

# WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL

**Friday September 6, 2019, 10:00 A.M.**  
**DEQ's Metcalf Building (1520 E. 6<sup>th</sup> St, Helena, MT)**  
**Room 111**

## AGENDA

To view conference presentations, [Join Skype Meeting](#)

Trouble Joining? [Try Skype Web App](#)

If your computer does not have audio capability, join by phone:

406-444-4647, access code: 685894

[Forgot your dial-in PIN?](#) | [Help](#)

**NOTE:** Interested persons, members of the public, and the media are welcome to attend at the location stated above. Reasonable accommodations will be made for persons with disabilities who wish to participate in this meeting. Please contact Hannah Riedl by telephone (406-444-0549) or by e-mail (Hannah.Riedl@mt.gov) no later than 24 hours prior to the meeting to advise of the nature of the accommodation needed.

10:00	<b>Call to Order</b>	<b>Trevor Selch</b>
10:02	<b>Approval of Agenda</b>	<b>Trevor Selch</b>
10:05	<b>Approval of Minutes from July 12 and July 26</b>	<b>Trevor Selch</b>
<b><i>Briefing Items</i></b>		
10:10	<b>Delivering Local Assistance Program and other Commerce funding sources</b>	<b>Becky Anseth, Dept. of Commerce</b>
10:35	<b>DNRC's Renewable Resource Grants and Loans, SRF, WASACT</b>	<b>Lindsay Volpe Anna Miller</b>
11:00	<b>DEQ's Optimization Training, and additional SRF, WASACT information</b>	<b>Mike Abrahamson</b>
11:25	<b>Nonpoint Source Program's Focus Watershed Update and State HAB Program Update</b>	<b>Hannah Riedl</b>
11:45	<b>General Public Comment</b> During this time, members of the public may comment on any public matter within the jurisdiction of the Council that is not otherwise on the meeting agenda.  For items on this meeting agenda, time for public comment will be provided after Council discussion of each item.	<b>Trevor Selch</b>
11:55	<b>Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings</b>	<b>Hannah Riedl</b>
12:00	<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>Trevor Selch</b>

**MEETING MINUTES  
WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL  
July 12, 2019  
METCALF BUILDING  
1520 EAST SIXTH AVE., HELENA, MT**

**PRESENT**

**Councilmembers Present:**

Trevor Selch

**Via Phone:**

Earl Salley  
Michael Wendland  
Craig Workman  
Karen Bucklin Sanchez  
Adam Sigler  
Stevie Neuman  
Bob Zimmer

**Others Present:**

Hannah Riedl, DEQ  
Sandy Matule, DEQ  
Christina Weaver, DEQ  
Myla Kelly, DEQ (via phone)  
Kurt Moser, DEQ attorney  
Peggy Trank, Treasure State Resources

**Via Phone:**

Nate Weisenburger  
Amanda McInnis, HDR  
Derf Johnson  
Todd Seib

**Councilmembers Absent:**

Mary Ahmann Hibbard

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Selch called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Selch brought forward the approval of the agenda. Councilmember Workman moved to accept the agenda. The agenda was approved with no second.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Selch brought forward approval of the May 3, 2019 meeting minutes. Councilmember Workman moved to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved with no edits or second.

**BRIEFING ITEMS**

**General Permit Updates: Sand and Gravel and Construction Dewatering by Christine Weaver, Permit Writer**

Ms. Weaver explained that she is in attendance to provide a brief update on permit renewal status for two General Permits – Sand & Gravel and Construction Dewatering. DEQ regulations specifically require the public notice be mailed to WPCAC. The **Sand & Gravel General Permit MTG490000** comment period ends August 29, 2019. A public hearing will be held August 29, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. Once the General Permit is effective, individual projects within the category apply for authorization under the General Permit. No further notice is required for the specific projects. The draft effluent limits and monitoring requirements for this renewal are unchanged from the current active general permit.

Chairman Selch opened for questions.

Hannah Riedl asked, “With monitoring for oil and grease, there is a numeric criteria of 10 mg per liter – that is oil, gas and water, so it is probably separating – are there recommendations for getting a representative sample?”

Ms. Weaver responded that they take a sample as it is being discharged because at that point it should be mixing. It is a grab sample – and hour later, 10 hours later it could be completely different. There is no real-time monitoring. There is a daily visual observation for oil sheen, odor, anything discernible. If that is seen, they must immediately take a grab sample and stop discharge until they track down what is happening and clean it up.

The current **Construction Dewatering Permit MTG070000** was effective 2015 and expires February 2020. DEQ’s goal is to have the renewed permit issued as final by January 1, 2020, but effective March 2, 2020. There are no plans for significant changes. It will be noticed for public comment mid-August. This is the general permit and not attached to anyone. Individual authorizations must be renewed after the general permit is authorized. This general permit authorizes dewatering discharge from construction projects to surface waters within three categories: *Minimal Impact* (very large rivers or dry ephemeral/dry intermittent); *Discharge Turbidity Limited to Prevent Impact* (more vulnerable receiving waterbodies including perennial, wetlands, lakes); or *Real-Time Turbidity Discharge Demonstration*. The effluent limits are proposed to remain unchanged from the active GP – turbidity limits, and oil & grease visual with monitoring if there is a sheen.

Councilmember Workman thanked Ms. Weaver for the summary and asked, “for the real-time permitting you have to be at or below the current conditions of the receiving body?”

Ms. Weaver responded, “Yes, you would go upstream of where your discharge is hitting the receiving water body and measure the turbidity; i.e., say it is 200 – measure your turbidity [in the discharge]...”

Councilmember Workman responded that with this change we could be allowing dischargers at construction sites to greatly increase turbidity depending on the season.

Ms. Weaver responded that their effluent must be less than the ambient.

Councilmember Workman responded that his point is in the spring runoff in the Yellowstone River, for example, the turbidity increases tremendously from runoff, so, we are now allowing construction sites to have considerably more turbidity in their effluent.

Ms. Weaver responded that the thought was we are not using their discharge to dilute the natural condition of the river. So, if they aren’t putting anything in that is any worse, there is no difference.

Councilmember Workman responded it is just an overall increase in load. It is more sediment to the receiving water.

Ms. Weaver responded that is a good point.

Chairman Selch asked if it is only turbidity that is being referenced or is it all the.

Ms. Weaver responded there is only turbidity, oil and grease. There is no other expected. If they have something else, the only caveat for that is if they are near or in Bozeman, where the groundwater is

high, and there are contaminated sites everywhere where people are building now. When they dewater there, they must check to be sure they are in or out of the expected contamination plume and are working with the remediation staff to make sure they can do the dewatering. If they can, they must be under the required reporting value for perchloroethylene, for instance. Other than that, DEQ is not expecting anything but turbidity, oil and grease.

Ms. Riedl commented that it is tricky with the real-time turbidity discharge because you can't require anyone to treat effluent better than natural conditions. So, if they are discharging in the spring, the natural condition is higher turbidity.

Councilmember Workman commented that with other point source discharges we are considerably better than natural conditions – in the wastewater for example – water lower, nitrogen, phosphorous, TSS – need to think about that one – interesting concept.

Ms. Weaver responded there may a way to add sidebars on it – they still need to meet their Best Management Practices (BMP) – that is part of the permit. They are declaring what it is they consider BMP for that site, because every site is different. Perhaps that might be the sidebars we are looking for.

Councilmember Workman commented that he was thinking more about excavation type construction projects.

Ms. Weaver responded that she believes the BMP would cover it. Removing the numeric angst that they cannot get down to 10.

Chairman Selch commented that he had the same question as Councilmember Workman with loading. If this gives them an opportunity to really clean out if they had a bad area or some equipment that they needed to flush out.

Ms. Weaver said she would meet with her supervisor, Rainie Devaney about the issue.

Councilmember Sigler asked what was the mean total suspended solid limit of the sand & gravel discharge?

Ms. Weaver responded the average monthly is 25 mg. per liter, and the daily max is 45, which is a little better than the secondary standard for POTW.

Councilmember Sigler commented that the conversation about the loads is an interesting one. For large rivers it probably doesn't matter, but if you were effectively doubling the sediment load in a small stream that could be important.

Chairman Selch asked that Ms. Weaver meet with Rainie Devaney to see if there is something in place they are missing.

**Variance Varieties: A History Through Today by Myla Kelly, Water Quality Planning, Acting Bureau Chief**

Ms. Kelly explained the variances and the options available. Ms. Kelly explained the term variance is a safe and clean water act tool that is appropriate to apply when the water quality standard of a water body is accurate. DEQ wants to maintain that water quality standard in the water body. For many

different reasons, flexibility is needed for permittees to achieve that standard. So, there is a time-limited tool that allows a permittee to catch up and for technology to catch up to the water quality standard requirement we have in the water body. Basically, what a variance does is allows a discharger to continue their current performance, which, if they are applying for a water quality standard variance, usually means exceeding the water quality standard for a limited amount of time. That limited amount of time requires justification and it needs to be reasonable, and the reason for not being able to achieve the water quality standard also must follow a set of factors and requirements.

The first water quality standards that DEQ had put into place came in conjunction with our numeric nutrient standards which are housed in DEQ Circular 12A, and in conjunction with numeric nutrient standards, DEQ put forth a variance option under DEQ Circular 12B, which allows for time for the permittees in Montana to achieve the numeric nutrient criteria. DEQ's numeric variance nutrient rules in 12B are under active litigation. Ms. Kelly said she couldn't discuss further – that she and Kurt Moser, DEQ attorney, would take questions later.

Following Circular 12B in the last couple of years DEQ went through a variance process under Senate Bill 325 rule. Those were rules that WPCAC approved to proceed to the Board of Environmental Review and those were eventually adopted into Montana law. Those variance rules provided the framework for permittees to apply for a variance when upstream conditions couldn't reasonably be expected to be remediated in the permit term. The very limited framework was designed for situations where there was historic legacy pollution upstream that wasn't going to be remediated in the very near term. With the very narrow framework, we developed rules around that; they went through WPCAC, and those were adopted by the BER last year. So, those are in place and remain in place.

Finally, in the last legislative session, DEQ put forth Senate Bill 48 which was also a variance bill. It doesn't replace DEQ 12-B or the rules that DEQ put out under Senate Bill 325. They both remain. The intent of Senate Bill 48 was to broaden state authority to conform more closely with EPA's authority of variances and open the possibility to consider all the factors EPA considers justifiable factors for variance. The bounds for variances under DEQ Circular 12B and SB 325 are very narrow framework. SB 48 was designed to broaden that. The factors that are allowable for making a variance potentially allowable under the Clean Water Act. There are six of them. One of them is when naturally occurring pollutant concentrations prevent the attainment of the use. There are other factors that include natural, intermittent, or low flow conditions, human-caused conditions, prevent attainment of the use, physical conditions, or substantial and wide-spread economic harm. The intent of SB48 was to open our state authority to allow for variances for permittees to apply for variances under any of those factors. That is not to say they would be approvable, but it would be feasible. There have been no requests for variances under SB48, but if there is one, department rulemaking will need to happen. Any of those variance rules would come before WPCAC and be vetted. Each variance always needs to be approved by EPA. Variances are considered a water quality standard and any water quality standard has the ultimate authority approvable by EPA. Variance rules require department rulemaking and then final EPA approval.

Councilmember Workman asked about the status of SB48.

Ms. Kelly responded that SB48 has been approved and is in law – not sure if it has been signed.

Mr. Moser added that it isn't effective yet – maybe not until October 2019.

Ms. Kelly added that the rules under Circular 12B allow for general variances and individual variances. Whitefish was the first individual variance that DEQ and the EPA approved.

Ms. Riedl asked Ms. Kelly to give an example of physical conditions that prevent attainment of these variances.

Ms. Kelly responded that she has not seen a variance come through nationally that has been approved under that factor, but examples they list of that would be lack of a proper substrate, cover load, depth pools, riffles, and the like that are unrelated to water quality would preclude the attainment of aquatic life. A dam is listed as a separate factor: Dam diversion or other hydrologic modification.

Derf Johnson thought Whitefish and received a variance that was approved by EPA – is this previously or what the timeline was on it.

Ms. Kelly responded that it was in 2018 –

Councilmember Workman responded May of 2018. Ms. Kelly responded that variance was based on a widespread economic factor.

Peggy Trenk asked regarding SB48 if DEQ was not going to do general rulemaking – it will be individual rulemaking if someone makes a request under one of those categories specific to that variance request.

Ms. Kelly responded that she is envisioning that is the most likely scenario, but there could be something more general or DEQ creates a more general framework; i.e.; ammonia and lagoon systems. A substantially regulated community with similar attributes and challenges.

#### **Public Comment**

There were none.

#### **Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings**

- a. Arsenic Standards
- b. Harmful Algae Update / Canyon Ferry & Flathead
- c. Funding Options – municipal infrastructure/Dept of Commerce; DEQ SRF Program
- d. Bitterroot Watershed – 319 timeline
- e. Sunriver meeting minutes – Mark Ockey presentation showed maps – status of groups

Councilmember Workman asked about meeting dates – Ms. Riedl responded they are held every 2 months on the first Friday. Meeting dates can always be moved if there are conflicts with council member schedules.

#### **Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn by Councilmember Workman.

**MEETING MINUTES  
WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL  
July 26, 2019  
METCALF BUILDING  
1520 EAST SIXTH AVE., HELENA, MT**

**PRESENT**

**Councilmembers Present:**

Trevor Selch  
Bob Zimmer

**Via Phone:**

Earl Salley  
Stevie Neuman  
Michael Wendland  
Craig Workman  
Karen Bucklin Sanchez  
Adam Sigler

**Others Present:**

Hannah Riedl, DEQ  
Sandy Matule, DEQ  
Kurt Moser, DEQ attorney  
Eric Trum, DEQ

**Via Phone:**

Guy Alsentzer, P.E., Missouri Waterkeepers  
Ricky Schultz, HDR Engineering  
Tammy Johnson, Montana Mining Association  
Peggy Trank, Treasure State Resources  
Bill Mercer, Holland & Hart  
Scott Schafer, AE2S  
Kyna Christensen  
Aaron Endel  
Susie Turner, City of Kalispel  
Scott Beuker

**Councilmembers Absent:**

Mary Ahmann Hibbard

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Selch called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Selch brought forward the approval of the agenda.

Councilmember Zimmer moved to approve the agenda. Councilmember Salley seconded. The agenda was approved.

**Action Item**

**Update to DEQ Circular 12B presented by Michael Suplee, Section Supervisor**

Mr. Suplee gave the council background the outline of events that led to Circular 12B and how DEQ got to the rulemaking process. (*See presentation materials*). Mr. Suplee recommends that WPCAC approve the action towards rulemaking on DEQ-12B.

Councilmember Workman reminded Mr. Suplee that there was a Nutrient Workgroup that was closely involved in the process of revising Circular 12B, both leading up to the 2015 product as well as the revised triennial review. Councilmember Workman suggested there had been a considerable amount of collaboration and insight that came from permittees and the Nutrient Workgroup within that timeline.

Mr. Suplee thanked Councilmember Workman for his comments. Mr. Suplee believed there had been 34 total meetings leading up to the adoption with the Nutrient Workgroup. Mr. Suplee reported to the council that there would be another Nutrient Workgroup meeting regarding this rulemaking; hopefully, before August 6, 2019. The meeting has not been scheduled as of this date as Mr. Suplee wanted to wait and see what the outcome of the WPCAC meeting would be.

Mr. Suplee pointed out the parts of the draft circular that DEQ has modified, and what hadn't been modified, which is equally important (*See presentation materials*).

Ms. Riedl reported that she had sent the proposed changes to council members, and members of the public can access them from DEQ's WPCAC website.

Mr. Suplee said the target date for adoption of these rules is November 2019. He defined "HAC" as the highest attainable condition, or interim treatment requirements; the HAC is not changing. The majority of the changes will be made to Section 2.1—Time to Achieve Treatment Requirements. DEQ is proposing that the permittees, predominantly the greater than 1 MGD and less than 1 MGD group, must meet those treatment requirements by July 1, 2027. DEQ's analysis found that of those 36 facilities that are eligible for this general variance, only nine of them are actual mechanical facilities, and among those nine, only four aren't meeting those treatment requirements. Of those four, three of them are already close to meeting the requirements. The fourth may take up to that time depending on the grant cycle application process. Once a permittee has met the interim treatment requirements, the same process will be repeated. DEQ will revisit those treatment requirements every three years to see if they are still reasonable and if DEQ needs to make them more stringent. DEQ will have permittees include their current list of PMPs (pollutant minimization program) in their permits so they can continue to make incremental progress towards the base numeric nutrient standards, so they can meet them by 2034 (20 years from the original adoption of the rules. Statues said we had 20 years for the variance to run under state law).

Mr. Suplee reported that the individual variance was not part of the lawsuit, only the general variance. Mr. Suplee reiterated that this is a draft, but close to the final version. There will be a Nutrient Workgroup meeting early August and EPA is also reviewing the draft from their perspective; so, there could be some changes, but, hopefully, this version is close to the final draft.

Mr. Suplee opened the floor for general questions.

Councilmember Zimmer asked what the council is accomplishing at this meeting ; is the council essentially asked to approve the draft presented? If so, what are the next steps – DEQ would continue to revise and then bring the revisions back to the council again for a final approval, or is the council just approving DEQ to move forward with rulemaking, and it is up to the court?

Mr. Suplee responded that this is basically the only opportunity the council will have to see it. DEQ has worked hard to make sure this draft is as close to final as possible. The BER will not see this rule as it is a department rule. Mr. Suplee pointed out that during the process there will be a 45-day public comment period, including for WPCAC , to comment on the final rule. There will and a response to comments as DEQ moves into official rulemaking after today's meeting. This is the council's opportunity to tell us yes or no on moving forward.

Councilmember Zimmer responded that he had no prepared remarks but his concern for DEQ is twofold

– one is that DEQ is going to meet legally what is required by the court? And based on his background in environmental consulting and compliance, Councilmember Zimmer believes there are some really big gaps in implementation of this process – how is DEQ going to get permittees to compliance in essentially 15 years and would like to see that piece in the rulemaking process. Councilmember Zimmer didn't know if he would be a no vote on this particular piece due to the timeline, but his advice to DEQ is to get a solid implementation schedule for this. Is that correct when you said there were 36 facilities and 9 of them more mechanical, so 20+ lagoons need work?

Mr. Suplee responded yes. DEQ has asked them to at least maintain their current nitrogen/phosphorous levels, but at the same time there is a recognition that there needs to be refinement issues that they may have as a facility. When those deficiencies are addressed, their N and P will drop.

Councilmember Zimmer responded that he and Mr. Suplee could continue this conversation at another time so as to not waste other council member's time. He believes the department should look at themselves as a technical resource to help these facilities to get in compliance.

Mr. Suplee responded that DEQ will review the HAC requirements more frequent than the EPA requires, and will lay out in a technical support document why we did or did not make the treatment requirements more stringent or not. If we did make it more stringent, why, and it will be based on the same fundamental processes of cost and economic impacts that DEQ looked at in 2017, before, and on a case-by-case basis. All the details will be captured in the permitting process in the fact sheets. The permitting process will lay out what a permittee will do and what the requirements are.

Councilmember Zimmer commented that he believes it is important that DEQ not giving permanent variances for some of the permittees. Councilmember Zimmer also believes that an individual variance might be a way to avoid compliance and those variances should be rare and site-specific.

Councilmember Workman asked Mr. Suplee to clarify – in terms of WPCAC – this is the only look the council will have at these draft rules. Mr. Suplee responded that was correct. Mr. Suplee did say that if the changes were so large that what the council saw today looked nothing like the final draft – he didn't know what they would do, but DEQ would stick to their guns to not make major changes. Anyone can make comment during the public comment period or during the public hearing.

Mr. Suplee summarized the short timeline DEQ has to complete the process. The court order was July 16, 2019, giving DEQ 120 days to comply – which would be November 13, 2019. DEQ will have two filings and two publications – a filing to propose a rule and then a publication comment period for a public hearing, and then another response to comments and then a public second filing. The closest publication in the Secretary of State's Montana Administrative Register is November 8, 2019. As DEQ must have this completed before November 13, which becomes the date that everything backs up from; so, as a result that pushed DEQ to identify the need for this WPCAC meeting today July 26, 2019. The next meeting will be a Water Nutrient Workgroup Meeting, which Mr. Suplee said he would schedule first thing Monday, July 29, 2019 to, hopefully, schedule August 5 or 6. It is required under statute whenever DEQ modifies these two circulars or the rules then we can file on the 27<sup>th</sup>. DEQ will publish on September 6 which begins a 45-day public comment period in all the major newspapers. The public hearing will be the 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019 in Helena. Then DEQ will respond to all public comments. The final rule will be published on the 8<sup>th</sup>.

Councilmember Workman responded that he doesn't understand how a rule of this magnitude is being

completed in 120 days by court order. There is really only six weeks to revise the rule – essentially the court order was July 16 and by August 27 – six weeks later, we need to have a rule that we are advertising. When you look at the years of effort that it took to come up with the first draft and frustration caused by the triennial review– here we go again with another rewrite. Six weeks is just not even close to the amount of time, in my opinion, that a rule of this magnitude needs for proper input and scrutiny. It is frustrating yet again that this rule takes another attack.

Councilmember Zimmer asked Councilmember Workman if his concerns were similar to his in terms of implementing progress toward water quality standards under the rule, or because the rule itself as being very basic. How is DEQ going to either facilitate or alternatively hold to compliance – curious about Councilmember Workman’s thoughts are on that and the results of this 120-day process and what could be packed into the rulemaking.

Councilmember Workman’s concern revolves around the exponential cost increase that permittees need to go through in order to reach the base numeric – they are not obtainable. There are grave economical consequences or the potential to create very grave economical consequences for a significant percentage of the state.

Michael Suplee responded the Department worked through what the current treatment requirements are, they were not easy to meet, but not impossible to meet by any means. They were based on an economic analysis that looked at whether the majority of the people could affordably meet them, based on criteria that no one is arguing with so far. Most of the facilities are already meeting treatment requirements. The treatment requirements could stay static for a while, depending on technological change or cost reductions associated with technology, or those numbers could come down. Any changes would follow the same process that you and others participated in earlier.

Kurt Moser responded it is important to remember that those economic and social factors that go into determining what HACs is (Table 12B1) still come into play. The base water quality standards cannot be met until, essentially, the current HACs and the base water quality standards line up, for lack of a better analogy. The base water quality standards can’t be met due to the economic and social factors. That’s been established and supported by the court, so the process is laid out. We go through the triennial review process and then the numbers can lower, but they are not going to lower if the economic and social impact factor hasn’t been relieved. We are looking for technology and economic factors to change. That is why you wait every three years to see how those things have changed.

Councilmember Bob Zimmer added that one of the things that came through the court order is that Waterkeeper recommended that it was a 5-year piece to get some of the facilities to compliance. He appreciates the date movement to accommodate one of the economically challenged permittees.

Kurt Moser responded that it will be implemented through the compliance schedule through the use of a permit. So, if a facility can meet it, they will have to meet it through their permit. Everybody is not guaranteed through 2027.

Councilmember Bob Zimmer suggested that in the interest of time for the council and other folks on the phone, moved that the council move forward and accept the DEQ recommendation to move forward with this rule making it as stated in the draft Circular 12B.

Chair Selch asked for a second. Chair Selch seconded the motion. Chair Selch opened the meeting to

council comment.

Councilmember Zimmer encouraged DEQ as they move forward with the process to make sure that it is a reasonable to get permittees off the general variance and into compliance with water quality standards in the timeframe given. He believes it is important to not rely on the HAC to be incrementally moved up. He believes the technology and the cost piece pieces of this, to be accomplished by 2034, is pretty huge. Hopefully the Department can help make that progress to get folks off the general variance.

Councilmember Workman had a point of order question – this meeting isn't advertised as a public hearing. The following agenda item is for General Public Comment, but it would be possible to hear any public comments before voting on the motion?

Chair Selch responded that he was just leaving this piece for council discussion and then open it for public comments. Chair Selch opened it for public comment.

Guy Alsentzer of Missouri Waterkeepers applauds DEQ on quickly moving forward on trying to get a draft in front of WPCAC and move forward with the court order. We have some concerns with the interpretation of when compliance plans will be put on the books. Will DEQ wait for permits to come up for renewal or immediately opening them. Again, this is within the context and making sure you know again discrete accountable measures are being taken to move forward with progress here. I will echo Councilmember Zimmer's concern with the eye on the prize for making progress and moving forward. A whole part of the technology forcing mandate of federal law under the Clean Water Act is to incentivize new ideas and that happens when you have hard back stops. I think it is important to remind ourselves that the back stops are here because they are protecting clean water. This is the foundation of Montana's outdoor economy. It is important to make progress here and you know we have got to balance that and in our policy discussions so looking forward to seeing a draft and offering technical comments at that time. Thank you.

Bill Mercer commented that it would be very helpful if the rule had citations to the court order to allow the public to understand what it is in the order or in the briefing that DEQ has relied upon for the amended language. It is somewhat unclear to me why we have got certain dates in here based upon what I think the court order says. As an example, if you are relying upon Waterkeepers brief to establish when certain things need to happen, I am having trouble reconciling the 2027 number with page 5 of the Waterkeeper brief indicating completion for mechanical plants by January 1, 2023, to construct and start meeting the 12B HAC. Also, on page 2 of the amended rule it doesn't look like the amended rule contemplates doing anything in the immediate term with lagoons. I don't see any language – just that the department intends to establish short-term time frames for lagoons to enhanced performance. Perhaps that is consistent with the court order, but obviously there was a lot of ink spilled in terms of what happened with respect to lagoons. I know there is language on page 7, but that is only speaking to a long-term goal. It is not speaking to anything before 2034; so, it would be helpful to understand what the department relied upon to reach that. I also think it would be very helpful for you to do the equivalent of a fiscal note, because I am not sure that there would be agreement on the assessment that this only going to affect 36 local governments and that the cost will be minimal in either the short-term or the longer term. I think to guide the discussion it would be very useful to understand that the department believes the cost of local governments would be whether they are running mechanical plants or lagoons. I think it would also help commenters and decision-makers in terms of whether these amendments are good ideas. Thank you.

Susie Turner asked how, during the triennial HAC reviews, that is going to be affected and how will the community be required to implement those by 2027. For the city of Kalispell, for example, we are talking the difference between \$3M and \$30M in implementation, and to change our plan is not going to be reasonable by 2027. I want to make sure that considerations on the actual practicality of implementing and meeting some of these by that time and what that means when it changes in the interim between now and 2027. I don't know if anyone can speak to that, or if it should be discussed at the later Nutrient Workgroup meetings, but are huge concerns for the citizens of Kalispell.

Mike Suplee addressed Ms. Turner's concerns. The 2027 date applies to the numbers with the court order – what the judge called the current variance standard, or I call the table values, what other people call HAC. The 2027 date applies to this and if that were to be challenged and be lowered then that 2027 date is not at play. What would be at play would be compliance schedules which would be looked at on a case-by-case basis. The possibility of going out on an individual variance for the permit fees depending on where they land relative to how difficult it would be for them to meet the upgraded table values and again those table values always will be looking at the fundamental impact to the group of facilities.

Guy Alsentzer responded that he wanted to reinforce Bill Mercer's comments about getting citations to the court order – they would be very helpful. Guy also brought up an addendum to Ms. Turner's point that a really clear tension exhibited here is the big difference between building a facility capable of meeting 6 TN and 1TP and a facility able to meet 3 TN and 0.3 TP, which is a national EPA value for best available conventional pollutant control technology. So, again, more discussion about what are the steps that this rule will lay out to give people and permittees a clear path forward and not make it some abstract game trying to guess. The Waterkeeper brief laid out suggestions of how to do that, starting with individualized PERs. The summary here is more details that are discrete about those steps – perhaps more prescriptive -- would be informative in a next draft iteration. Thank you.

Mike Suplee responded that as a rule writer, he is not familiar with the process of incorporating reference to court cases. He will talk to Kurt Moser, DEQ legal counsel to figure out that can be done.

Councilmember Zimmer commented that it seems comments today have been about getting plans in place to act on these Table 12B1 requirements. So, it perhaps appropriate to move the minimization requirement up from 2027 to a sooner date to get plans in place. It doesn't mean they have to be in compliance, sooner but to give them a basis for completing those compliance goals sooner – get a BMP or something like that in the process.

Mr. Suplee responded, if a facility is already meeting the table values upon permit renewal, then they would be asked to wait until 2027 but in that permit renewal to work on implementing the BMP. So, it is all a function of where people are in the process. If they are already at their table values and the permit renewal is coming up, then they will be expected to recommend what their PMPs are going to look like. That will be incorporated in a permit and then expect it to implement that process over the course of that permit. The 2027 date is the date for all the 36 facilities to meet the table values. So, if the permittee is already there, they will be asked to move more quickly on the next step. That will be documented in the permit and the permit fact sheet for each facility.

Scott Bueker with A2S commented that everyone should consider that as you push for expedition of meeting these standards, pushing up timelines, and ratcheting down on HACs, you are potentially pushing development outside the cities and into the counties and septic issues. Can that be a social and economic impacts?

Mr. Suplee responded that DEQ does look at that issue and will continue to look at it in the future. DEQ

looks at what it costs to install and maintain a Level 1 or Level 2 treatment system for septic, relative to the cost of being on the main sewer system. I know our division administrator has a fundamental point of view and philosophy that we want to work towards getting people to hook up, not to go out on their own septic. So far, DEQ's data suggests that people are not fleeing the interior of the cities to go out and build on the exterior because of the cost of wastewater.

Mr. Mercer asked what data set are you relying upon for this data?

Mr. Suplee responded that DEQ has looked at median average wastewater fees per household and it varies from community to community. Some places it is high - \$100 per month and other \$30 to \$40 per month. We know what the numbers look like relative installing and maintaining your own septic on your property and keep it maintained, which is something many people don't do very well. The state has not seen evidence of people leaving the urban areas to get away from these costs. In fact, if anything what we are seeing is net movement towards the cities for the purpose of employment.

Mr. Mercer asked if that analysis could be posted on the nutrient workgroup website; so, we had access to what data was relied upon and what the analysis has been built on that was included in 2017.

Chair Selch if there were any other comments. Hearing none, Chair Selch asked Hannah Riedl to read the motion that is on the table.

Hannah Riedl responded, "Does the council advise the department to move forward with this rulemaking?"

Chair Selch asked for the vote – there were 7 ayes, 0 nays, and 0 abstained. The motion carried.

#### **Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings**

No changes from July 7, 2019, agenda item suggestions for September. Ms. Riedl is still planning on inviting staff from the Department of Commerce and DNRC to talk about different funding opportunities.

Chair Selch asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Zimmer made a motion to adjourn. Council Chair Selch seconded the motion. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned.

Program	Funding Cycle	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Projects	Max funding	Match	Contact
Delivering Local Assistance	Applications due by September 30, 2019	Eligible applicants who are impacted by natural resource development may apply for eligible infrastructure projects. Eligible applicants are local governments including an incorporated city or town, a county, a consolidated local government, a tribal government, a county or multicounty water, sewer, solid waste district, school district, or an authority as defined in 75-6-304.	Eligible applicants can apply to complete infrastructure projects that solve a deficiency related to the following project types: drinking water systems; wastewater treatment; sanitary sewer or storm sewer systems; solid waste disposal and separation systems (including site acquisition, preparation, and monitoring); bridges; facilities for government administration; public safety infrastructure related to law enforcement, fire protection, or emergency services; or school district infrastructure projects. A school district infrastructure project means a project: that is related to life safety or security issues; for major repairs or deferred maintenance in an existing school facility; or for major improvements or enhancements to an existing school facility.	\$750,000 per project, not to exceed \$1.5 per county	none, but encouraged	Becky Anseth; banseth@mt.gov, 841-2865

See also <http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/cardd/docs/resource-development/w2asact-docs/WASACTFundingProgramTableFeb2019.pdf>