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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR RUFFATTO: At this point in our agenda, we will introduce the next action item. This is on Page 7 of our agenda. This is in the matter of the notice of appeal of Duane Murray regarding the notice of violations and administrative compliance and penalty order, BER-2020-01.

The Board will hear argument from Mr. Murray if he's available to participate in the meeting; and if he makes arguments we will give DEQ an opportunity to respond to those arguments; and we will then consider the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law; and the Board can either accept those, reject those findings and conclusions, modify the conclusions of law, or remand to the Hearing Examiner. And we will go over those options as we get into it. We're not done talking about that.

So my first question is to Mr. Murray. You are on the telephone, $I$ believe.

MS. SCHERER: You may need to dial star six to be unmuted.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I'm suspicious Mr. Murray got tired of our last agenda item, and maybe went away for a moment. We'll just wait a minute.
(Off the record briefly)
(Mr. Murray present)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Since Mr. Murray is available, $I$ will ask the question who on behalf of DEQ would like to argue in response to Mr. Murray's arguments?

MR. PETTIS: Chairman Ruffatto, members of the Board. My name is Aaron Pettis. I'm an attorney here at DEQ, and I'll be representing DEQ in this.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Mr. Pettis. Mr. Murray, are you available?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, Dave.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Chairman
Ruffatto, $I$ am just wondering if somehow we can see if we can get in touch with Mr. Murray, if it isn't too time consuming. I can see where he might have wandered off during our last item. But if you think that's appropriate. It may not be.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I think it is. I think
it's very appropriate. He was on, and I understood he was planning on participating. So is Elena on? And $I$ think that she has communicated with him. Or Sandy, have you communicated with Mr. Murray?

MS. SCHERER: No, sir, I have not.
Elena is in the meeting. Mr. Murray, if you can hear me, if you could push star six, and that would unmute you.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Elena, could you shoot Mr. Murray an email -- and if $I$ don't know if he's in front of his computer or not -- and also try to call him. Maybe he will respond to that.

MS. HAGEN: Hi, there. Can you guys hear me?

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, we can, Elena. MS. HAGEN: I will shoot him an email, and $I$ will also try to reach him by phone and see if he can get on and talk.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Thank you.
Let's take a five minute break while we're waiting. I will wait here so we don't miss him. But if anybody else needs to run down the hall or something, go ahead and take a -- we'll reconvene in five minutes.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Let's reconvene, and Sandy, please call roll.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
(No response)
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Here.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: We have a quorum.
MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto, it
looked like Mr. Murray hung up, and I asked Elena to have him recall in to the meeting. So I'm waiting to see if he's going to call back in, because he's not in the queue.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. If he calls back in in the next few minutes, we will hear his
matter. Otherwise we will move on.
But for the sake of the folks that are interested in the Signal Peak matter, $I$ will at least give the folks that are going to be doing some arguing what $I$ envision for that, and then we can go back to Mr. Murray if he shows up. But who do we have that's going to be arguing on behalf of MEIC on the Signal Peak matter?

MR. HERNANDEZ: (Indicating)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, Mr. Hernandez.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Good morning, Chairman Ruffatto, members of the Board. Shiloh Hernandez with EarthJustice. I will be arguing on behalf of the Petitioner Montana Environmental Information Center. And for whatever reason my camera is -I'm not sure. I don't seem to have control over it, but $I$ am available if you wish to see me, but for some reason it won't appear.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: All right. We've got your name, and so we've got your -- and your voice. So we're good.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto, it
looks like Mr. Murray is calling in.
(Mr. Murray present)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay.

MS. SCHERER: Mr. Murray, if you would dial star six.

MR. MURRAY: Good morning.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Good morning, Mr.
Murray. If you would hold off for just a second.
I want to give a couple of points to the people that are going to be arguing on another matter, so this won't relate to you.

So you can prepare, the folks on Signal Peak, I'm going to give MEIC 20 minutes, and then I'm going to give DEQ 20 minutes, and then I'll give Signal Peak 20 minutes, and then I'll give MEIC ten minutes for rebuttal. So if that helps you over the next few minutes, $I$ thought $I$ would give that to you.

Mr. Murray, I'm going to introduce the matter. We are now going to consider the matter of the notice of appeal of Duane Murray regarding the notice of violations and administrative compliance and penalty order.

The Board will hear oral arguments from Mr. Murray, and oral arguments from DEQ in response, and then we will consider the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law provided by the Hearing Examiner, and we can accept those,
reject the findings of fact and conclusions of law, except we can't reject the findings without more. We can modify the conclusions of law, or we can remand.

So with that, Mr. Murray, can you give me an idea of how much time you think you would like to have to make your points?

MR. MURRAY: I don't need more than a few minutes.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Well, 1 will give you up to 15 minutes, and if you need more than that, ask me. So Mr. Murray, please proceed with your arguments, and then Mr. Pettis will respond.

MR. MURRAY: I installed the septic system about ten years ago, and $I$ don't have all the dates in front of me - I'm traveling today - and come to find out later then that the septic system $I$ put in did not meet $S t a t e$ standards, even though it was approved by the local state -- or excuse me -- local County Sanitarian.

And later $I$ went to put another septic system in, and $I$ was told that $I$ needed to go through the DEQ. The County wouldn't do it. He wouldn't work with me anymore because of the
problems we'd had with the first one.
Then $I$ talked with the different people at the $S$ tate, and they told me that $I$ needed to hire an engineer to put in the third septic system on the problem, which I did.

Then after $I$ did that, $I$ was unable to get a permit because the County refused to give me -- they would tell me, "That's a State issue. You need to talk to the $S t a t e, "$ and $I$ would talk to the State, and they would say, "We don't issue permits. The County issues permits," and it went back and forth, back and forth a long time.

And then $I$ was told, "You can't --" After the fact $I$ was told to hire an engineer to put in the septic system, and it just would go from one problem to another. You'd resolve one problem, another problem would raise up.

And then $I$ was told, "You can't even have more than one septic system on there," because the original subdivision stated each lot will have an individual septic and individual well.

My take on that was that they were. I would interpret it that it was implying that there's no city water, no city sewer, so you
needed to have your own system. The Department's take on that was no, you can only have one septic and one -- so $I$ was in violation.

So it just has gone on, and on, and on. I disconnected, and all of the things, disconnected all the power, disconnected all the water, disconnected everything. So I did everything in good faith. I tried to follow the rules. And $I$ just got tied up in a bunch of bureaucracy.

And I've been dealing with the DEQ over this issue for eight years. It's time to come to an end, and $I$ 'm ready to just call it quits, and just swallow probably $\$ 150,000$ investment that $I$ have, and loss of income, and just, you know, I'm tired. I'm tired of it. I've had enough of it. I just want to be done with it. I'm done.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Mr. Murray. Mr. Pettis, $I$ will give you up to ten minutes to respond.

MR. PETTIS: Thank you, Chair Ruffatto, members of the Board.

I think that the facts are undisputed in this case, and $I$ think the law is straight forward, and $I$ think that the Hearing Examiner hit
the nail on the head in the order, and $I$ think -you know, that's why DEQ did not file any exceptions. I think that's a straight forward application of the facts and the law in this case.

I just want to back up a little bit, and give a little context about essentially what the effect of the Board's ruling in this case would be.

First off, just to be clear, DEQ is not trying to stop Mr. Murray from developing anything on his property, not trying to get him to remove his cabins, or his RV spaces, or any of that. If he wants to keep those, then he should, so long as they are reviewed, and approved, and compliant with State law, and that's ultimately the issue here.

What he needs to do is have those reviewed and approved, and ensure that they comply with State law; or disconnect them and revert to the initial conditions of approval. And $I$ think that's set out pretty clearly in the proposed FOFCOL.

One other thing that the Board should be aware of is after Mr. Murray filed his notice of appeal, DEQ talked to him, and committed to him
that if he disconnected during the pendency of this appeal, $D E Q$ would forego the penalty that it assessed in the original order. And DEQ still is committed to that, since Mr. Murray has disconnected everything during this appeal, that DEQ would not be seeking that penalty.

So ultimately, what DEQ is asking the Board is just for an order that if he wants to deviate from the original conditions of approval, that he needs to go through DEQ review to have those approved, and that will be some effort. He may need an engineer for this. He will need to remove the second wastewater system because it does not comply with State law. I don't know about the third system. So there may be some work there to be done.

But it is not like an absolute prohibition against his development on the property. It's just that if he wants to do that, then it needs to be reviewed and approved.

One other thing that is clearly
confusing and clearly a frustrating issue is the relationship between $D E Q$ and the County. And just to clarify on that, we're talking about two separate regulatory schemes, and one is DEQ's
subdivision process, which involves review of water, wastewater, and storm water, and solid waste, and the separate County septic permitting system.

And $I$ guess the way that $I$ think of that is DEQ reviews more about planning, and ensuring that the proposed facilities comply, and then the County septic permitting is more of a construction on-the-ground type permit.

And so clearly there was some sort of problems involved with the County septic permitting on this, but ultimately those are separate from the $D E Q$ issues and the compliance with State law. And I'll admit it's a frustrating and confusing process, and so that's why there are some things that $D E Q$ can do with the subdivision approval and the COSA, and why some things are left to the County.

And ultimately regardless of what happens at the County level, you still need approval from DEQ on this. You still need to install those systems to ensure that they comply with State law.

And just to emphasize, though, it's not just the septic systems. As the Hearing Examiner
rightfully went through, there are issues with the water system; there are issues with the six RV spaces.

And just to clarify that, because it might seem a little confusing, but the Sanitation and Subdivisions Act, which is what DEQ administers, applies to things that we normally think of with subdivisions, right -- dividing the land into multiple parcels -- but it also considers multiple $R V$ spaces as a subdivision. So that's the regulatory hook on that, and why those need to be reviewed as well.

And $I$ think that's generally it. I think the Hearing Examiner got the findings of fact and conclusions of law right, and those are the general issues, and I'll respond to any questions that you have. Thank you.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Mr. Murray, do you want to respond to any of Mr. Pettis's comments?

MR. MURRAY: No, I don't think so.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Well, then I'm going to ask the Board members if you have questions of either party at this point, and then we can deliberate. Yes, Dr. Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, if I
could ask a couple of questions of Mr. Pettis, please.

First of all, I'm not at all familiar with the ins and outs of the subdivision law, but I'm curious as to why the restriction on to the water system versus a multi-family system, and why it's an issue, from a practical standpoint. I mean $I$ assume you're following the law, but $I$ don't quite understand what the rationale is.

MR. PETTIS: Chairman Ruffatto, Member Simpson. The Sanitation and Subdivisions Act requires $D E Q$ to adopt rules about different sizes of water systems, and DEQ has adopted rules, and it has adopted design circulars based on the size of the systems, and how many houses it serves, and how many people are served. And I'm obviously not an engineer, but there are capacity issues, and all those kind of things, right? And so that's why there's a distinction between those types of systems.

And so the way it works is that an applicant comes to DEQ, and they say, "We want to develop a system, and this is what we're going to do." DEQ isn't directing the development or making those decisions. It's an applicant comes
forward, they say, "We're going to put in this individual system, and that's what we're going to do." And so DEQ will review and approve it based on that.

And then later down the line, if you want to go to a multiple system, or a public system, or whatever, then you come back in and say, "Okay. We're going to make these changes, and would like approval for that."

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: If I understand correctly, there is a threshold number of people to be served to be considered a public water system; is that correct?

MR. PETTIS: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: And this system falls below that number.

MR. PETTIS: Right. There are three classifications essentially. There's an individual system, the multiple family system, and then the public system. So the public system is anything over 25 persons for a certain number of days per year, and an individual system is one or two living units, and the multiple family is anything in between.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

I just have one additional question. Has there been any environmental harm as a result of this or -- this situation, or is this strictly a compliance issue?

MR. PETTIS: Chair Ruffatto, Member Simpson. There's no evidence in the record about environmental harm. And ultimately these statutes are designed to be forward looking and preventative, not just to the environment, but for people's health, too. Right?

It's making sure that a septic system is sufficiently far away from wells, or that the septic system is not near a wetland, or whatever, those types of things. So it's ensuring that those protections are met before there is harm instead of reacting to it.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any more questions?
Dr. Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Board Member Altemus, go ahead if you'd like. I can go after you.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Go ahead, Dr. Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I appreciate
having a well, and being on septic. I do appreciate DEQ's proactivity. Once you start seeing a well contamination, the cat is sort out of the bag.

But I'm just wondering -- this might be, Chairman Ruffatto, something you can answer. I just want to make sure I'm clear on the recommended decision, summary judgment. Would that be primarily payment -- and then $I$ have a second question for Mr. Murray -- but would that be payment of the $\$ 6,000$, or are there other elements?

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I'll start to answer that. Before we're done here, we will go through the findings of fact and conclusions, and address those. And what $I$ have heard from Mr. Pettis is that they're going to waive the $\$ 6,000$ penalty, and we can amend the conclusions to reflect that. So it would be adopting the summary judgment motion with whatever changes we make in it, including the potential for waiving the penalty. Does that answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Yes. And then I was just wanting to get -- make sure $I$ understand Mr. Murray's outlook on the future of the property.

As $I$ understand it, nothing is hooked into a septic system currently, but Mr. Murray, are you wanting to -- you say you're done. Does that mean you are not going to do anything more with the property, or you've literally given up on it? Thank you for the answer.

MR. MURRAY: Currently, $I$ have a 12 unit hotel on the property and, you know, that will stay. I have four cabins on the property which are sitting empty. I have six RV slots that are sitting empty.

And I tried very diligently to do a lot of things to make it correct. And $I$ hired an engineer to do a subdivision review at one point; I hired another engineer to design septic systems. I never had anybody ever say that anything was an environmental risk or a potential environmental risk on anything.

It's just that there was no way that $I$ could make it all work when the local sanitation department would not work with me for personal reasons, and every time $I$ would try and correct something that the $D E Q$ would come up with for -I'd resolve that, and then they'd come up with
another issue.
And so it just kept going on, and on, and on, and there's no return on investment. What the Department is requiring, and what everybody wants, is just cost prohibitive to the point that there is no return on your investment, and there has to come a time you just have to throw the towel in and say it's not going to work because there's no return on your investment.

And so when you live in rural Montana, it's different. It's a different world than living someplace else where the economy is different. And at this point there's just no return on investment.

And so no, $I$ cannot, even if $I$ wanted to. There's no financial gain in doing anything different. The only thing $I$ can do is take and bulldozer push them all down, because I'm paying taxes. I'm paying taxes on houses that are sitting empty that $I$ cannot have any -- no return on.

And so no, I'm done. I'm not planning on doing anything different. I'm not planning on further development. It's cost prohibitive what the Department wants.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you. CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any more questions? Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. And for Mr. Murray. So Dr. Lehnherr actually asked part of my question, but what $I$ actually would like to know is it sounds like you have infrastructure built on your property, but you did not get -- you haven't been able to get approval from the local sanitation department, is that correct, in addition to the issues with the DEQ?

MR. MURRAY: Okay. I'll just kind of summarize real briefly on that.

Originally about a little over 25 years ago, I built an assisted living facility on the property that was zoned commercial, non-restricted. And in that original plan review, covenants on the property, it states that --

Like most of the lots around the golf course there in that subdivision review are like three to five acre houses. The exception is the lot that $I$ own is a 6.3 acre lot. And in the subdivision review it says each lot will have an individual well and an individual septic. It
never became an issue, never was an issue.
When I decided to build the first cabins, $I$ went to the local sanitation department, and $I$ said, "Hey, this is what $I$ want to do." They said, "Yes. No problem. Here's a set of plans. Follow these plans."

And of course the whole story -- and it's long, and $I$ don't want to take everybody's full day -- but the thing was it was no issue. There was no issue in putting in this septic system. Put in one septic system for all three cabins that $I$ built.

Later on it became an issue because the local sanitation guy and $I$ kind of got in a little bit of a spat, because $I$ felt some of the things he was doing as far as like selling plans to people, selling septic plans to people under the thing that, "If you do this, you won't have to hire an engineer. So you buy a set of plans from me, I approve them."

So I made a comment about that that I felt that was unethical. That's where the whole problem, this whole issue, this is why we're here today, because $I$ said to the local sanitation guy, "What you're doing is unethical to sell plans, and
then approve them."
Well, come to find out after he turned everything over to the DEQ, you know, which then the plans that he sold me for those three cabins did not meet standards. So all of a sudden, nothing $I$ do $I$ can get through the local sanitation department because he's not going to work with me.

So then the Department says, "You need to hire an engineer to design a septic system for you," so $I$ hire an engineer, I get it designed. I called the local sanitation, I said, "Hey, I have an engineered set of plans here. I'm ready to put in the septic system." He says, "I'm not going to help you. You need to call DEQ." So 1 called DEQ. They say, "We don't issue permits. That's your local County guy."

Well, unfortunately in the local County, it is so hard to find sanitationists that nobody will hold the guy accountable. He does the sanitations for six counties. That's how hard it is to find a sanitationist. There's no way that he can adequately do six counties, but he is the sanitationist for six counties.

And so he's telling me, "You can't --

I'm not going to help you. You've got to talk with DEQ. Deal with them. They'll have to do it." So I called DEQ, and DEQ says, "We don't give permits. You've got to talk to your County." And so this goes on, and on, and around in circles. Well, at some point -- you know. So I sat a whole winter because the ground froze and I couldn't put the septic in. Another winter comes up. I've got to get this septic in. I call the County and I say, "Hey, I need a permit. I need to put this in before the frost comes," and I don't get a response.

I called the State DEQ, "Hey, I need permit. It's going to be frozen. The ground's going to be froze. I've been sitting for a year and a half trying to get a permit here. I need a permit to get this in the ground." Nobody said at that time, "You're not allowed to have more than permit -- or one septic on that." No one even said that. They just said, "Get a permit."

Okay. I try and get a permit. I can't get a permit. So $I$ dig it, $I$ set it in the ground, $I$ called the County and said, "Hey, it's sitting in the ground according to plans. Come approve it, because the ground is going to be
froze." I get absolutely no response.
I call the State. "Well, that's a
County problem." I give up. I give up. I'm done. I'm not going to pursue it any further. There's no financial advantage for me to even try and fight it any further.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thanks, Mr.
Murray.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any more questions?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: I have a question.
Maybe I just missed it. But Mr. Pettis, is it your understanding that Mr. Murray has complied with your request to disconnect?

MR. PETTIS: Chairman Ruffatto, yes. DEQ talked to Mr. Murray about that, and then we didn't hear anything else from him about it, and so we did not think that he had disconnected anything.

And then last summer $I$ went out to Havre by myself, and I met with Mr. Murray. We talked about this for a long time. And at that time, he told me that they had disconnected. So that is our understanding of it right now. We have not gone out and inspected. I don't know for sure,
but he has represented that to us.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Thank you. I think our next step would be to go through the proposed findings and conclusions -- Well, maybe our next step should be discussion among the Board as to where generally you think we should go with that, then maybe we'll start more detailed review of the FOFCOL.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: I guess $I$ will start with one little discussion. I hear Mr. Murray's concerns, and $I$ appreciate them. I can hear his frustration, and $I$ think it's probably justified. I know that these laws are complicated and difficult. I have had to deal with them to some extent, so $I$ understand that.

But that doesn't change the fact that these laws have to be followed. And so I appreciate the concern, $I$ appreciate his concern, but these laws in my view have to be followed, and the way we -- if we don't like them, we need to make changes, we need to see if changes can be made, but this Board is not the board to make changes.

And with respect to the County, this

Board has no jurisdiction over the County, and so we can't deal with what's going on in the County, and to be honest with you, I don't know what the remedy there would be.

So my view is -- $I$ will state this -- I think the Hearing Examiner did a good job of laying out the situation. I don't hear really any dispute about the facts as articulated in the FOFCOL. So $I$ want to say that, but that doesn't mean that $I$ don't understand the frustration that Mr. Murray is expressing.

I am going to then -- I want to flip through these pages, because $I$ think we need to address -- there are a couple things $I$ want to address because they have some longer term impacts.

But before we go through that, $I$ will-I need to remind the Board that since this came from a Hearing Examiner, the Board cannot change the findings of fact unless we review the whole record. We can change conclusions of law or interpretation of law, but we can't change the findings of fact.

So I am going to go through this. I'm going to page through this pretty quickly, but $I$
want to go through it and make sure everybody -if you've made notes that you want to talk about, we can do that.

And so $I$ want to start out by taking a look at Pages 1 through 3. Are there any notes in that that you want to talk about andor any points you want to talk about on Page 1 through 3?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Then I'm going to go to Pages 4 and 5. Excuse me. Did someone have a question?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Pages 4 and 5, any questions?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Pages 6 and 7, any questions?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Pages 8 and 9, any questions?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Pages 9 and 10.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any questions?
(No response)

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I have a question.
Paragraph 5 I believe is not accurate. The case that is cited does not stand for the proposition that is stated for Paragraph 5. The Mayer decision (phonetic) is talking about a judicial review, not a board review. So $I$ move that Paragraph 5 be stricken.

I will explain that. $I$ don't think that changes the result at all, but $I$ don't want the Board approving a statement of law which I believe is not accurate. Yes, Dr. Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Chairman
Ruffatto, $I$ 'm just needing a little clarification. Mayer is mentioned in item four, and you mentioned item five. I'm just trying to do -- Does five relate to Mayer as well, and do we need to --

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. I'll explain that. Paragraph 4 cites the case Mayer for the proposition that the interpretation of an administrative rule is a question of law. That's accurate, and Mayer supports that.

Paragraph 5, if you see that little ID down there, that means it's the same cite. What that means is that the conclusion is using the Mayer decision to support five also. Does that
make sense?
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Yes. Thank you.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: And I probably wouldn't have even picked up on this except that this issue is going to come up in the Signal Peak matter, and there is a 2005 Montana Supreme Court case that says that the Board does not give the same deference to the DEQ as the Courts do, and that case is pretty clear. It's MEIC versus DEQ. It's a 2005 case.

I have made a motion to strike Paragraph 5. We're allowed to do that because it's a point of law.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: A motion has been made and seconded that we strike Paragraph 5. Is there discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Now we'll keep going.

11 and 12 , any points?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: 13. If you go to the bottom of 13 , consistent with the motion that just passed, I want to strike the last sentence because the deference under Mayer does not apply. And I also want to strike the words, "DEQ determined that."

And let me explain why, because what this says is that the Hearing Examiner made the decision because it deferred to DEQ, but $I$ think the statement of law is accurate without giving the deference.

So I would have paragraph -- and I will move this. Actually $I$ will move two of them, because there's another one just like it. Paragraph 29, we have to do the same thing.

So I move that in Paragraphs 22 and 29 we strike the words, "DEQ determined that" in the last sentence, and we do the same thing in 29. Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I'll second the motion.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any more discussion?
(No response)

CHAIR RUFFATTO: $\quad$ will call the question. All favor of the motion say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: We'll move on. I have no more changes. If anybody else has any changes in 14, 15 and 16 , please let me know.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Now $I$ think we have to deal with the waiver of the penalty. Mr. Pettis, do you just want us to include a provision that says that the DEQ has agreed to waive the penalty? MR. PETTIS: Chairman Ruffatto, $I$ would be fine with that. The original agreement was if we confirm that everything had been disconnected, and so if it could reflect that, $I$ think that would be most appropriate.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I would move that we rewrite the penalty provision to provide that if it is confirmed that the disconnect as requested by DEQ has occurred, the penalty will be waived. I won't try to draft it now. We'll do that after the fact. Is there a second to that motion?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: I'll call the question. All in favor of the motion say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion carries unanimously.

Now $I$ think we have one more motion to make, and that is to adopt the full FOFCOL as we have amended it as the decision of the Board, and that will necessarily require making these little changes and putting a final paragraph on it that it is the decision of the Board.

So $I$ move that the findings of fact and conclusions of law be adopted as the decision of the Board. Is there a second to that?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Passes unanimously.
Mr. Murray, $I$ just want to thank you for coming
and appearing, and telling us your story. I hope you can salvage something from this, and $I$ hope that your issue with the County sanitarian can get resolved, but $I$ do want to thank you for coming and talking to us. That was very helpful, and we appreciate it. And thank you, Mr. Pettis. I think we're done with that agenda item.

It's now 12:00 in Montana, and I'm really hungry. So we'll take an hour break, and at $1: 00$ we will convene with the Signal Peak matter.
(Lunch recess taken)

*     *         *             *                 * 
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