 depicts the lots that were owned by Copper Ridge at the time of the violations. And there was testimony about that in the transcript at Page 217, the June 13 th transcript.

This included lots 8,9 , and 10 in the second filing of Copper Ridge. That's at the northern portion of that subdivision. And Exhibit 34 depicts the lots owned by Reflections at the time of the violations. That's discussed in the transcript on Page 22. And that also included lots in the northern part of that subdivision.

So the finding, the exception that DEQ takes is that Mr. Freedland could not confirm that all of the lots he saw were owned by Copper Ridge and Reflections, or when, how, why, or by whom they may have been cleared.

CHAIR DEVENY: You're saying that he did confirm that?

MS. BOWERS: There is evidence in the record of which lots were owned by Reflections and
by Copper Ridge, and that's shown on the Exhibits 33 and 34 , which are in the packet that we gave to you today, and that's also part of the record.

CHAIR DEVENY: Could you pinpoint us to those places.

MS. CLERGET: 33 and 34 are up.
MS. BOWERS: Yes. And Copper Ridge and Reflections, they did not dispute that this accurately reflects lots that they owned.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Just a quick question.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: But at this point he could not confirm that, or deny it at this point, or he didn't know for sure, is the way $I$ read this 44.

MS. BOWERS: Well, at the time of his inspection he didn't identify lots. That was after he went back to the office with his phone data. That's correct.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: So if I take 44 in context, the only thing it says here, he could not confirm at the time of this that -- he didn't say they were or they weren't, it was just he could not confirm it.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, maybe with that addition that Mr. Freedland could not confirm at the time of the inspection.

CHAIR DEVENY: Then go to your next objection in that group that we're looking at. 46 and 47.

MS. BOWERS: And our exception there is based on the definition of construction activity, that Mr. Freedland describes disturbed ground, and the findings appear to be limited to active construction activity. That's the basis of our exceptions.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. So I think we've kind of talked about the use of the construction term previously, and $I$ think we've moved ahead with the facts anyway, just in addition to the exceptions.

And with that, $I$ think we can go all the way to through Finding of Fact 62 without any issues coming up. So $I$ would so move that we approve Findings of Fact 43 through 62 .

MS. BOWERS: DEQ does have some
exceptions to 54, for example --
CHAIR DEVENY: I'm sorry.
MS. BOWERS: That's on Page 66.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'll modify my motion -excuse me then -- to go through Finding of fact 53.

MS . BOWERS: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I'll second your motion.

CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there discussion?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I have concerns about Photograph 44 where it says -- the discussion that we just had where he could not confirm that the lots he saw were owned by Copper Ridge. The way $I$ read that is he couldn't confirm it at the time of his testimony. There is nothing about it to me that says he couldn't confirm it in the field, and $D E Q$ asserting that he then did provide evidence confirming it subsequent to his field work.

So $I$ have concerns with that one, and $I$ just want to be clear that my concerns apply to Paragraph 44 and not the entire subset of paragraphs that this motion applies to.

CHAIR DEVENY: You don't think it would be enough to stop the whole procedure, and go back, and have the Board review the entire record?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Well, I mean I've had concerns throughout this process, and I voted to reflect those concerns.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other comments or discussion on the motion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris and Hillary, are you still with us?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Yes.
CHAIR DEVENY: I haven't heard from Chris, but I'm going to go ahead and call for a vote. All those in favor of the motion to approve Findings of Fact 43 through 53, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Those opposed?
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Nay.
BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Nay.
CHAIR DEVENY: So we have a tie. The motion fails. Chris voted yes. So we have a tie vote. That motion fails. So if we don't want to approve these facts, then we will start over. Does anybody have a discussion on how the Board wants to proceed?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I have an observation. I appreciate the work that the parties have put into this, and that the Board's attorney has put into these Finding of Fact. I do have concerns. The preponderance of the evidence is 51 percent. DEQ has raised, especially with regard to these photographs, some concerns -- not that active construction was happening on these sites, but that there was bare ground that maybe have caused these violations to occur.

I do share the Board attorney's concerns that she expressed in her order on the motions in limine as to why this evidence wasn't presented earlier on, but it does leave us where we are. So I don't really have any recommendations for where to go from here, but those are the reasons why $I$ voted the way I did.

CHAIR DEVENY: Hillary, do you have anything you want to say?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I'm kind of with what was said last. I guess I'm just concerned, I'm mostly concerned less about the whole process, and more about the specific one, if they're taking the statement appropriately, and then reflecting in the Findings of Fact appropriately.

And so I feel like there are enough unknowns that this one statement specifically is still kind of sticking with me on like is that correct, and being interpreted correctly.

CHAIR DEVENY: David, comments,
questions?
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I think I agree with what Melissa stated well. I certainly haven't been consistently a nay vote, but I'm troubled by several items in the exceptions.

CHAIR DEVENY: Well, it appears that there is enough of the Board members that don't feel that comfortable approving the facts in this case. And with that, $I$ believe our only choice is to stop the case and agree to all go back and review the record on our own, and then at another future meeting make a decision, come up with our own Findings of Fact and Conclusions.

Sarah, would you kind of go through that procedure since we haven't done that before.

MS. CLERGET: Sure. So this kind of in the memo, but you have to remember, keep in mind the standards that are in the memo for rejecting or modifying a Finding of Fact.

So what you do now is go back through
the record, and we'll provide you with the whole record, and every Board member -- the Supreme Court has been very clear that every Board member has to review the entire record. So it can't be that some review the record, and then we rely on those who have reviewed the record when we come back. Everybody has to review it.

And then once you've reviewed it, you can come back and discuss on the record whether you're going to modify or reject those findings of Fact. And your options at the next meeting after you have reviewed the record are essentially the same options that you've had all along, but you have at this meeting. You can accept.

The addition to that is that you can modify the facts once you've reviewed the entire record. So you guys can decide -- Again, you can do it as you have been going through finding by finding, or if you want to modify this finding this way; or you can give me or anyone else instructions on how you want Findings of Fact written whole cloth. So we're going to reject one or all of the Findings of Fact and rewrite them ourselves.

And again, you can instruct me on how
you want that done, or Lindsay, or anybody for that matter, on how you want that done; or one of you can write them, just so long as the ultimate final product has to look like you're used to seeing a Finding of Fact, Conclusions of Law looking. And how you get to that final product is sort of up to you guys. But that's ultimately where you have to get.

CHAIR DEVENY: And we would individually
look at all of the record.
MS. CLERGET: Yes, every Board member has --

CHAIR DEVENY: We couldn't sit two in a room? That would not be appropriate; is that correct?

MS. CLERGET: You can't discuss it. Any discussion needs to happen on the record. So I would recommend, human nature being what it is, that you don't review it together because it's very difficult to review and not talk.

CHAIR DEVENY: Then in terms of coming up with the Findings of Fact, it would probably have to be done at the meeting where we're all together then.

MS. CLERGET: Probably. What I have
seen done before is that sometimes Board members will come with, you know, this is their version of what they think the Findings of Fact should be, and then we all compare at the meeting. That's happened before.

The other thing that sometimes happens is you discuss how you want the Findings of fact modified at the meeting, instruct me to do that, and then we circulate a draft, and then you come back again and comment on that draft. That's another way to do it; or we just sit down and write them essentially line by line. Any of those options are available. It's up to you guys how you want to do it.

CHAIR DEVENY: So is there further discussion? I guess that's the road we're talking about taking at this point since we --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, Madam Chair, $I$ think this is complicated enough, so let me make it a little more complicated. We also have a motion in limine to deal with.

MS. CLERGET: Yes, and $I$ think that will be -- When $I$ say the entire record, the record is not just the record of the hearing. The record is the record. So you're going to get all of it.

You're going to get all the --
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I get that.
That's not my point. My point is this: If the Board were to decide that Sarah abused her discretion -- and that sounds harsh, but that's the name of the legal principle that's involved -is that Sarah abused her discretion in granting the motion in limine, Copper Ridge's argument today that they have additional evidence addressed at those photographs, and the subject of those photographs, that they did not present because the motion in limine had been granted; that were the Board to decide that the motion in limine was, that the granting of the motion in limine was an abuse of discretion, we would be best advised to remand this case again for another, for more proceedings in front of Sarah, in which the parties can go back over that ground with those documents in the record, and with Copper Ridge having the opportunity to then to marshal its evidence with respect to the subject matter of those documents, those photographs in order to complete the record before the case came back up here. And who knows? And as part of that exercise, Sarah could conceivably change her mind.
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MS. CLERGET: It's happened before.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Completely
differently than what we see in the front of us.
So $I$ would suggest it would not be the best use of our time as Board members to go through the exercise of reviewing the record right now until we've confirmed or rejected the decision that the Hearing Examiner made with respect to the motion in limine.

For the benefit of the non-lawyers in the room, a motion in limine is a -- TV shows with trials, and movies with trials. And people offer exhibits, and if they're objected to, and the Judge makes a ruling.

Well, a motion in limine is an objection to evidence that's offered before the hearing starts rather than during the course of the hearing. And the law allows parties to move the Decider in advance of the hearing to rule on certain evidentiary issues like this one.

And that's what happened here. The photographs as exhibits, rather than waiting for the hearing and waiting for them to be offered as exhibits before tendering their objection, Copper Ridge decided they would file a motion in advance
of the hearing asking Sarah as the Hearing Examiner to rule on the admissibility of the photographs, and Sarah ruled that they would not be admitted.

And DEQ argued today $I$ think that their proof at the hearing would have been different, perhaps longer, perhaps more would have been offered in addition to what was there had they known that these photographs were going to be in evidence.

So it seems to me that we ought to decide before we take on the burden of reviewing the record that may end up being incomplete, we ought to decide whether we approve of the Hearing Examiner's decision to exclude these photographs as evidence.

And if we approve of that decision, then we go on to the step of, "Well, okay. I guess we've got to all read the record." But if we don't approve of that decision, and we overrule Sarah's decision with respect to the motion, then I think that the most appropriate course for the Board to take would be to remand this matter once again for further proceedings in the record, and the parties marshalling all of the evidence they
have with respect to those photographs.
CHAIR DEVENY: So for clarification, if we go down the road, and it ends up remanded back to Sarah, does Sarah hold another hearing then? Sarah, is that what would happen?

MS. CLERGET: If --
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well --
MS. CLERGET: Go ahead, Chris.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: -- (inaudible) --
out of fairness we can let DEQ's documents in, and not give Copper Ridge an opportunity to marshal its evidence in response to what those photographs show, and it makes -- it's not much, and it's not contested, and it can go into the record by stipulation, and then Sarah could make another pass at her proposed order with those matters under consideration as well.

So how that gets done -- (inaudible) -Examiner, but $I$ do think that in fairness, if we were to hold that those photographs should have been admitted, then it does have to get remanded. That's my opinion anyway.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other Board member discussion or thoughts?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I agree with

Chris.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: As a non-lawyer, I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Sounds reasonable.

CHAIR DEVENY: Should we take up the order on limine then?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Did you say the whole order on limine, or just pictures?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I would suggest that --

CHAIR DEVENY: Well, the motion in limine dealt with what we could or couldn't do with the pictures. So we have to rule on the motion in limine.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: There is more than that.

CHAIR DEVENY: There is more than that in the motion in limine.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Am I correct in understanding that the only part of that order in limine that $D E Q$ has excepted to was the part dealing with the four photographs? That's right, isn't it?

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers.

MS. BOWERS: That's correct. The motions in limine addressed more evidence than just the photos, but the only exception that DEQ raised was the photos, the excluded photos.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: So I would suggest that that's the only part of the order in limine that we need to deal with at this point. The rest of it $I$ think is --

CHAIR DEVENY: So it sounds like we should talk about the motion in limine and make a decision on that. Does everybody have that document? Hillary, do you have that?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I think I do. I just need to find it.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. We'll give you a couple minutes.

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: It was the one that was sent this morning, correct, or a little before lunch?

CHAIR DEVENY: Just at lunch. Right. We need to take a break for our Court Reporter. Let's take ten minutes.

> (Recess taken)

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris and Hillary, are you still with us?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: This is Hillary. I'm here.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris Tweeten, are you still on?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: I'll try another minute to get Chris on. Maybe we'll get go ahead and get started anyway. We have five members.

So before we proceed any further, Sarah, could you just give us kind of a procedural thing and a MAPA interpretation of what Chris has proposed that we do.

MS. CLERGET: Yes. Just during the break, $I$ was just looking up to be sure, to confirm what the burden is with respect to evidentiary hearings, and $I$ did find a case that very clearly discusses a board reviewing a Hearing Examiner case.

For the lawyers in the room, this is PVB v. PTRCB, (phonetic) it's a Montana District Court, Lexis 427 from 1999. It is a First Judicial District Court case where the First Judicial District is reviewing the agency's decision who reviewed the Hearing Examiner's decision, and they modified an evidentiary ruling
of the Hearing Examiner based on the determination that it was an abuse of the Hearing Examiner's discretion.

So the standard is abuse of discretion, and there is specific case law that you can modify the evidentiary rulings as long as you find that there was an abuse of discretion; and then specifically, you need to make a record about specifically why the discretion was abused, and how you're modifying the evidentiary ruling, how and why you're modifying the evidentiary ruling. So I just confirmed that with respect to the motion in limine. So the standard is abuse of discretion. You have to determine whether the ruling on the motion in limine was an abse of discretion.

If so, then you can either remand it back for additional findings -- Essentially it is open to you what you want to do. You could remand it back for additional hearing; you could allow written substitution, or written testimony $I$ guess, or written documentary evidence if you wanted to. You can have your own hearing about that particular issue, or you can review the whole record.

The other thing $I$ thought about on the break that $I$ should mention is that -- and I apologize for not having mentioned this before when you were discussing the motion in limine.

In addition to the briefing, there was also an oral argument on the motion in limine, and then there was a subsequent hearing, the scheduling conference which $I$ noted in the FOFCOL where $I$ discussed and further articulated the order on motions in limine.

So if you're talking about the universe of things that occurred within the motion in limine, there were also those two hearings, of which there are both transcripts.

So those are your options and what is available in addition to, of course, the entire evidentiary record.

CHAIR DEVENY: Do Board members have a suggestion how to proceed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Have we heard from Chris
yet?
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris.

CHAIR DEVENY: You are on. Okay. Good.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I kind of told you what $I$ think we should do. I guess my suggestion would be we proceed to consider whether we think Sarah abused her discretion in excluding those four photographs. And Melissa has spoken to this issue briefly, $I$ think, and I'll just add my thoughts to that.

I understand to the extent that the ruling is based on failure to disclose, and if there is surprise, and so on, I'm not insensitive to the idea that this is pretty late in the game.

But on the other hand, we did remand this to the Hearing Examiner for the purpose of taking additional evidence. And $I$ think the Hearing Examiner recognized that by reopening the discovery, calling for a second disclosure of exhibits, and so on, and so forth.

I think implicit in all of that is the understanding that somebody may come up with an exhibit that hasn't previously been considered for introduction. If the record were limited to the evidence that was already in, none of those procedural steps would have been necessary. So I think it's pretty clear to me that when the matter was remanded, it was understood by everybody that
additional evidence might be required.
In that respect, $I$ think the arguments about unfair surprise and so forth are probably not as persuasive as they otherwise might be. The matter was disclosed some weeks ahead of the hearing. I think Copper Ridge had plenty of time to prepare a response. In fact they told us today that they know of additional evidence and additional witnesses that they would have offered had this material been admitted.

So clearly $I$ mean whatever might have been the case back last summer, at this point admitting the exhibits isn't going to cause them any undue prejudice. So that argument $I$ think is to me not persuasive.

And I'm not sure what else there is to the reasoning behind the order granting the motion in limine. I tend to think that these photographs should have been admitted, and the parties can make of them what they want. And they may not be found by the Hearing Examiner to be particularly probative, but they're certainly relevant, and $I$ think they ought to have been admitted.

And reluctant as $I$ am to say so, because I have great respect for Sarah, and $I$ know how
much work she's put in on this case, $I$ do think that the ruling was an abuse of discretion, and I think we ought to overturn it. That's my thought.

MS. CLERGET: Chris, if I may. I want to reiterate. There is no ego here, so once again, we need to get it right. So $I$ say this not for any reason other than to tell the lawyers or the non-lawyers in here.

Abuse of discretion is particular thing in the legal world when we say "abuse of discretion standard." And for those of you who aren't lawyers, there's a definition of it, and I was going to provide that if it would be helpful. But again, $I$ don't want to appear that -- Again, there is no ego in here, so if you believe they should have been admitted, that's appropriate to do. I say this not to argue but to provide you with you a definition. Would that be helpful?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes. Go ahead.
MS. CLERGET: So this is from the case State v. McLaughlin 2009 Montana 211, which is a Supreme Court case. "An abuse of discretion occurs when a District Court --" or in this case Hearing Examiner -- "acts arbitrarily, or without conscious judgment, or exceeds the bounds of
reason." So that's the standard. And I'm sure the parties have all of that.

CHAIR DEVENY: So would an appropriate procedure here then be to let the parties give their opinion on this, or just for the Board to make a decision?

MS. CLERGET: I could be wrong, but I'm guessing the parties are probably itching to say something, and $I$ don't think it would be inappropriate if you wanted to let them do that.

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, did you want to hear from the parties before we proceed with any motions on this, do you think?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: First of all, thanks to Sarah for bringing out the definition. And yes. Well, we've heard from the parties to an extent already, but $I$ don't think it would hurt to give them five minutes apiece at this stage of the day to --

CHAIR DEVENY: I agree. We'll do that then. And DEQ, would you like to start. And just a couple minutes, please, unless it is really relevant.

MS. BOWERS: Thank you, Chair Deveny, members of the Board. I will be very brief
because $I$ think I've made my arguments on this already as far as DEQ's arguments against excluding the four photos. We believe the photos are relevant, and that they are probative to the decision before the Board on the owner/operator issue.

And we're also concerned that the Hearing Examiner didn't make any -- there is nothing in the record weighing the undue prejudice, and it seemed like the main reason for excluding the photos was because they weren't disclosed during discovery, and a proper remedy for that is what the Board is doing now, giving the parties a chance to address the photos, maybe by allowing some additional discovery.

So DEQ supports overturning the ruling on the motion in limine, and allowing the parties a chance to address this evidence in the record.

I do have one point of clarification $I$ would like to make, and that is in the order on motions in limine on Page 7, the determination is made to exclude the photographs, and that's on the order Part $1(c)$; and then there is also a determination made to not allow DEQ to use or enter any documents including maps that are
derived from or based on the photographs.
And $I$ would also ask that you overturn
1(d), and allow preparation of maps derived from photographs because I think those would be helpful to understanding of the photos and showing location of the photos. Nothing further.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Bowers.
Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, thanks for your time today.

I don't disagree that the remand was to have more evidence presented. What I do disagree with is it was not to allow the Department to bring up entirely different violations than the ones that they originally alleged. And this is very important.

If you look to the enforcement statutes 75-5-617 and 75-5-611, the Department has to provide notice to people when they're going to allege a violation, and they have to state with specificity the facts underlying the alleged violations. I'm sorry. Can we get Exhibit 16 up again? Is that possible?

The reason this is important is because things are moving very rapidly, and when you're
charged with a violation, you want to gather evidence and talk to witnesses. And while we can put on some evidence to rebut those photos, we can't go out and figure out who owned the big equipment that was shown in those photographs because that equipment is gone. There are houses there now.

We can't go back and recreate those photographs with anything that depicts clearly the property lines because there are houses there, and you don't have the field of vision that those photographs have because they were taken six years ago, and we were never provided a copy of them, or given an opportunity to know that that different area, those different violations were part of this action.

Again, $I$ just want to reiterate. On this aerial photo -- and this was the big hearing we had over a year ago about this case, and the Department's evidence supported by photographs. Here are photographs; here are photographed locations; here, here, and here.

The photographs that you're talking about today are up here in an area not even shown on this map. So they're a different area,
different disturbance, different alleged violations of which we were never provided notice. That is the main reason why they should be excluded.

Can we go back and argue about them? You bet we can. Could we have done a better job if they'd been included in the violation letter or the administrative order? Yes, we could have. So we are prejudiced by going back and revisiting and allowing new areas of the subdivisions to come in and be part of this action when they were never appropriately noticed.

The original violation letters and the original orders were all about home building. You can go back and read the orders yourselves, Exhibits 2, 9, and 10. It's all about home building. As you saw from the USDA photo, there were no home building activities up in that area where those photos were supposedly taken.

The scope of this enforcement action was limited by the Department through the six years of this litigation. Based on that, it was appropriate to exclude those four photographs. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Ms. Marquis.

Do Board members have any questions of the parties at this point?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I have a question for $D E Q . \quad I$ would like them to address this issue that these proposed four photographs addressed only new violations.

When $I$ read the violation notice, the first bullet point, $I$ don't read that to be limited exclusively to the building of homes, but I do find it troubling that the map that was just up on the board doesn't even include the area that these photographs were taken in, so $I$ would like you to address that, please.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Board Member Hornbein, and members of the Board.

First of all, you're right. The first notice that was given to Reflections and Copper Ridge was the violation letter that's Exhibit 2 dated September 23rd, 2013. And in that notice, the inspector refers to construction activity occurring throughout the subdivision. It is not limited to certain lots or certain areas of the subdivision.

And then with regard to Exhibit 16 , the map that was up on the Board, that map was
prepared as a demonstrative exhibit to show locations of the inspector's photographs. And admittedly he did concentrate his inspection on the southern end of the subdivisions, and that was because that's where waters of the state were, and he was trying to document discharges to waters of the state.

But we aren't alleging new violations. The original violation letter and the order allege violations related to storm water discharges from construction activity throughout the subdivisions.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions of the parties by Board members?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I have one for Sarah, I believe. I think Sarah is the one.

The original remand from my memory was for determination of owner/operator at the locations of the violations; is that not correct?

MS. CLERGET: I believe that's correct, and that's why you guys have the transcripts of the original hearing, so you could go back and look at that yourself.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: That was my memory
anyway. I'm not sure what another remand is going to do for us on the original determination of
owner/operator, whether the violations occurred, because they're not specific. DEQ has not been specific and says, "This is this lot, this lot," that locations for the violations they're saying generally.

So we have a piece of property here that's owned somewhat by the developer, and largely by property owners, and we have violations that may or may not be from home building, but it's alluded to, or may or may not be from leftovers from their original development.

So I'm not sure we've really gone anywhere into determining owner/operator yet for the violations, and it's the violations that's being appealed. So $I$ have a question whether we're going to get there with a new remand. Do you want to take a shot at what $I$ just said?

MS. CLERGET: No, I'm going to leave that to the parties.

MS. BOWERS: Could I -- Board Member Busby, members of the Board. I think the remand could provide more information on -- We have provided information on ownership of lots within the subdivisions at the time of the violations. And the remand, including the photos, would
provide more information on the condition of those lots, as far as whether they were cleared and left that way at the time of the violations.

And that was -- my understanding -- what the Board wanted was more information on ownership and the status of the lots.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Board Member Busby, I think you hit the nail on the head.

These are 100 acre subdivisions with multiple property owners, and so when the notice of violation was sent out citing home building construction with an attached inspection report with a set of photographs, those are the violations.

And the remand was to determine, based on those alleged violations, whether Copper Ridge or Reflections was the owner/operator with respect to those violations. Now we've ballooned out into a larger universe of property and alleged violations that we're looking for.

And we can't go back in time and collect evidence and talk to witnesses. The alleged violations are what they were alleged as supported
by the violation letters with the attached inspection report, and that set of photographs, and those are the ones that we've been talking about through six years of litigation, including the last hearing; and that the Board did on this in December, and again in February.

And on the remand what we were confronted with was an entirely new different set of violations, and that's why our first reaction was to file a motion in limine because it's improper, and they were properly excluded.

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

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this
is Chris. I have one for Ms. Bowers.
CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: -- argues with
considerable force $I$ think that these four photographs depict -- (inaudible) -- to the violations that are described in the notice of violation which $I$ think is Exhibit 2 ; is that right?

MS. BOWERS: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Each one of these four photographs before me -- and again, I don't
happen to have these in front of me, I don't think -- can explain the violations that are described in Exhibit 2.

MS. BOWERS: I'm digging for Exhibit 2.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I think the elements of the various violations seem to be on Page 2.

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board. On Page 2 of DEQ Exhibit 2, the inspector describes his facility site review, and he talks about what he observed and documented, and one of his first bullets, $I$ guess it's actually the second bullet on that page, he says, "Active construction is occurring throughout the facility site. Construction activities include clearing, excavation, stockpiling, grading, and construction of single family homes."

So the photographs at the northern end of the subdivision show clearing, excavation, there are stockpiles, and there is grading.

He also talks about, in the last bullet on that page, he talks about sediment observed in streets, and he talks about sediments on Western Bluffs Way. He talks about ground disturbance and potential pollutant sources; that's on Page 3.

And he's talking more about the entire site. His photographs are attached as some examples of what he's observing.

So in answer to your question, $I$ think the excluded photographs show examples of lots that have been disturbed by construction activity within the subdivisions.

MS. MARQUIS: May I respond?
CHAIR DEVENY: Yes. Go ahead, Ms.
Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a little bit different than -- What the Department has told you today is a little bit different than the testimony that we had at the hearing in June.

For example, Mr. Dan Freedland testified that the fact -- this is on Page 18 of the transcript, quote, "The factual portions of this letter of the violations are on the second page, and $I$ identified during the compliance evaluation the conditions that were identified and documented. There is six bullet points, including the first one," end quote.

And he's talking about those bullet points that Ms. Bowers directed you to on Page 2
of the violation letter.
Now, Ms. Bowers told you that the disputed photos would support that first bullet comment of, "Active construction is occurring throughout the facility site. Construction activities include clearing, excavation, stockpiling, grading, and construction of single family homes."

On Page 19 of the transcript, $M r$.
Freedland was asked specifically about that first bullet point, and on Page 20 , he was asked which photographs pertain to that allegation, and his answer, quote, "I didn't have photographs specifically for the first bullet point."

DEQ has also directed you to the bullet point at the bottom of that page. There are sub-bullet points under there that refer to specific photographs that were attached to the inspection report. We don't disagree that we were on notice with those specific photographs to support that allegation, but not any others. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Bowers, do you have a response to that?

MS. BOWERS: Well, in regard to Dan's
testimony, he was asked about photographs attached to his inspection report, which would not have included the excluded photos.

MR. HAYES: Madam Chair, if $I$ might add.
DEQ isn't required when we issue a Notice of Violation to actually attach evidence to the Notice of Violation. What we're required to do is provide a narrative that describes the provision or statute or rule that's being violated, and then notice of the factual content of the violation.

When we issued the Notice of Violation for this action, we went beyond that, and we actually attached some photographs to support those violations, but we're not limited to those photographs. Otherwise we'll never attach evidence or photographs to a violation letter if we're confined to just that evidence.

And $I$ think the Board member hit it on the head, in that those six bullet points, if you read them, they're actually separate violations, and the first one is, "Active construction is occurring throughout the facility site.

Construction activities include clearing, excavation, stockpiling, grading, and construction of single family homes."

Copper Ridge has tried to narrow our notice and say that it was just based on construction of family homes, but that's clearly not the case when you look at the first violation cited in this violation letter, when it talks about construction activity, defines it partially as including construction of single homes, but is much broader and goes to clearing, excavating, stockpiling, grading, and construction of single family homes.

For that succinct violation, we did not attach any photographs because we weren't required to do so.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'll give Ms. Marquis another minute if you'd like to respond, and then I'm going to have the Board go on and take some action here so we can move forward.

MS. MARQUIS: The statutes 75-5-611 and 75-5-617 require the Department to put the alleged violator on notice, including on notice of the facts that support the alleged violation. These are the facts that the Department presented.

The testimony that we heard in June was that Mr. Freedland didn't have photographs to support that first alleged violation. Now the

Department is coming back and saying, "Oh, wait a minute. These photographs do support the first alleged violation."

They're in a completely different location and different area of the subdivision. We were never put on notice of those. Our argument has been and will remain that there's no way to collect penalties for those violations because they were not properly noticed.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Do Board members have any further discussion, or questions, comments, suggestions for what to do today?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this
is Chris. May I follow up with Ms. Bowers?
CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Ms. Bowers, Mr.
Freedland -- (inaudible) -- violation have in mind the conditions that were shown in these four photographs? These four photographs as evidence at that time?

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten. He took the four excluded photographs at the time of his inspection. He didn't include them with the violation letter -- I'm kind of trying to get into his mind and reasoning -- but when $I$ talked to
him, he told me he was more concerned about showing discharges to State waters, and he wasn't as concerned about the northern end of the subdivision. But he did make the observations on the northern end of the subdivision. He did take the photos on the day of his inspection.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: And if we remand this matter for further proceedings, and direct the Hearing Examiner to admit these exhibits, do you have testimony that will tie the conditions that are shown in these exhibits to the discharge of storm water to State waters?

MS. BOWERS: I believe we can make that connection.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Would you make a brief offer of proof and tell me what that testimony is.

MS. BOWERS: Well, I guess at this point in time, Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board, I would rely on the Hearing Examiner's previous determinations that a storm event, ten year storm event in 24 hours -- I think that's a quarter of an inch in 24 hours. I might be wrong -- but a storm event of that magnitude would cause a discharge. And if there were a storm event on
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bare lots that are upgradient from State waters, that discharge could make its way to State waters and impact state waters.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: And these four photographs depict lots that were owned by Copper Ridge at the time of the inspection?

MS. BOWERS: Owned by Reflections.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm using Copper
Ridge as --
MS. BOWERS: Right.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any other comments from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: How do we want to proceed? Do we want to take any action on the motion in limine?

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, could I respond to the last exchange between Board Member Tweeten and DEQ briefly?

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay.
MS. MARQUIS: Let's not forget that those lots are in the third filing of Reflections, which had a storm water general permit in effect at the time. So whatever discharges occurred
wouldn't be an unpermitted discharge.
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Comments from
Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Is there a movement to take action on the motion in limine?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Or do we want to just go back and review the whole record?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: One of our lawyers should make the motion.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Chris.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I think we've moved far enough to make a decision one way or another on the motion in limine, and it is a hard decision. I understand. I think it's a close question.

Candidly $I$ don't feel as strongly about it now as $I$ did an hour ago, but I'd be curious to hear what some of the other Board members might think about the importance of these photographs, and whether their admission or rejection actually makes a difference in this case, and just what they think -- $I$ hate to be the only one out there on record on this at this point, and I'm absolutely susceptible to having my mind changed here, but I'd like to hear some discussion from some of my colleagues about what they think about this issue.

CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Chris, I want your thoughts on this. But if those photographs are simply of an area that's covered under an existing, or was covered under an existing permit, I'm not sure they're relevant.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I just want to respond to you, Chris, and build on what Dexter said.

My understanding is that the issue of whether those alleged discharges occurred under an existing permit is disputed between the parties, and so $I$ don't feel that these four photographs are dispositive either way, but I also don't feel comfortable with the level of evidence that we have before us on that issue.

So I guess what $I$ would like to see is to have those photos admitted, and see what the parties can come up with in addition on the issue
of "A," land ownership, and "B," whether the existing discharge permit that was still in effect at that time actually covered the areas from which that sediment was coming.

CHAIR DEVENY: Sarah, did you have a comment?

MS. CLERGET: I just want clarification, because how you would like that to fit into the violations as they're alleged, so where you think that evidence should go. Is it under the four violations? Does that make sense?

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Uh-huh.
MS. CLERGET: Because if you're
remanding it, $I$ want to be sure that $I$ understand why you're remanding it, $I$ get the remand correct for what you want additional evidence for. And so which of those violations potentially that evidence could go under would be helpful.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Well, I think -and I may be not be correct here -- but I believe that it would be violation 2 and potentially Violation 3 , if we're talking about an area that is arguably, as DEQ argued, outside of the disturbance zone for a discharge.

And I do understand that there is legal
disagreement as to whether the disturbance zone is the relevant area to be looking at, or if the permit in fact covers all of the lot area. I think that's a question of fact that $I$ have not been convinced on either way. That's what's making me fundamentally uneasy with coming to a decision on this.

CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I would also like to see whether DEQ can identify the exact properties that the runoff came off of, because this is split ownership, and it is not an easy split. Because if it did not come off of their property, then the violation does not belong to them. It's that simple. If it came of off their property, that's another conversation and another thing.

I don't know if Sarah can determine that, but $I$ think DEQ, to write a violation letter, needs to be able to identify who belongs to the land.

MS. CLERGET: I guess I have another question. Again, $I$ 'm trying to understand if this is coming back, so $I$ make sure that you guys get what it is that you want on potential remand.

So Violation 2 is for discharges without a permit. The discharge -- and please, parties, if I'm getting this wrong, please correct me. But I believe that the permit that Copper Ridge and Reflections got was to essentially solve that unpermitted discharge, so there was never -- or at least in my understanding that there was no permitted discharge of the permit that you're discussing.

So if my understanding is flawed, and there is -- we need evidence about the permit that you're talking about, which is not the permit that cured the unpermitted discharge. Does that make sense? So in December they're charged with unpermitted discharge in Violation 2, so they're required to get a permit. The permit that they get is the permit in December of 2013, December 23rd, 2013, which cures the unpermitted discharge.

So there is no --
And DEQ needs to correct me if I'm wrong on this. But $I$ don't think the allegation has ever been that the unpermitted discharge was unpermitted based on the permit existing and the disturbance area in that existing permit in two thousand -- the one that was noticed, the
termination in 2014 .
So they may need to correct me if I'm wrong, but that's why I'm asking about Violation 2, because if you want to remand and you want more information about the permit that terminated in 2014 in the northern section of the subdivision, $I$ need to be sure and get that evidence in.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: And maybe it is entirely possible $I$ have this wrong as well. I mean $I$ referred to the permit number just because I believe this is the one I'm talking about, and the parties can verify that.

My understanding is that MTR104993 which was actually issued to CMG Construction, but that's the permit that addressed road building, and utilities, and related issues, and that is the one that was actually in effect at the time of the storm event.

What is not clear to me is whether the discharges that $D E Q$ is alleging came from an area covered by that permit, as Reflections alleges, or whether they in fact came from outside of the permitted area, which would mean that they are a violation under 75-5-605(2) (c).

MS. CLERGET: So the permit that they
got to cover the unpermitted discharge was 105376 ; have I got that right?

MS. MARQUIS: That's right.
MS. CLERGET: So that's not the permit that you're talking about, just to be clear for the record.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Correct.
MS. CLERGET: So the evidence that you want on remand is whether there were unpermitted discharges with respect to --

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: -- 104993.
MS. CLERGET: Is that right?
BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Yes. And just to clarify, the real issue is whether the discharges that are alleged by DEQ fell within that permit, in which case they're off the hook; or whether they didn't. And there is argument, $I$ heard extensive argument today about the area of disturbance covered by that permit, as well as like the entire -- I can't remember the terminology, but basically the project area covered by the permit.

And I would love to know which of those two is relevant for determining if a violation occurred, and once we know that, to see if there
is evidence on where the violation came from. In other words, was it within that permit area, or they were allowed to discharge, or was it not? Because to me, that seems like the hub of the issue. Maybe I'm missing something, but that seems like the crux of it.

MS. MARQUIS: If $I$ could just briefly.
CHAIR DEVENY: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, members of the Board. I appreciate the concern and the level of interest in that permit. I have to again raise this objection on behalf of my client. We're greatly prejudiced by having to go back and gather evidence and testimony about a permit that was terminated five years ago. Are any of the people who managed that permit still available to come as witnesses? What kind of documents still exist? We have no idea.

Again, we weren't put on notice that any of the permits were subject to questioning in this enforcement action until May of this year. And so we can do what we can, but we're prejudiced in this regard, and that is exactly why we filed the motion in limine to keep those photographs out, to keep that area of the subdivision out, because it
wasn't appropriately noticed. It was covered by a permit. They've never alleged that there were any problems with the permit.

And so that's the prejudice to us and the detriment that we will have if this goes back on remand in that regard.

CHAIR DEVENY: David.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I'm probably more confused than anyone in the room, but $I$ think it would be helpful to have -- I think there is confusion about what permits covered what areas when, and where the photographs were allegedly taken.

And we have yet to see a large view of the subdivision, the Copper Ridge and Reflections Subdivision, with the permit areas outlined with a chronology, with the alleged locations of the photographs clearly delineated. And for someone like me, that would be extremely helpful.

CHAIR DEVENY: Other questions, comments from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Do we want to proceed with the remand? And do we first need to address the motion in limine? Not being an attorney, I'm
not quite sure how to proceed, and would greatly appreciate suggestions from Chris and Melissa.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. I hate to keep doing this, but $I$ think we are having trouble keeping track. Could I ask another question of Ms. Bowers, please?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: In the Hearing
Examiner proposed -- (inaudible) -- in this matter, she found that with respect to Violations 2 and 3 -- (inaudible) -- was not an owner/operator.

CHAIR DEVENY: I think we lost a little bit of what you said there, Chris. In respect to Violations 2 and 3 what?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm having trouble getting my question organized. Just a question this way. What -- (inaudible) -- do the photographs have on the question of whether Reflections was an owner/operator?

MS. BOWERS: So Board Member Tweeten, are you asking if the -- what effect on Violations 2 and 3 if Copper Ridge and Reflections are not owner/operators?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: No, I'm just --
(inaudible) -- owner/operator -- (inaudible) -CHAIR DEVENY: We're not hearing you, Chris.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: -- the
owner/operator issue.
CHAIR DEVENY: We can't hear you. It is kind of just garbled.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Let me try again.
Is this better?
CHAIR DEVENY: Yes, I believe so.
BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I guess the
question, basic question for me is: Why are these photographs relevant to the owner/operator question that was before the Hearing Examiner on remand?

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Tweeten, members of the Board. The photos are relevant in that they show the condition of lots that were owned by Reflections during the time of the violations.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. Madam Chair, just for discussion purposes, I'm going to, just to get the matter on the floor, move it off of dead zero here, I'm going to move that the Board -- (inaudible) -- Hearing Examiner abused
her discretion -- (inaudible) -- the motion in limine with respect to the four photographs that are identified in -- (inaudible) -- exceptions.

CHAIR DEVENY: There is a motion before the Board. Is there a second? Were you not through, Chris, with your motion?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: -- motion and remand the matter.

CHAIR DEVENY: I'm sorry, Chris, but we lost you.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Okay. I'm back. Can you hear me now?

CHAIR DEVENY: Could you state your motion for us one more time.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I move that the Board find that the Hearing Examiner abused her discretion with respect to the four photographs as exceptions in DEQ's bill of exceptions, and that the Board remand this matter to the Hearing Examiner for further proceedings to take additional evidence with respect to the subject matter depicted by these four exhibits, determine the extent to which any of that is relevant to contested issues in this matter, and to issue a report back to the Board via the findings and
conclusions, and the proposed order that's currently before the Board need to be changed, and if so, in what respect.

CHAIR DEVENY: We're getting your motion written down and put up on the board so everybody can read it.

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Great.
MS. CLERGET: So Chris, I'm just going to read this to you. This is what we got as your motion. Tell me if this is right.

Member Tweeten moved to find that the Hearing Examiner abused her discretion in regard to the motion in limine's four photographs, and that the matter be remanded back to the Hearing Examiner to take additional evidence and issue new proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. That's a slight restatement of your motion, I guess. How do you want us to edit that so it's --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, not exactly a match here, because I'm not convinced that additional evidence is even necessary. I think the parties ought to be offered the opportunity to submit whatever additional evidence they want to submit, and Sarah can then review it, and
determine -- I guess to put it most basically -whether it makes any difference.

I don't think Sarah needs to make additional findings and conclusions in the event that $D E Q$ gets its way, and gets to put these photographs into evidence, and say whatever it is they want to say about them; and then Copper Ridge and Reflections gets to put in their evidence, and it all turns out to be a tempest in a teapot, and it doesn't really have anything to do with the question of who's an owner/operator with respect to these discharges, or any other contested issue that might be in the case at that point.

I don't want to tie Sarah's hands and make her go through an unnecessary exercise of issuing different findings if, in her judgment, they don't make any difference. I just want to get the evidence in the record, get all of the evidence from both sides as to that subject matter, and cover the questions that Melissa talked about in her comment, and explain to us why these photographs make it more likely that Copper Ridge and Reflections was responsible for this storm water discharge.

And $I$ don't think there is any question
that a storm water discharge occurred. But was Copper Ridge the responsible party -- and I use that term broadly. Was Copper Ridge the responsible party, or were the properties that Copper Ridge still owns at the time of the discharge not contributing factors in the fact that the discharge happened.

And for sake of fairness and completeness, let these documents in, hear what the parties have to say about them, and then I would leave it to Sarah's discretion to decide what, if any, additional changes need to be made to her proposed order as it stands today. That's my motion. Massage the language that's on the Board accordingly.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Chris, did you suggest that she review the additional evidence and then report back or provide a memo of some sort to the Board with regard to whether it's relevant and probative, or did I mishear that?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I think I said that. I'm not sure it's what $I$ meant however.

If she makes the determination that this evidence isn't probative with respect to any contested issues, $I$ think she could send a memo to
the Board to that effect along with the resubmission of her existing order.

If on the other hand -- (inaudible) -then she ought to provide us with modified proposed findings, conclusions, and a proposed order, taking into account whatever probative value these photographs have. Does that make sense?

CHAIR DEVENY: Is anybody getting -- you guys look a little confused over there. We're trying to come up with a motion.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: I have a question.
CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter has a question for you, Chris.

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Chris, are you looking for her to just look at the photographs, or are you thinking if there is other evidence out there from either side, that that should be brought in also?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Dexter, I think that she ought to look at the photographs, whatever additional evidence, the photographs, and the general subject matter of the photographs that DEQ would have offered had the photographs been admitted in the first place; and then whatever
rebuttal evidence Copper Ridge and Reflections has. So we basically complete the record with respect to the matter that's depicted in the photographs.

Because $I$ understand both sides to have told us that they have other evidence out there with respect to this property on the north end of the subdivision, and they didn't present it because the motion in limine was granted and the photographs were excluded, and that if the photographs were admitted, there would have been other evidence surrounding the photographs that would have come in as well, and $I$ think all of that should be in the record.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead, Sarah, and see if Chris --

MS. CLERGET: I guess I'm trying to get clarity here. Chris, $I$ know you're thinking as you're going. So do you want me to collect the evidence and then present you with the evidence, so that you can weigh the evidence, or do you want me to collect the evidence, and then weigh both the relevance -- which would determine the admissibility -- and then the ultimate question of whether or not Copper Ridge and Reflections are
the owner/operator and/or committed the violations alleged?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Well, $I$ want you to be the Hearing Examiner. That's what that means is -- what that means to me is that --

MS. CLERGET: So I think what I've got here --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Let me finish.
Maybe this will help. I mean you receive the case back from us on remand; you pretend that the way -- and the photographs have been admitted. We're going to have a half day hearing on such and such a date. I want to hear everything you've got on the general subject on these photographs that you would have introduced at the hearing in June had the photographs been in evidence.
-- (inaudible) -- in front of you, it seems to me you do one of two things. One, you can say, "None of this makes any difference with respect to what $I$ found in my earlier proposed -my earlier findings and conclusions and proposed order," in which case you send us a memo to that effect; or you send a supplemental proposed findings, conclusions, and a supplemental proposed order, explaining what difference this new
evidence makes with respect to what you decided before. Does that --

MS. CLERGET: I'm trying to write that in so we can rewrite your motion here, so everybody is clear what they're voting on.

So one is: If the additional evidence changes the findings of fact or conclusions of law in the $F O F C O L$, and then if so, submit a modified FOFCOL, and if not, then a memo to that effect; is that right?

So the entire, what I've got written here is: Member Tweeten moved to find that the Hearing Examiner abused her discretion with regard to the four photographs excluded by the motion in limine.

And that the matter be remanded back to the Hearing Examiner to take additional evidence regarding the photographs from $D E Q$ and REF, and determine that -- sorry -- from DEQ and Reflections and Copper Ridge, and determine, one, if the additional evidence changes the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in the FOFCOL; two, if so, submit modified Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law; and three, if not, then submit a memo to that effect. Does that --

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: Yes, I think you've got it.

MS. CLERGET: Okay. So does somebody want to put that in a motion?

BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Chris did.
MS. CLERGET: So are we are clear that's your motion that everybody is voting on is what $I$ just read?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I'm clear. I can't speak for anybody else.

MS. CLERGET: Then if everybody is clear, we need a second.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Second.
CHAIR DEVENY: It's been moved and seconded. Is everybody clear on what we're voting on? Hillary, how about you?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I've got it.
CHAIR DEVENY: I'm sorry. Did you get it?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: Still alive and I got it.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Good.
MR. HAYES: Madam Chair.
CHAIR DEVENY: Let's have some
discussion on the motion before us from Board
members.
BOARD MEMBER BUSBY: Just one quick
thought. Whether $I$ think it is irrelevant or not, this will solve that problem from all of us, I think, and let's just move forward on it.

CHAIR DEVENY: David.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Maybe this isn't the best time to make this request, but $I$ would ask that we get a single map of the subdivision or subdivisions -- depending on how you define $C R$ and REF -- and have the appurtenant areas outlined and whatnot, so we can reference the maps or the map when we get together again. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Would that have to do with the No. D in the motion in limine?

MS. CLERGET: Maybe. That would be up to the parties, I think, as to whether that's how they would want to do that. It's up to them how they present their evidence. So it could be through "D," or it could be through existing evidence. I don't know.

CHAIR DEVENY: But if we don't change on that in the motion in limine, this still stands?

MS. CLERGET: So the way the motion is worded right now, it just relates to the four
photographs. So if it needs be changed, then we need to change it.

CHAIR DEVENY: Because right now it says, "DEQ will not be permitted to use or enter documents including maps based on, derived from, and created with information from the photographs."

MS. CLERGET: We could say "additional evidence regarding the photographs --" Sorry. I'm modifying this motion, so somebody is going to have to --

CHAIR DEVENY: I will move to modify Chris's motion to include the addition of maps.

MS. CLERGET: So I've got that modification right, it now reads -- this is going to be your motion, so "Chair Deveny moved to find that the Hearing Examiner abused her discretion with regard to the four photographs included by the motion in limine, and that the matter be remanded back to the Hearing Examiner to take additional evidence regarding the photographs, to include maps created from the photographs." That doesn't make any sense. So "Additional evidence regarding photographs from DEQ --" that makes more sense -- "and Copper Ridge
and Reflections to include maps created from the photographs." Does that work, Chris?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes. Is there a second to my addition to the motion?

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I would second it.

MR. HAYES: Madam Chair, may I request a clarification?

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead.
MR. HAYES: There has also been some interest expressed in regard to evidence regarding what areas were covered by the specific permit MT104993. And I don't know if this needs to be read broad enough to include that, or another motion needs to be made that the evidentiary hearing also include evidence on that matter, which is what $I$ think Board members have voiced.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: I think David also had mentioned something about seeing the permit areas depicted.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Correct. CHAIR DEVENY: David had also asked that, Mr. Hayes. Thank you. Sarah, did you hear that?

MS. CLERGET: Yes. Do you mean the
areas permitted by 910 ?
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I'm thinking all
of the permits that were issued, because it is a little bit confusing what areas were covered by the permits.

MS. CLERGET: Okay. So this, for purposes of the record, this says that the motion is "abused her discretion with regard to the four photographs excluded by the motion in limine, and that the matter be remanded back to the Hearing Examiner to take additional evidence regarding the photographs from DEQ and Copper Ridge and Reflections to include maps created from the photographs, and maps of the areas covered by the permits, and determine, one, if the additional evidence changes the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in the FOFCOL; two, if so, submit a modified FOFCOL; and three, if not, then submit a memo to that effect.

That's not my best English, but does that appropriately reflect the motion as it stands? Everybody is nodding. You have to actually say something for the record.

CHAIR DEVENY: I think it does. I'm not hearing anybody say that it doesn't.

MR. LEHNHERR: From my standpoint. What about Chris?

CHAIR DEVENY: Chris, you're okay with that?

BOARD MEMBER TWEETEN: I think so.
MS. CLERGET: So I think it was your motion. We need a second. Or your amendment. Sorry.

CHAIR DEVENY: Let's vote on the amendment to the original motion, which was to add the information about the photographs being -creating the maps, and the photograph evidence. So all in favor of the amendment to the motion, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, the motion passes. Is there any further discussion on the motion before the Board?

MS. CLERGET: So the amendment passed, but you need to vote on the original motion.

CHAIR DEVENY: That's what we're getting ready to do. I called for more discussion, just in case somebody has second thoughts. Hearing
none, we need to vote on the motion before us. MS. CLERGET: Chris Tweeten moved the original motion, Chris Deveny moved the amendment. Second were David.

CHAIR DEVENY: All those in favor of the motion before the Board, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: All those opposed, nay.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: The motion carries. So is there any further work that we need to do on this today?

MS. CLERGET: Just to be clear for the record, $I$ guess, essentially the matter that the -- Well, no.

CHAIR DEVENY: So then $I$ think, Sarah, you had an update for --

MS. CLERGET: This is the Board Counsel update, under the main agenda.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you today to the parties for your efforts.

MS. CLERGET: Wait. Actually I have one scheduling thing before the parties go somewhere. So do you want the remanded portion of this -- do you want to schedule a special meeting to do that, or do you want to do this and Montinore at the October meeting?

Oh, sorry. And Vicki can't do that because she's Counsel for both Montinore and Copper Ridge, and it will kill her. So can we have a special meeting?

CHAIR DEVENY: Why don't you find out when some dates would be for a special meeting that would fit everybody's summer schedule, and we'll try to do that.

MS. CLERGET: When would you like to aim for that? Do you want it before the October meeting? Do you want it in September? Do you want it in November? Because we may have other things coming in.

CHAIR DEVENY: What are people's schedules?

MS. CLERGET: And then the reason $I$ want to do this with the parties because they're going to need to hear the schedule, and they may need to be heard on the schedule, so $I$ want to make sure everybody's on the same page.

BOARD MEMBER HORNBEIN: Do you want to
consult Counsel for the parties first, because their time commitment is going to be greater than
ours in terms of an additional hearing and preparing documents.

MS. CLERGET: I think it would be most helpful for me if we could do some of that here, so you guys can tell me whether you want it before or after.

CHAIR DEVENY: Later in September.
MS. CLERGET: The parties, is that possible?

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I'd like to do it before, so we don't forget everything we've talked about today and get it confused with a new case.

CHAIR DEVENY: Hillary, we missed the first part of what you said.

BOARD MEMBER HANSON: I said I vote for before so that we don't forget everything we heard today, and before we get it confused with a new case.

CHAIR DEVENY: So before the October meeting? Are people okay with that?

MS. MARQUIS: Madam Chair, to be honest, my schedule is full until the next meeting. I'm not entirely sure the scope of effort that this is going to require, but $I$ know the remaining issues on my plate between now and October.

MS. CLERGET: December.
MS. MARQUIS: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN DEVENY: I think it might work best, Sarah, for you to work with the attorneys, try find two or three dates, and then --

MS. CLERGET: Are you guys going to be okay if it doesn't happen until November?

CHAIR DEVENY: It would be nice to have it done sooner, but if we can't fit it in, it's just the way it is.

MS. CLERGET: Thank you guys.
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you very much, parties.
(The proceedings were concluded at 4:35 p.m. )
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