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CHAIR DEVENY: I believe it's 9:00, so I think we'll go ahead and get started. I'm Chris Deveny, and for the record, I'm Chair of the Board of Environmental Review, and today we're hosting this meeting of the Board via Zoom because of the COVID-19. So that's the technology we're using.

Before we do roll call, Deb Sutliff is our interim Board secretary, and she has a few housekeeping rules she wants to tell everybody. She'll be running the technology today. Go ahead, Deb.

MS. SUTLIFF: Well, at this point we're just -- I'm at a loss for words. We've got a lot of people connecting today, so please keep your microphones muted, and we will call on you as the topics come up. We'll have everybody introduce themselves once we've done roll call, so that we have kind of an idea who is on the phone, as well as connected to the zoom.

CHAIR DEVENY: So Deb, I was told that you were going to ask people to enter their names into Chat, so you could kind of do that, make that an easier way to do attendance of various people from the phone and on Zoom.

MS. SUTLIFF: Absolutely. Yes. Thank you. If you could, please chat your name, let me know who you are on the phone, send me a quick chat. That would be great. I can see who is connected. We've got a lot of staff, DEQ staff as well. But yes, please send me a chat so we can get you introduced. If you have any questions or concerns, please send it through the chat, and we'll address your questions upon the appropriate time.

MR. MATHIEUS: Chris, this is George. I'd just add that since we are assuming that some people are on a cell phone and are not on Zoom via computer, if you're on the computer, send your name and we will read those off.

If you're only on a cell phone, we'll call on you, and we'll mention -- I think usually what it shows is like the last three or four digits of your cell phone number. I don't know if there are people today who are on a cell phone group only. If there are, that's how we'll get through the roll call.

MS. CLERGET: There are, George.

MR. MATHIEUS: Clear as mud?
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Let's go ahead and have the roll call then, Deb, please.

MS. SUTLIFF: All right. Chris Deveny.
CHAIR DEVENY: Here.
MS. SUTLIFF: David Lehnherr.
MR. LEHNHERR: Here.
MS. SUTLIFF: Dexter Busby.
MR. BUSBY: I'm here.
MS. SUTLIFF: John DeArment.
MR. DEARMENT: Here.
MS. SUTLIFF: Chris Tweeten.
MR. TWEETEN: Here.
MS. SUTLIFF: Jerry Lynch.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Jerry, we didn't hear you. I see your face there. Can you check in?
(No response)
MS. SUTLIFF: Jerry, I see your camera.
I'm not seeing a connection as far as audio.
There we go. We do see Jerry. I don't hear him, but I do see him. Let's continue on with Hillary Hanson.

MS. HANSON: Here.
CHAIR DEVENY: Welcome Board members.

Jerry, have you figured out your audio yet? (No response)

CHAIR DEVENY: Well, hopefully Jerry will get that figured out. In the meantime let's go ahead then, and have introductions of our legal folks, and then $D E Q$.

MS. CLERGET: This is Sarah Clerget, and I'm Board attorney working for the AG's office. CHAIR DEVENY: Is Aleisha on?

MS. SOLEM: This is Aleisha Solem, I'm paralegal with the DOJ Agency Legal Services Bureau.

CHAIR DEVENY: Let's go to DEQ. George, go ahead and start.

MR. MATHIEUS: Good morning. My name is George Mathieus. I'm the Deputy Director for DEQ, and the Board liaison for the Department.

MR. DAVIS: Good morning. This is Tim
Davis. I'm the Water Quality Division
Administrator at DEQ.
MS. COLAMARIA: This is Angie Colamaria, Chief Counsel, DEQ.

MS. KELLY: This is Myla Kelly with the Water Quality Standards and Modeling Section.

MR. ANDERSON: This is Chad Anderson
with the Enforcement Program.
MR. MOSER: This is Kurt Moser with DEQ Legal.

MS. CHRISTOPHERSON: Sarah
Christopherson with DEQ Legal.
MS. BOWERS: Kirsten Bowers, DEQ Legal.
MR. SUPLEE: Mike Suplee, Water Quality
Standards and Modeling Section, DEQ.
MS. SULLIVAN: Lauren Sullivan, Water
Quality Standards Section, DEQ.
MS. FORTMAN: Kristy Fortman, Watershed Protection Section, DEQ.

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

MR. LARGE: This is Keith Large with Federal Superfund and Construction --

CHAIR DEVENY: Keith, $I$ don't think we got your title. Could you speak up again.

MR. LARGE: Sorry about that. I'm State Project Officer with the Federal Superfund and Construction Bureau.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Any other DEQ people?

MR. MATHIEUS: Madam Chair, this is
George. I see that Galen Steffens is on. It
looks like she's maybe struggling to connect to audio.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay.
MR. MATHIEUS: She's the Water Quality Bureau Chief in the Water Quality Division.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other DEQ staff?
MS. HINZ: This is Emily Hinz from the Coal Section, DEQ.

CHAIR DEVENY: Are there any members of the general public on Zoom that would check in with their name?

MS. CHRISTENSEN: This is Amy
Christensen, I'm an attorney with Christensen and Prezeau, and $I$ represent the Board.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Amy. Sorry I forgot you.

MR. RYAN-AYLWARD: This is Michele Ryan-Aylward. I'm with BC Ministry of Environment, British Columbia.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you. Any other members of the public or anybody we may have missed that's on Zoom?

MS. JOHNSON: Tammy Johnson with the Montana Mining Association is on the phone.

MS. JACOBSEN: This is Nancy Jacobsen,

I'm with the Big Creek Coalition, the Moudy Pit No. 2949 Appellant.

MS. TRANK: Peggy Trank with Treasure State Resources Association.

CHAIR DEVENY: Anybody else?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Thank you. So
with that, we'll move on. Jerry, did you get your audio to work?
(No response)
MS. CLERGET: I don't see him on.
CHAIR DEVENY: He's on. His video is on. Jerry, could you raise your hand if you can hear us? Deb, maybe you could give Jerry a call, and we can get him just to call in on his cell phone.

MR. LYNCH: I just did that. I just got on. I had technical difficulties, so $I$ used the phone. Can you hear me?

CHAIR DEVENY: Good to have you on. All right.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: So Deb, is there a way you can set it up so that just the Board members are visible, at least to me, and maybe George and

Sarah for sure. I'd also to like remind people, because we are recording this, and we have a Court Reporter as well, that it's very helpful for everybody if people state their name before they speak. Okay.

So Board members, you have received the minutes of the April 17 th meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to those minutes?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any additions or corrections? If not, I'll move that we approve the minutes of the April 17 th Board meeting.

MR. DEARMENT: This is John DeArment. I'll second.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, John. Is there any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, all those in favor of approving the minutes, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any Board members that are opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, the motion
passes to approve the minutes. At this point, I guess if there's any public comment on the minutes, $I$ should open that up as well.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, we'll move on. Sarah, could you please give us an update on our cases. And just for your information, there's three cases where $I$ will be calling on our outside Counsel Amy Christensen for updates, so Amy is on standby ready for that. So Sarah, go ahead.

MS. CLERGET: So briefing items, it
looks like $A(1)(a)$ first is Copper Ridge. As you guys know, this has been remanded three times now back to me. This update requires a split between me and Amy, so I'm only updating on the contested case portion of it.

So as you can see from your agenda, there was a motion filed on February -- I ruled on a motion to sever the cases on February 21 st. That motion to sever cases is now something Amy will talk to you about.

After that, on April 23 rd I issued an order requesting that the parties indicate whether they wanted a stay based on the appeal of that order denying the sever. The parties indicated
that they did not want a stay pending the District Court action, so we are proceeding with the contested case simultaneous to the District Court action.

The Copper Ridge/Reflections filed a motion in limine and a motion for summary judgment. An update from your agenda, I have now ruled on the motion in limine and denied it. The motion for summary judgment is not yet fully briefed. I've given them an amended scheduling order on May 27 th -- or sorry -- DEQ moved for an amended scheduling order on May 27 th. I denied that motion, so we are proceeding with summary judgment, which will be fully briefed shortly, and then $I$ have to issue a decision on that.

Amy, you're up.
MS. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you. So we found out about this petition for judicial review right after the last Board meeting, and it presents many of the same issues as another case that $I$ 'm working on, the one involving the Rosebud Mine.

And in that case there's -- and I'll talk about this later -- but the main issue that I'm dealing with is this question of whether or
not the Board should be a party to that case.
This petition presents that same issue, and so rather than going ahead and filing a motion to dismiss like we did in the other case to get the Board out, we have gotten an extension in order give the Montana Supreme Court some time to rule on that issue. So right now our responsive pleading is due on July $31 s t$, so we're hoping that we'll get some guidance from the Supreme Court before that.

In the meantime we have some issues involving the administrative record that we're working through some disagreement about what should be included in that. It has been transmitted to the District Court. We're working through those issues with Counsel in the case. Aleisha has been awesome in helping us with that, and I'm cautiously optimistic we'll get those issues resolved.

So for now, the case from the District Court side of it is kind of on hold until the Supreme Court rules.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Amy.
MS. CLERGET: Moving on down my list, (b), you've got the Signal Peak Energy notice of
violations. There's two Signal Peak Energy cases. We call this one Signal Peak AO.

On April 30 th, the parties filed a joint status report, and $I$ issued a scheduling order on May 7th. Discovery closes in September 2020 so they're proceeding along that scheduling order.

An update from your agenda. DEQ has a pending motion to dismiss filed early on in this case, which has been sort of pushed down the road, and $I$ just granted Signal Peak an extension to respond to that, which will be fully briefed on June 23rd. So that will be a motion for my decision, once it's fully briefed.

No. 2 in the nonenforcement cases, we have (a), Alpine Pacific Utilities. I issued an amended scheduling order on April 20 th. The parties are proceeding with expert disclosures due at the end of June.
(b) is the City of Great Falls. I issued an amended scheduling order on March 20 th.

Then Calumet Montana Refining, LLC,
filed a motion to file, for permission to file a brief amicus curiae, which means "a friend of the Court," and I issued an order -- that was opposed. I issued an order partially already granting their
request to file an amicus brief on May 18 th. Other than that, they're proceeding according to the scheduling order, and they're in discovery right now.
(c) is Westmoreland Absaloka Mine. This has been under a motion to stay for awhile. They will have to file an update on June 24 th, so I will get more information at that point.
(d) is Montanore Minerals. As you guys probably remember, this has been stayed pending -The District Court ruled in a separate action that affected our case. That's gone up to the Supreme Court, and so the contested case is stayed pending that decision from the Supreme Court, which is now fully briefed and just awaiting decision.
(e) is Talen, Major Facilities Siting

Act. This one there was a motion to stay or a motion for a scheduling order, and then also a motion to vacate that were pending. I issued an order on all of those, denying the motion to vacate which was essentially a motion to dismiss. And then $I$ also granted and denied in part the motion for scheduling order.

And we had a scheduling conference on May 15 th. Well, they could have asked for a
scheduling conference on May 15 th. Instead they filed an agreement that they had reached to go forward with the case, so saying that they didn't need a schedule, litigation schedule.

They have a status report due July 1 st. They are going to indicate at that point whether they've reached a final settlement. Absent a final settlement, Talen will inform me that they relinquish the certificate amendment that they challenged in this proceeding, and then they'll complete the relinquishment by August 31 st, or the parties will move to dismiss the proceeding on or before December 30 th . So that was their agreement based on my order.

CHAIR DEVENY: Sarah, do you mean September? I think you said December.

MS. CLERGET: Oh, sorry. Yes, September.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Thank you.
MS. CLERGET: So Spring Creek Coal is the next case. On May 8 th, the parties filed a joint motion to substitute Spring Creek Coal for the Navaho Transitional Energy Company, based on a purchase of Spring Creek Coal. And they also jointly moved to replace Spring Creek Coal as the
permit holder and the party of interest in that case. I granted that motion on May 13 th , and entered an amended scheduling order.

Since then, an update to your agenda, MEIC has filed an unopposed motion to amend the notice of appeal, which $I$ granted on June $9 t h$, so we're proceeding through discovery which ends January of 2021 with that amended notice of appeal filed by MEIC.
(g) is CHS. This is the case that requires the rulemaking on arsenic to be completed before we can continue, so we had a status conference on April 24 th, and $I$ issued an order continuing the stay of this case until September 4th of 2020, pending the rulemaking on the arsenic.
(h) is Laurel Refinery. We consolidated this case with CHS, so its update is the same.
(i) is Signal Peak Energy. This is not the AO case, but the MPDES permit case. First, Amy has an update on the District Court case.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: So that District Court case is now up on appeal to the Montana Supreme Court. The Board has filed a notice of nonparticipation in that case, so we have just
been monitoring it. It has been fully briefed and now just it's awaiting a decision, which $I$ would expect anytime.

MS. CLERGET: Then the contested case continued while the District, and now also Supreme Court case was appealed. They filed a motion in limine in February of 2020 . Oral argument was held on that in March of 2020. It is fully briefed and awaiting my decision. The hearing was rescheduled for August of 2020 , I think it's a three day hearing that's scheduled.

Today we have Rippling Woods Homeowners Association for the Moudy Pit site in Ravalli County. On May $26 t h$, DEQ filed a motion to dismiss, which is not yet fully briefed, so that will be pending my decision once it is.
(k) is Western Energy. We call this Western Energy Area $F$ to distinguish from the other Western Energy cases. The parties have cross-moved for partial summary judgment, and the motions are fully briefed and awaiting my decision.
(1) is Amy.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you. This is a case that we talked about pretty extensively at the last Board meeting. It involves the Rosebud Mine. And we had previously filed a motion to dismiss in front of the District Court arguing that BER should not have been a party to that case. We lost the motion, and so at the last meeting we talked about what we were going to do next.

And a decision was made to see if the Conservation Groups were willing to let us out of the case before we took the issue to the Supreme Court, and if they were not willing to do so, to file a petition for writ of supervisory control to the Montana Supreme Court to address the issue.

We did have some conversations with the Conservation Groups. We weren't successful in convincing them to let us out, so we did file a motion for a writ of supervisory control. We filed that on May 22 nd.

And a writ of supervisory control is considered an extraordinary remedy. They're not automatically granted. It's not like a regular appeal where you ask the Court to consider an issue and they just do. This they have to be convinced to consider the case, really to consider the issue at this point in the case. And they can just dismiss it and say, "We don't think this is an appropriate issue to be considered on supervisory control."

We did overcome that hurdle. The Court has accepted the case, and they have ordered a summary response from the Conservation Groups and the District Court.

The District Courts typically don't respond in these types of situations. The Conservation Groups have thirty days to respond, so their response is due June 29 th, so end of this month. And then $I$ don't know how long it will take to get a response from the Supreme Court.

We likely won't have an opportunity to file a reply brief. It would be unusual if we were granted oral argument. So probably once the Conservation Groups submit their response, it will be submitted for decision.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you for the update, Amy.

MS. CLERGET: The next one $3(a)$ is DEQ. CHAIR DEVENY: DEQ, I didn't see anything in writing in our Board summary. Do you have an oral update on the Western Energy case? MS. BOWERS: Madam Chair, members of the

Board, that case has been remanded to the District Court by the Montana Supreme Court on certain questions of material fact, and the parties are just proceeding under Judge Reynolds' scheduling order. So there's really nothing beyond that. I'll just keep you updated as milestones occur.

CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
Bowers. Let's go on to some DEQ briefing items now. George Mathieus.

MR. MATHIEUS: So thank you, Madam
Chair. We have two briefing items today. One is the conversations we've had at the last Board meeting about our numeric nutrient criteria, so Tim Davis is going to provide an update on that; and then Myla Kelly is providing an update on Lake Kookanusa.

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, members of the Council, would like me to just jump in?

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes. Go ahead, Tim.
MR. DAVIS: Thank you. Again, members of the Council, Madam Chair, my name is Tim Davis. I'm the Water Quality Division Administrator at DEQ. As George indicated, I'm going to give you an update on both the numeric nutrient criteria status in Montana, as well as our nutrient
variance rules.
As I think the Board may be aware, Montana's nutrient variance rules have been challenged in court, so EPA's approval of those rules -- Variances are water quality standards and must be approved by EPA.

So EPA's approval of those Montana variance rules has been tied up in court for the last several years, and Judge Morris is the presiding Judge in Federal District Court on that case.

As a result of his decisions, DEQ adopted revised variance rules in the fall as directed by the Court. EPA disapproved those rules in February of this year, and that disapproval was at least largely based on some Court decisions that occurred after we adopted our rules.

And EPA's disapproval triggered nonseverability provisions that were in the numeric nutrient criteria when a prior BER adopted those numeric nutrient criteria, that effectively said if the general variance was disapproved, then the numeric nutrient criteria go away.

So DEQ has concluded, as well as the
plaintiffs, the Upper Missouri Waterkeepers, in a filing that they filed before Judge Morris, has concluded that the nonseverability provisions in the numeric nutrient criteria are self-executing, that they have been triggered, and so the numeric nutrient criteria are no longer in effect in Montana.

That means that the Department now reverts back to what's known as a narrative standard, so a narrative nutrient standard. And in order to continue to make progress on nutrients, DEQ is working on a variety of short term, medium term, and long term options.

We pulled together the Nutrient Work Group for a meeting on May 21st. That work group was established, and it's really been guiding us through all of our work on nutrients for much of the last ten years. There was around 70 participants in that Nutrient Work Group meeting, so there's a lot of interest in how we're going to proceed.

We got a lot of feedback and questions during that work group meeting, and we're working on responding to that feedback and those questions at this time. And we plan to set up a series of

Nutrient Work Group meetings going forward.
So at this point, the last thing $I$ would say, Madam Chair, members of the Council, is that there has been a challenge. EPA in their disapproval of our variance rules in February, they also adopted the nonseverability provisions and approved them from a prior rulemaking when the numeric nutrient criteria were adopted.

So the Upper Missouri Waterkeepers has challenged EPA's approval of the adoption of those nonseverability provisions, again in front of Judge Morris. DEQ has intervened, has asked to intervene in that case as well.

But at this point, we're planning to engage the stakeholders, continue to make progress on nutrients, work with them in a fairly robust process going forward to address their concerns, and not backslide on protecting Montana's waters from nutrients. So I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR DEVENY: Questions from Board members of Tim Davis?

MR. LEHNHERR: This is --
MR. LYNCH: This is Jerry. Go ahead.
I'm sorry.

CHAIR DEVENY: I don't know who was there first.

MR. LYNCH: I don't know. I'll go first, $I$ guess.

CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead.

MR. LYNCH: This is Jerry Lynch. Could you explain to me, Mr. Davis, the difference between the numeric nutrient standard and the fallback, $I$ guess as you called it, standard that existed before.

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, I didn't catch which Board member that was, but --

CHAIR DEVENY: Jerry Lynch.
MR. DAVIS: Okay. The numeric nutrient criteria, so when the Department does not have a numeric criteria based on the science, there is a narrative process that we can go through, and we had a narrative process in place prior to - - a narrative standard prior to the adoption of the numeric nutrient criteria that we applied, that is applied during the permitting process.

So if someone has a reasonable potential to violate a narrative nutrient standard, then in the permitting process we would apply a permit limit, or narrative permit condition for
nutrients, that's not going to fall back on a statewide numeric number. It's going to be based on more site-specific narrative provisions.

MR. LYNCH: Followup question for my own edification. I obviously understand numeric standards. I don't understand narrative standards. What does that mean?

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair. So I'll give you an example. We're still working through how the narrative standard will be applied in permits at this point. That's part of the conversations that we're having with the Nutrient Work Group.

How we applied the narrative standard previously was if there was an impairment for nutrients in a stream that a discharger was discharging into, then we would put on their permit limits that they could not -- that they had to hold at current performance, or they had to take steps to improve performance of their discharge of nutrients into that source.

So that's an example of if under a TMDL, a total maximum daily load, identified that there was an impairment on a stream, then we would apply a narrative standard at that point.

That's not necessarily how we will be
applying it at this point, because there's a lot more science that's been developed since then, so we're still working through exactly what that means. And so I'd be happy to report back as we're moving through, as we're coming up with more specific answers on how it applies to individual permits.

MR. LYNCH: Again, sorry. Just one last question, and then I'll leave you alone. But you say impairment. Is the impairment, when you decide there's an impairment, that's based upon some -- isn't that based upon some standard? MR. DAVIS: The impairment is based on a standard, and we used the narrative standard previously. We had been using the numeric nutrient standard for TMDL's since we adopted it. We're looking at how we would identify new impairments going forward.

We're not necessarily going to be falling back on the -- that's where $I$ was indicating. We're not looking at falling back on the same process, where we would rely upon impairments for nutrients in order to apply a narrative nutrients condition on the permit. CHAIR DEVENY: George, do you have
something to add to that?
MR. MATHIEUS: Yes, Madam Chair. I might just add a couple of things.

One is we have many narrative standards, and the whole point of doing a numeric standard, it's site specific, so all the science and data analysis that went into setting those standards was virtually site specific.

And the main reason for that, or one of the reasons, one of the good reasons for that is regulatory certainty. The narrative side is very similar, in that we use a translater mechanism.

So I think the simplest way to put this is that what will likely happen is as we move forward, and we would, let's say, look at a particular stream, and try to figure out what the standard for that stream should be, we're going to use the same science that we've been developing for the last twenty years that developed our numeric standards.

So I don't see there being a large deviation from what we did before. It just frankly becomes more process. Once we did all that work, and created a numeric standard, we virtually had those set in stone.

This is just going to require us to develop a translater that says, "Okay. Now that we're operating with a narrative, here's how we're going to translate to a number for purposes of permitting," and fortunately we already have twenty years of data to help us do that.

CHAIR DEVENY: David Lehnherr, you had a question.

MR. LEHNHERR: Yes. Just a brief
comment. I agree that the word "narrative" is a bit confusing in this context.

But $I$ have a question for Mr. Davis, just wondering about the Nutrient Work Group, and I'm wondering if you could give us just a real rough idea of the variety of individuals and groups represented in the working group.

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, Board Member Lehnherr, I'd be happy to. So the working group is really a very diverse representation of membership, and includes Conservation Groups, it includes cities and towns, it includes industrial associations, it includes individual consulting engineers, and so basically everyone across the spectrum is represented.

Those are also noticed, so we don't have 70 members of the work group, but those meetings have been open for anyone to participate in as well.

MR. LEHNHERR: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions from

Board members?
(No response)

CHAIR DEVENY: Tim, one of the questions that $I$ have is: In your medium to long term solutions that you're talking about with the work group, are you talking about the possibility of the BER -- since these are our rules -- putting out new rules that would meet EPA's requirements, and put something a little more solid in the air? MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, members of the Council, we are not currently contemplating bringing back and proposing the numeric nutrient criteria again as they were constituted.

And the variance rules themselves were Department rulemaking, and so that was the difference, was the criteria were adopted by BER with the nonseverability clause. The variance was adopted by rule through the DEQ, through the Department process.

We're not at this point intending to
bring those back, but that doesn't mean that we won't come back to the Board with potential rulemaking in the future. We're simply at this point working through those variety of options, short term, medium term, and long term.

CHAIR DEVENY: And then just one other question. How is this all affecting enforcement of water quality violations that might be occurring?

MR. DAVIS: Madam Chair, members of the Council, all the permits and all the limits that are currently in permits stay in effect. All of the variances stay in effect as well. If someone is violating their permit limits, their current permit limits, then we will be working to bring them back to compliance, and if that was not effective, that's where enforcement would come into play.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any comments or questions from the public?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Tim.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
CHAIR DEVENY: And with that, $I$ believe Myla Kelly has some information on Lake Kookanusa for us.

MS. KELLY: Madam Chair, members of the Board. My name is Myla Kelly. I'm the manager of the Water Quality Standards and Modeling Section here at Montana DEQ. Thanks for your time this morning. I would just like to take a few minutes to brief the Board on an upcoming rulemaking that we are anticipating for the early fall.

The proposed rulemaking will be specific to a geographical location, that is Lake Kookanusa in the Kootenai River, and specific to one pollutant, and that is selenium.

So if you aren't familiar, Lake
Kookanusa is located in northwestern Montana. It crosses the US/Canadian boarder, and it's formed by Libby Dam. The Lake Kookanusa drains to the Kootenai River, which flows through Montana, then it crosses the border into Idaho, and then it takes a sharp right turn north back into Canada, if you can kind of picture a very large U-shaped watershed.

Draining into Lake Kookanusa in Canada
is the Elk Valley, within which lies substantial metallurgical coal reserves, and multiple large scale metallurgical coal mines, so over 26 million tons of metallurgical coal was produced in the Elk Valley just in 2018.

And the overburden from these operations creates large waste piles, which are high in some contaminants, including selenium. Selenium is a naturally occurring element that is present in sedimentary rocks, in shales, coals, and phosphate deposits.

And selenium is a micronutrient, which means it's essential for biological processes to occur in humans and animals, but at high levels it can be toxic.

So Montana DEQ is concerned about those rising levels of selenium in Lake Kookanusa and the Kootenai River, and what those subsequent effects are on aquatic life; and as a result, we listed the lake, Lake Kookanusa, as threatened for selenium in 2012. And since then, we've begun the process of establishing a site specific water quality standard for selenium that protects our aquatic life. So 95 percent of the selenium that enters Lake Kookanusa comes from the Elk Valley.

So we talked a little bit about standards already today, and interestingly we've talked about site specific standards, and site specific standards might not be a term that you have heard us use often before this morning.

For the most part, Montana adopts EPA national recommended water quality standards for the protection of our beneficial uses, like aquatic life or human health. So EPA does the science behind what a protective standard is, it recommends that standard, and the Board chooses whether to adopt that standard for Montana. We have many examples of that -- cadmium, chloride, copper, zinc, etc., and so on.

So with the case of selenium, when EPA finalized their recommended criteria in 2016, one of their strong recommendations was that because of the way selenium bioaccumulates and moves up through the food chain, and because that is very dependent on site specific conditions, if the data can be collected and the ecosystem modeling completed for a specific water body or region, then that is the most protective and accurate standard.

So for the past six years we have been
working in collaboration with British Columbia, with Federal agencies on both sides of the border, with our Tribal and indigenous communities, with the mining industry, tech, coal, with selenium experts from across the continent, and countless stakeholders, to collect that necessary data, and to complete the science to establish a joint British Columbia/Montana site specific selenium criteria.

So we are, happy to say, in the finishing stages of that collaborative work, and we're going to be coming in you in the near term to share those results, and request initiation of rulemaking for that criteria.

In conjunction with the site specific criteria for Lake Kookanusa, we will also be requesting initiation of rulemaking to adopt EPA's 2016 national recommended selenium criteria for the Kootenai River.

So for the Kootenai River, at this time we do not have data that's needed to develop a site specific criteria. So in lieu of that, the best protective criteria for the river is to update our existing criteria which we have on the books with EPA's recommended 2016 recommendation,
so it will be an update to the criteria using EPA's national recommended standard.

So there'll be two parts to that rulemaking: Lake Kookanusa site specific criteria, and the Kootenai River criteria as well.

So that concludes my update. I know it was brief, but $I$ just wanted to alert you that that was going to be coming in the near future, and would like to take any questions that you might have at this time.

CHAIR DEVENY: Thank you, Myla. Do Board members have questions of Ms. Kelly?

MR. LYNCH: This is Jerry Lynch. I do have one, just again for my own education. Myla, what is the EPA recommended standard compared to, if you know, current levels of selenium in Lake Kookanusa and/or the river?

MS. KELLY: Yes. So thank you. Madam Chair, members of the Board.

The existing criteria that we currently have established for Lake Kookanusa is five micrograms per liter, so that's what we currently have in our Circular DEQ7. And that applies to all water bodies in the Montana.
In 2016, when EPA provided their
recommended national water quality criteria, they recommended a couple of different elements to the criteria. So they recommended an egg ovary, a fish egg ovary element, a fish whole body muscle element, and a water column element, one for lentic systems and one for lotic systems.

So the values that they recommended are with -- So we are proposing to not adopt those criteria for Lake Kookanusa, but our own unique site specific criteria that will be established, or that we'll be determining through this modeling effort.

So the levels of selenium currently in Lake Kookanusa are between one and two micrograms per liter, and it varies depending on the location within the reservoir. And we anticipate it's likely that the site specific criteria will be within that same range, but we don't know those results yet.

MR. LYNCH: A followup question. What is the EPA recommended standard?

MS. KELLY: The EPA recommended standard for lakes, so for lentic system is 1.5 micrograms per liter.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: This sounds like a real important issue. I'm glad that DEQ is moving forward on it. It looks like David Lehnherr, do you have a question?

MR. LEHNHERR: Yes. I may have misunderstood, but is there going to be -- there are going to be different standards for the lake and the river; is that correct?

MS. KELLY: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board.

MR. LEHNHERR: Why is that?
MS. KELLY: The national recommended criteria establishes a different criteria for lentic versus lotic systems because of the way the selenium bioaccumulates up the food chain. And so that's one of the reasons.

So for example, for lentic is -- for flowing systems, lotic systems, rivers, the national recommended criteria is three; whereas in lentic systems in lakes and reservoirs, their national recommended criteria is 1.5 .

MR. LEHNHERR: Thank you.

CHAIR DEVENY: Any other questions from Board members?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Dexter, are you still with us on the phone?

MR. BUSBY: Yes, I am.
CHAIR DEVENY: Okay. Good. Just wanted to check in.

MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair.
CHAIR DEVENY: Go ahead.
MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is
Chris.
CHAIR DEVENY: Chris Tweeten, go ahead. MR. TWEETEN: I observe that we have a representative from the British Columbia

Environmental Ministry in attendance electronically. I wonder if this might be an appropriate time to see if our neighbors in Canada have any comments on this issue.

CHAIR DEVENY: Yes. I was planning to
do that. Thank you. Mr. Large, if you're interested in making any comments, you'd be welcome to at this time.

MS. KELLY: Madam Chair, members of the Board, I believe the representative from British

Columbia Environmental is Michele Ryan-Aylward.
CHAIR DEVENY: I'm sorry.
MR. RYAN-AYLWARD: Thanks Myla, and Madam Chair. Sorry. I don't know the proper introductory remarks. I'm just here to observe. No comments from me. Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIR DEVENY: You're welcome. Any
other comments from members of the public?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, thank you very much, Myla.

Moving right along, we have no action on contested cases today, so with that, I'll turn it back to Sarah to give us a Board Counsel update. Sarah Clerget.

MS. CLERGET: The only thing I have is that we had had some rulemaking on the procedural rules that you guys had initiated, and that has sort of been put on hold with COVID and me not working full-time. So $I$ just wanted to tell you guys the status of that hasn't moved forward at all.

We are working on a few policies on docketing, based on the -- drafting some of those
policies and/or rules, based upon some of the docketing issues that we've had in cases going up to District Court, so hopefully by the next meeting we're going to have something to bring to you, whether it's a policy or a proposed rule that we can get some standardization in our docketing, so if $I$ get hit by a bus, or Aleisha gets hit by a bus, the next person's docket will look the same as ours, and we can have some consistency through that. So we are working on that.

So the other thing was we had talked about a system for filing for contested cases -I'd told you guys about different IT systems that folks had used -- to get our prior BER decisions up in a more accessible public format.

And $I$ have continued working with both DOJ IT and Department of Administration IT. I know the tech people are talking to each other about the PSC system, and my understanding at very high levels is that there is a possibility that because $D$ of $A$ designed the PSC docketing system that it is something that we could adapt for relatively little money.

We'd still have to pay $D$ of $A$ because of how -- they're like ALS. They're self-funded, so
that's how they support their budget. We would have to pay them a little bit to adapt that system.

I don't have an estimate yet -- they're going to work on what the estimate would be for that -- but $I$ understand it to be a relatively small amount of money, because most of the work is all done. All we'd have to do is just translate it a little bit to fit with our website and our specific needs. There are pieces of it that we did not need.

So that project is continuing as well, although more slowly than otherwise, because frankly I'm at capacity with the contested cases.

Also I did want to tell you I have another attorney from ALS helping me with at least the summary judgment decisions that are pending, so that's essentially a law clerk to the law clerk, to assist in work flow to try and get these decisions moving a little bit more quickly, because like I said, I'm only at about three quarter time right now with child care issues and stuff.

So hopefully that will move a little more quickly, and $I$ think that's all I've got,
unless anybody has questions for me.
CHAIR DEVENY: Any questions of Sarah? (No response)

CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, we'll move on. At this point, I'd like to open up the meeting for any general public comment that there may be, not on any contested cases, but on any other matter.
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, would
somebody like to move to adjourn?
MR. TWEETEN: Madam Chair, this is Chris. So moved.

CHAIR DEVENY: I believe Chris Tweeten moved to adjourn. I'll second it. Is there any other discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, all those in favor of adjourning, please signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Any opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR DEVENY: Hearing none, this meeting is adjourned. Thanks, everybody, and I
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