1	1 BEFORE THE BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
2	OF THE STATE OF MONTANA
3	
4	In the Matter of the Petitions of Teck) Coal Limited and the Board of County)
5	Commissioners of Lincoln County,)
6	Montana, for review of ARM) 17.30.632(7)(a) pursuant to Mont. Code)
7	Ann. Section 75-5-203 - Stringency) Review of Rule Pertaining to Selenium)
8	Standard for Lake Koocanusa)
9	
0	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
1	
2	Heard at the Montana Department
3	of Environmental Quality Metcalf Building, Room 111
	1520 East Sixth Avenue, Helena, MT
4	October 14, 2022, 9:15 a.m.
5	BEFORE CHAIRMAN STEVEN RUFFATTO (via Zoom),
6	VICE CHAIR STACY AGUIRRE,
7	BOARD MEMBERS DAVID SIMPSON,
8	JON REITEN (via Zoom), JOSEPH SMITH,
9	JULIA ALTEMUS (via zoom),
0	and DAVID LEHNHERR (via Zoom)
1	
2	PREPARED BY: LAURIE CRUTCHER, RPR
3	COURT REPORTER, NOTARY PUBLIC
4	lauriecrutcher@gmail.com
5	

1	2 APPEARANCES
2	
3	ATTORNEY APPEARING ON BEHALF OF TECK COAL:
4	MS. VICKI MARQUIS, ESQ. Attorney at Law Holland & Hart
5	401 North 31st St., Suite 1500
6	Billings, MT 59101
7	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF LINCOLN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:
8	MR. MURRY WARHANK, ESQ. (Via Zoom) Attorney at Law
9	Jackson, Murdo and Grant, PC 203 North Ewing Street
10	Helena, MT 59601
11	ATTORNEY APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT:
12	MS. KIRSTEN BOWERS, ESQ. Special Assistant Attorney General
13	Department of Environmental Quality
14	P.O. Box 200901 Helena, MT 59620
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

3 1 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were 2 had: 3 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We'll move to the 4 5 action items, and the first matter is the petitions of Teck Coal, Limited, and the Board of 6 7 County Commissioners of Lincoln County, Montana, for review of ARM 17.30.632(7)(a) pursuant to 8 9 Montana Code Annotated Section 75-5-203, stringency review of rule pertaining to selenium 10 standard for Lake Koocanusa, BER 2021-04 and 08, 11 12 Water Quality, DEQ. 13 I'd like to move to the last paragraph of this section and address that motion first. 14 At 15 the last meeting, this motion was tabled -- a 16 motion was made by Board Member Altemus and 17 seconded by Chairman Ruffatto -- based on the fact 18 that there was not a quorum, so the motion was So I'd like us to move that motion to a 19 tabled. 20 vote at this meeting, and so I'm calling for a 21 motion to consider DEQ's motion to alter or amend 22 be made at this time. 23 I don't think we need a new motion. 24 That's correct, right? No new motion? The motion 25 has already been made, so we're calling for the

4 1 vote at this time. 2 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman, 3 could we please repeat the motion. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes. We will have 4 5 to go back in the record to find the motion. CHAIR RUFFATTO: Stacy, I don't think 6 7 Dave is needing it word for word. Can't we -- The motion was to deny DEQ's motion to alter or amend. 8 9 Is that adequate from your view, Board Member 10 Simpson? 11 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes, it is. Ι just wanted to repeat the motion, even though 12 13 we've circulated the minutes for the benefit of 14 those who weren't present at the last meeting. 15 That's the reason for the request, just to refresh 16 our memories as to what it was about, and I 17 remember, having been there. 18 CHAIR RUFFATTO: So the motion was to 19 deny DEQ's request to alter or amend. 20 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll make that 21 motion. 22 BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So I was not 23 present at the last meeting. I've read through 24 the minutes. I'm still a little confused about 25 what all was discussed, and it looks like

5 1 basically the amendment would be just the one 2 paragraph, right, of the filing from I think April 3 or May.

But I'm not sure how to get at it, but 4 5 I'm wondering, I guess, what the purpose of deleting the one paragraph, what will be achieved 6 7 by that. And I don't want to reinvent the wheel 8 for everybody who was in the meeting, but I'm still just a little fuzzy on the intent. 9 10 MS. SCHERER: Dr. Lehnherr. 11 BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you. Ι 12 think it's appropriate to have a very clear 13 motion, have it be very clear what the motion is 14 regarding, and then have some discussion, since 15 there are new people here, and it's been a couple 16 of months since the last meeting. Thank you. 17 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I think it's

18 appropriate then to have Kirsten Bowers with DEQ 19 to read that and discuss it.

20 MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto has his 21 hand up as well.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Ruffatto.
 CHAIR RUFFATTO: I have no problem
 having some discussion, but everybody had the
 opportunity to read the transcript, and read all

-	6
1	the briefs, so I don't think it's appropriate to
2	take up everybody's time to any great extent here,
3	because there was ample opportunity to read
4	through that stuff.
5	But if we want to have discussion, let's
6	go ahead. So Vice Chair Aguirre, I suppose we
7	could start with DEQ giving their position, but I
8	think we're duplicating effort that isn't
9	necessary.
10	BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman,
11	I'd ask Chairman Ruffatto to his comment. If
12	I'm off base here. But as I recall, the issue has
13	to do with the statement in the order ordering the
14	Department to start a new rulemaking process on
15	the selenium rule.
16	And the basis for that was that because
17	the stringency statute was not issued, the rule
18	was issued improvidently, and there is a not
19	being an attorney, I don't recall the legal basis
20	for that but is a standard, as I understood it,
21	it was a standard requirement in the law that if a
22	rule is issued improvidently, that is, if it does
23	not follow the rules of procedure, then rulemaking
24	must start all over again. Is that essentially
25	correct, Steve?

1 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, you stated it 2 better than I could. BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: 3 Sorry. Ι 4 couldn't hear you. 5 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We couldn't hear you, Chairman Ruffatto. 6 7 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes. That is stating it very well. Can you hear me? 8 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: 9 Yes. So it's even though the Department went -- As I understand 10 11 it, even though the Department went through the 12 rulemaking process. And initially my thought was 13 that since that process had been already undertaken and completed, that it didn't need to 14 15 be repeated. I was persuaded to change my mind 16 based on the legal standard. And so that's why 17 I'm supporting the motion. 18 BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I think for me, my 19 question, if I were here during the last meeting, 20 I think more evolves around -- I can't find it 21 anywhere in the manuscripts, but I guess --22 I know one of the options was for DEQ, 23 was to go back into the public comment period, 24 which is one of the potential remedies, and I was 25 just wondering if that was maybe the intent of

1 striking the one paragraph.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member
 Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you. Just
a couple points. I certainly disagree with the
notion that the rulemaking process was done
incorrectly by the previous Board.

8 But I'm also wondering if, after this 9 vote, we will then deal with the issue of whether 10 or not we will submit our opinion to the EPA. 11 Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes. That will be
 the second matter that we deal with on this item.
 BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you.

MS. BOWERS: Would you like me to proceed? Thank you, Vice Chair Aguirre, members of the Board, Chair Ruffatto. Out of respect for the Board's time, I won't reargue my motion, but just state the reason for the motion.

And in its pending motion to alter or amend the Board's final agency action and order, DEQ requests that the Board strike the portion of the order that provides, "Because the Board's rulemaking failed to comply with Section 75-5-203, Montana Code Annotated, in order to have a valid and enforceable lake water column standard, new
 rulemaking must be initiated." This is in
 paragraph Roman Numeral IV sub (6) of the Board's
 order.

5 And the reason for the motion is because 6 the stringency determination by the Board answered 7 a narrow question, and that is whether the Lake 8 Koocanusa water column standard is more stringent 9 than Federal; and upon that determination, DEQ 10 implemented the remedy set forth in the stringency 11 statute, which provides two options:

12 One is to comply with the section by 13 revising the rule to conform to the Federal regulations or guidelines, and the other is to 14 15 make the written findings. And DEQ did make the 16 written findings which were subject to a public 17 notice hearing comment period, but that remedy 18 does not provide for initiation of new rulemaking. 19 That was the reason for the DEQ's motion.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you for that
 re-explanation.

MS. BOWERS: Thank you.

22

25

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Is there any more
 discussion? Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you. Since

10 1 the Department was able to state their case, is it 2 possible to hear from Ms. Marquis to refresh the 3 memory of their position as well, please. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: 4 Yes. BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I believe she's 5 in the room. 6 7 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes, Ms. Marquis. MS. MAROUIS: Hi. Good morning. 8 Ι would first like to acknowledge Murry Warhank 9 10 represents the Lincoln County Commissioners. I'm 11 Vicki Marquis with Crowley Fleck. I represent 12 Teck. 13 I would like to defer to Murry Warhank. I see he's participating virtually. He represents 14 15 the Lincoln County Commissioners. So if it's okay 16 with the Board, I'd like to give him a moment or 17 two to weigh in, because he had a portion of our 18 argument at the last meeting as well. Is that 19 okay? 20 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes. 21 MS. SCHERER: He's being promoted to 22 panelist, so he should be --23 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: He should be able 24 to speak. 25 MS. SCHERER: There he is. Okay.

11 1 MR. WARHANK: I'm sorry. I cut out a 2 moment as I was promoted to panelist. Can everybody hear me okay? 3 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: 4 Yes. 5 MR. WARHANK: Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of my client, 6 7 Lincoln County. Just briefly, the portion of the 8 9 argument that I want to cover this morning is with 10 regards to the legal standard. The motion is based on Rule 59, and Rule 59 is not appropriate 11 12 in this case. 13 Rule 59 from the Montana Supreme Court is not intended to be a situation where parties 14 15 re-argue what has already been presented to the 16 Court, or in this case to the Board. 17 Here there's no question that this was 18 presented to the Board significantly throughout It was in DEQ's comments on January 19 the process. 20 13th; and it was discussed at length in the 21 Board's hearing on the 25th of February at Pages 22 57 through 75; and at the April 8th hearing at 23 Pages 26 through 45. 24 So it's our position that this just 25 isn't an appropriate motion. The Board has made

12 its decision on this matter, and it should not be 1 2 subject to continually revising every opinion it makes. If there needs to be revision, that should 3 happen through the judicial process. 4 5 So that's the position we have, and I know Ms. Marquis has further argument on the 6 7 substantive issues. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: 8 Thank you. 9 MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. I won't go back through the argument that we raised last 10 11 month, but I do want to point out a couple things 12 that have come to light since then. 13 And I have a couple hand-outs. Ι 14 apologize for those participating virtually. 15 These are documents that have been in front of the Board before. The first one is House Bill No. 521 16 17 from 1995, and this is the House Bill where the 18 Legislature passed and enacted the stringency 19 statute that is the subject of this issue. So I 20 have a copy I'd like to pass out, if that's okay, 21 to the Board members. 22 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I believe that's, 23 yes, acceptable. 24 MS. MARQUIS: (Provides document) 25 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We need to figure

13 out how to get an electronic copy distributed. 1 2 BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: A point of 3 order. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes, Board Member 4 5 Lehnherr. BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I have a 6 7 question about the propriety of information being provided to some Board members and not others. 8 MS. MARQUIS: Certainly. This is House 9 Bill No. 521, and I believe Chairman Ruffatto 10 11 cited it during the last Board meeting. I can forward that by email. If you'd like me to take a 12 13 few minutes and do that now, I can do that. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Probably need to. 14 15 Thank you. MS. MARQUIS: Should I send it to Sandy? 16 17 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I believe that 18 would be Sandy and Chairman Ruffatto probably, 19 correct? 20 MS. SCHERER: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN RUFFATTO: Pardon me? 22 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Is that correct, 23 that if the email is getting forwarded to those 24 Board members that are on the call virtually, that 25 it should go to yourself and Sandy?

14 CHAIR RUFFATTO: No, it should go to 2 myself, and Julia, and Jon, and David.

But I'm going to ask Vice Chair Aguirre 3 that we terminate this discussion. We don't want 4 5 to open this up to discussion again. We beat it to death two months ago. All of this is in the 6 7 record. I would say let's cut the discussion off here because we're just rehashing old stuff that's 8 9 in the record, and everybody had an opportunity to 10 review that.

I emailed all the members of the Board 11 12 two or three weeks ago to please review all of 13 that, and so everybody had an opportunity. So I 14 move that we terminate this repeat discussion and 15 argument, and if Board members have specific 16 questions, let's hear those specific questions. 17 So I move to stop the oral arguments, 18 stop the arguments, and only hear specific 19 questions from Board members.

20VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE:Is there a second21to that motion?

22 BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: This is Julia. I 23 second.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. All in favor
of that motion, say aye.

15 1 (Response) 2 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed. 3 (No response) 4 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. Motion 5 carries. So based on that, are there specific questions that the Board members have on this 6 7 matter prior to a vote on the motion that is on the table to deny DEQ's motion to alter or amend? 8 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman, I 9 10 don't believe the motion was seconded. 11 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Which motion? 12 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: My motion to deny 13 DEQ's petition to change the Board's order. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Was it not seconded 14 15 at the last meeting? BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: It was not 16 17 seconded at this meeting. So I don't know that 18 the motion needs to be remade, but I'm just 19 pointing out that you had asked for a motion on 20 the issue, which was to deny the Department's 21 petition for the Board to change its order with 22 respect to rulemaking. 23 That motion was made at the last 24 I repeated it here. I don't know that meeting. 25 it needs to be repeated, but that's the substance

1 of the motion.

2	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I think I misspoke
3	in my working through managing the meeting that
4	the motion was made to deny DEQ's motion to alter
5	or amend at the last meeting.
6	BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Correct.
7	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: And that meeting
8	was made or that motion that was made and
9	seconded at the last meeting. So I spoke
10	incorrectly by talking about the previous motion
11	that was already made and seconded and on the
12	table.
13	I should have gone directly to the
14	discussion, any questions by the Board, and so I
15	think I took that in a direction that it didn't
16	need to go to because the motion was already on
17	the table.
18	BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: So the essence is
19	that my motion made earlier was unnecessary?
20	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Correct.
21	BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Then I'll
22	withdraw it.
23	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. So
24	we're at the place where if any of the Board
25	members have questions on the motion to deny DEQ's

17 motion to alter or amend, that's where we're at. 1 2 Are there any further questions by the Board members? 3 4 (No response) 5 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Hearing none, I'd like to move the motion to a vote. All in favor 6 7 of the motion made to deny DEQ's motion to alter or amend, say aye. 8 9 (Response) 10 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed. 11 (Response) 12 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Roll call. 13 MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto. 14 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye. 15 MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre. 16 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye. 17 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus. 18 BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye. 19 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr. 20 BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay. MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten. 21 22 BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay. 23 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson. 24 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye. 25 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.

18 1 BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye. 2 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carried. Moving to the Joint Notice and Motion to Submit 3 4 Final Agency Action to EPA that was filed by Lincoln County and Teck Coal on July 20th, 2022. 5 DEQ filed a response to the joint notice 6 7 and motion on August 3rd, Petitioners' reply in support of the motion was filed on August 18th, 8 and this motion is ready for a Board decision. 9 10 At this point we're going to move to 11 oral argument, and we're going to call for oral 12 argument, and we're going to give Lincoln County 13 and Teck Coal ten minutes. You can divide that up however you choose. And then we'll move to ten 14 15 minutes for DEQ oral argument. At that point 16 we'll open it up to the Board for questions and 17 then move forward. So we're going to start with 18 oral argument from Lincoln County and Teck Coal. MR. WARHANK: Lincoln County will defer 19 20 its time to Ms. Marquis. 21 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Ms. Marquis. 22 MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. I'll take 23 approximately three to four minutes and save the 24 rest for rebuttal. 25 We filed this Notice and Motion to

1 Submit the Board's Agency Action to EPA for a 2 couple of reasons. I think the first most obvious 3 reason is to ensure that there's clear and 4 consistent communication between the State of 5 Montana and EPA Region 8 on Montana's water 6 quality standards.

7 We see that in the history of this standard itself. We know that it was submitted to 8 EPA for approval immediately after it was 9 promulgated in December of 2020. Exhibit A to our 10 11 filing is a copy of EPA's approval letter, which 12 was submitted to this Board on February 25th, 13 2021, and that letter was signed by Judy Bloom, 14 the Manager of the Clean Water branch at EPA 15 Region 8.

We also know that EPA's approval was premised at least in part on their reliance on a legal certification that came from Montana certifying that the new standard had been promulgated in accordance with all State laws.

We know now that was in error. This Board order that was signed in April that you just upheld establishes that there is a legal error in the rulemaking, so the rulemaking was not conducted in accordance with all State laws. The stringency statute is an important part of the
 Montana Water Quality Act, and that law was
 violated during that rulemaking.

So we also know that EPA cannot approve a water quality standard that has been promulgated in violation of State laws. Because EPA approved the standard based on a certification from the State, that certification is now erroneous.

9 EPA should formally be informed of that 10 legal error, and given the opportunity to respond 11 and address their approval by either revoking it 12 or taking some other action, but there needs to be 13 that next step to clarify the communication, and 14 allow EPA to take whatever action it wants to 15 take.

The second reason is, as I've already touched on, the legal error that occurred in the Board's rulemaking carries over to the EPA's decision. So in order to clean all of this up, and get back to a legally defensible standard, we need to go through all of the same steps again.

The steps that the Board followed and DEQ followed in the beginning were rulemaking, Board decision, and then it was submitted to EPA. EPA then submitted a document back to the Board.

21 1 So we need to do that process again, submit the Board's decision to EPA, and allow EPA to make a 2 decision on that. 3 And that's all I have unless Mr. Warhank 4 5 wants to add more, or if the Board has questions, and then I'll save the remainder of my time for 6 7 rebuttal. Thank you. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: 8 Thank you, Ms. 9 Marquis. DEQ. 10 MS. BOWERS: Thank you, Vice Chair 11 Aguirre, members of the Board. For the record, my 12 name is Kirsten Bowers. I'm an attorney with DEQ, 13 responding to Teck's motion, Teck and Lincoln County's motion to submit the Board's final agency 14 15 action and order to EPA. 16 Teck and Lincoln County argue the Board 17 should submit the final agency action and order to 18 EPA to notify EPA of legal errors in the December 2020 submission of the Lake Koocanusa water column 19 20 standard, and request that EPA vacate its 2021 21 approval of the lake numeric standard. 22 Teck and Lincoln County further allege 23 that EPA's approval of the lake numeric standard 24 relied on the State of Montana's 2020 25 certification that the Board duly adopted ARM

1 17.30.632 under authority of the Montana Water 2 Quality Act, the Montana Administrative Procedure 3 Act, and all relevant laws and regulations, and 4 they cite to the DEQ Chief Legal Counsel's 5 certification of that water quality standard to 6 EPA.

7 Teck argues that DEQ's 2020 legal certification of the lake numeric standard was 8 erroneous, and EPA's approval of the lake numeric 9 standard was therefore erroneous, and the Board 10 should resubmit final agency action and order to 11 EPA, and request vacatur of its approval of the 12 13 Lake Koocanusa water column standard for selenium 14 for Federal Clean Water Act purposes.

When the Board accepted the Teck and Lincoln County petitions, it recognized that the petitions presented a narrow issue for the Board's consideration: Whether the Board complied with the stringency statute when it adopted the Lake Koocanusa water column standard.

The Board considered the petitions in a non-formal administrative process that was neither a contested case nor a rulemaking. The Board's decision found the lake numeric standard more stringent than comparable Federal regulations or 1 guidelines, and that required DEQ to implement the 2 statutory remedy.

The Board's final decision is not a 3 water quality standard that EPA has the authority 4 5 or the duty to approve or disapprove, because the Board order finding the Lake Koocanusa numeric 6 7 standard more stringent than comparable Federal regulations or guidelines does not address 8 9 designated uses, water quality criteria, or 10 nondegradation, and it does not express the desired condition of Lake Koocanusa. 11 12 The Board order is therefore not a new 13 water quality standard or a revised water quality standard that EPA has the authority and duty to 14 15 approve or disapprove under the Clean Water Act. 16 DEQ acknowledged the Board's 17 determination that the Lake Koocanusa water column 18 standard was more stringent than comparable 19 Federal regulations or guidelines, and implemented 20 the statutory remedy available to a successful 21 petitioner by making the findings under Section 22 75-5-203 Sub (2) and (3).

DEQ did recognize the Board's authority to make this determination, and DEQ's interpretation of the statute is in accordance

with the clear stringency provisions of the
 Montana Water Quality Act, which grants DEQ the
 authority to implement the remedy.

This remedy may involve either 4 5 rulemaking to adopt a rule that is consistent with the comparable Federal regulation or guidance, or 6 7 to make the stringency findings necessary to support the more stringent standard, and DEQ chose 8 to make the findings in response to the Board's 9 10 determination that the Lake Koocanusa water column 11 standard is more stringent.

DEQ reviews its water quality standards every three years, and a review of the Lake Koocanusa water column standard will be completed by the end of 2023.

A revised standard is not a guaranteed outcome of this review process, but Teck, and Lincoln County, and all stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide new or updated data, and DEQ can address any questions, concerns, about its model at that time.

And if there are revisions to the Lake Koocanusa water column standard, they will occur after rulemaking conducted in accordance with MAPA, the Montana Water Quality Act, and they will

1 be based on sound science.

2	DEQ disagrees there is an outstanding
3	legal error related to the adoption of the Lake
4	Koocanusa water column standard. In response to
5	the Board's stringency determination, DEQ
6	implemented the remedy by making the findings to
7	support the Lake Koocanusa selenium standard, and
8	this is one of the statutory remedies to cure a
9	standard that the Board finds more stringent than
10	Federal, but these statutory remedies do not
11	include invalidation of a rule that's consistent
12	with the intent and purpose of the Water Quality
13	Act and the Montana Administrative Procedures Act.
14	In its briefing and motion, Teck cites
14 15	In its briefing and motion, Teck cites the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the
15	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the
15 16	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the proposition that when a Court invalidates a rule,
15 16 17	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the proposition that when a Court invalidates a rule, the effect is return to the former rule. However,
15 16 17 18	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the proposition that when a Court invalidates a rule, the effect is return to the former rule. However, this ignores the fact that the stringency statute
15 16 17 18 19	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the proposition that when a Court invalidates a rule, the effect is return to the former rule. However, this ignores the fact that the stringency statute provides a remedy for a successful petitioner, and
15 16 17 18 19 20	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the proposition that when a Court invalidates a rule, the effect is return to the former rule. However, this ignores the fact that the stringency statute provides a remedy for a successful petitioner, and that remedy was implemented in this case.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the proposition that when a Court invalidates a rule, the effect is return to the former rule. However, this ignores the fact that the stringency statute provides a remedy for a successful petitioner, and that remedy was implemented in this case. The Clark Fork versus Tubbs case
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Clark Fork Coalition v. Tubbs case for the proposition that when a Court invalidates a rule, the effect is return to the former rule. However, this ignores the fact that the stringency statute provides a remedy for a successful petitioner, and that remedy was implemented in this case. The Clark Fork versus Tubbs case involved the question of validity of an

26
1 effective unless it is, "A," consistent and not in
2 conflict with the statute; and "B," reasonably
3 necessary to effectuate the purpose of the
4 statute.

5 Teck did not challenge the Lake 6 Koocanusa water column standard based on 7 consistency with the Water Quality Act, or whether 8 the agency's rulemaking authority under that act 9 was exceeded.

Teck does not dispute that the Lake Koocanusa water column standard was adopted in accordance with MAPA. Teck's challenge is based solely on the stringency statute, and the remedy provided to a successful petitioner under that statute cannot be ignored.

16 That remedy provides an alternative when 17 the Board determines that the rule is more 18 stringent than comparable Federal regulations or 19 quidelines, and the Department shall comply with 20 this section by either revising the rule to 21 conform to the Federal regulations or guidelines, 22 or by making the written findings as provided in 23 Subsection (2) within a reasonable period of time 24 not to exceed eight months, which DEQ did. 25 Furthermore, the stringency statute

provides the Department may adopt a rule to 1 2 implement the Montana Water Quality Act that is more stringent than comparable Federal regulations 3 or guidelines if they make the written findings in 4 5 Subsection (2), but both Subsection (4), the remedy provision, and Subsection (2) require 6 7 written findings after public hearings, public comment, and based on evidence in the record, but 8 9 neither require a new rulemaking process to make 10 those findings.

In the construction of a statute, a decision maker must ascertain and declare what is in terms or in substance contained in the statute, not insert language that has been omitted or omit language that is in the statute; and the Board can't insert a rulemaking requirement into the statute when it isn't there.

And additionally, when there are several provisions in a statute, all must be read in a way that they all are given effect. So the remedy provisions in the stringency statute can't be read out of the statute.

DEQ respected the Board's authority to determine the petitioned rule is more stringent than Federal, and made the findings after a public

comment period, and a hearing, and based on
 evidence in the record.

One of the eight factors that EPA would consider in reviewing and approving a state standard is whether that standard was adopted in accordance with applicable legal procedures for revising or adopting standards.

8 The Lake Koocanusa water column standard 9 was adopted after rulemaking conducted in 10 accordance with MAPA, and under the authority of 11 Montana Water Quality Act.

12 The Board's stringency determination was 13 also made under the Montana Water Quality Act, and 14 triggered the remedy provisions in the stringency 15 The Board's stringency decision did not statute. 16 result in a new or revised water quality standard 17 that includes criteria to protect designated uses, 18 a scientific rational, and consideration of the 19 State nondegradation policy.

The BER should not submit its final agency action to EPA for review and approval because under the Federal regulation 40 CFR 131.5, EPA approves or disapproves state adopted water quality standards, and the regulation does not provide for EPA's vacatur of prior approval of

29 1 those state water quality standards. Thank you. 2 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. Ms. 3 Marquis, rebuttal. MR. WARHANK: Just briefly in rebuttal. 4 5 This is Murry Warhank. May I just say that to the extent it's unclear, Lincoln County is part of 6 7 this motion as well and we join in it. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: 8 Yes. 9 MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. I think what you just heard from DEQ is continued argument 10 about the remedy which was the focus of their 11 12 motion that this Board just denied. 13 The remedy is clear, and this Board's 14 order just established that new rulemaking is 15 required in order to have a valid site specific water column standard for Lake Koocanusa. The 16 17 remedy argument is done. The Board's order is 18 well supported by legislative history, the statute itself, and case law, both State and Federal case 19 20 law. 21 The issue before the Board right now is 22 what's the next step that is necessary to clear up 23 the legal error, and that next step is the same as 24 you did before. This Board before forwarded its 25 decision to EPA. You've now found legal error in

30 that decision, and that should also be forwarded 1 2 to EPA to take appropriate action, which we believe is to vacate the standard at the Federal 3 level. 4 5 One thing DEQ said I want to clarify. Ι believe they said that Teck does not dispute that 6 7 the rule was promulgated in accordance with the Montana Administrative Procedures Act. 8 I want to clarify that there is a 9 There is no current litigation 10 dispute there. 11 pending on that, but please don't assume that Teck 12 believes that the rest of the rulemaking was in 13 compliance with the statutes because that is not the case. 14 15 Teck and Lincoln County had the right to 16 bring this petition before the Board, and there 17 were timelines in which we felt we needed to do 18 that, and give the Board a chance to clear up the That's what we've done. 19 record. 20 The legal effect of the Board's order is 21 that the rule is void, and it has been void since 22 its inception. That means that the governing 23 statewide standard for selenium, which is five 24 micrograms per liter, is what governs Lake 25 Koocanusa at this time.

31 DEQ talks about doing a triennial 1 2 review, and that's fine. They are statutorily required to do a triennial review of all their 3 water quality standards. So if DEQ chooses to 4 5 wait and review and go into new rulemaking after the triennial review, they can do that, but in the 6 7 meantime the water column standard that governs Lake Koocanusa is the statewide standard of five 8 9 micrograms per liter. 10 The final point I want to make is that 11 that statewide standard was acknowledged by EPA on 12 Page 5 of its EPA approval letter, so that 13 standard is on the books. It's been on the books for a long time, and EPA has acknowledged that on 14 a statewide level. 15 16 I'm sorry. I do have one other point. 17 This is an important issue statewide. Selenium is 18 not just found in Lake Koocanusa, it is found statewide. 19 20 It's also an important point for how our 21 water quality standards are administered and acted 22 upon by our State agencies. In our notice and 23 motion on Page 9 we provided a table, and on the 24 first column on the left-hand side we pulled out 25 specific citations from the Board's orders; and

the other column on right-hand side, we pulled out quotations from DEQ, either in their filings, in their public comments, or in their legislative testimony.

5 And it is clear, and what you just heard 6 today again, is that DEQ intends to continue 7 forward as if the standard governing Lake 8 Koocanusa is 0.8 micrograms per liter. That 9 standard is invalid. It was promulgated in 10 violation of a State law.

11 And so to give effect to the Board's order, we need that next step to occur. DEQ has 12 13 said in other forums that for Federal Clean Water 14 Act purposes, they're going to rely on that 15 standard. We need to send that standard, the 16 Board's decision on the standard, up to EPA to 17 have them vacate their approval of the standard, 18 and to give effect to the Board's order. Thank 19 you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. I
believe it might be best to take a quick break at
this time, a ten minute break, and we'll come back
and move into the opening questions of the Board.
We're in recess for ten minutes.

(Recess taken)

33 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'm going to call 1 2 the meeting back to order. Sandy, will you do a roll call. 3 MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto. 4 5 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Here. MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre. 6 7 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Here. MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus. 8 9 BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Here. 10 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr. BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Here. 11 12 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten. 13 BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here. 14 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson. 15 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Here. MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith. 16 17 BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here. 18 MS. SCHERER: All present. 19 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. Moving 20 from the oral argument, we'll open up to the Board 21 to ask any questions that you have on this matter. 22 (No response) 23 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Do any Board 24 members have questions? 25 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I have one

34 1 question for Ms. Bowers. As I was listening to 2 the oral arguments, I believe Ms. Marquis answered a question that was on my mind, and that was what 3 was the standard up until -- the selenium standard 4 5 for Lake Koocanusa up until the time that the new standard was adopted in the Department's view. 6 7 Do you concur with the view that before that -- her point that before that standard was 8 adopted, the standard was, the statewide standard 9 was five? Is that correct? Is that the statement 10 11 that would have been in --12 MS. BOWERS: Yes, Board Member Simpson, 13 members of the Board. That's correct. The statewide standard is five, and that was the 14 15 standard also for Lake Koocanusa. 16 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: So that in the 17 case that the rule is now invalid because of 18 improper procedure, improper administrative procedure, that's what the standard would defer 19 20 to, is the five, statewide standard of five, 21 because that standard has not changed? That's my 22 That standard has not changed? main question. 23 MS. BOWERS: That's correct. That

24 standard hasn't changed.

25

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you.

35 MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto has his 1 2 hand up. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I just want to ask 3 that it has a different basis, though, correct? 4 5 The five has a different basis of application? Ι think that is good for everybody to know as well. 6 7 MS. BOWERS: Yes, Vice Chair Aguirre, members of the Board. The statewide standard of 8 five is supported by different rationale and 9 different basis, and the site specific standard 10 for Lake Koocanusa and the Kootenai River Basin 11 12 was based on site specific scientific rationale. 13 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. Chair Ruffatto. 14 15 CHAIR RUFFATTO: My question is -- and 16 I'd like both lawyers to answer this question --17 but if the Board is correct, and the rulemaking 18 was invalid, and therefore the rule was invalid 19 from the start, the first question is: Would you 20 agree, assuming that, that then the rule is 21 invalid for Montana purposes and Federal purposes? 22 Would you agree with that? 23 MS. MARQUIS: Certainly. I can address 24 that question first. Make sure I understand the 25 question, as I heard it was it was assuming --

36 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Would you please 1 2 just reidentify yourself for the record. MS. MARQUIS: Vicki Marquis representing 3 Teck Coal. 4 5 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. MS. MARQUIS: The rulemaking is invalid, 6 7 which makes the rule invalid from its inception, 8 is supported by case law. And then the question Does that make the rule invalid for both 9 was: Montana and Federal purposes? 10 11 And Teck's position is that, yes, it EPA has no authority to enforce a state 12 does. 13 water quality standard that was enacted in violation of state laws, and that is obvious from 14 15 the fact that one of their check points, when they 16 approve a state water quality standard, they have 17 to check to ensure that it was promulgated in accordance with state law. 18 19 This one was not, so it cannot be in 20 effect for State purposes, and it cannot be used 21 for Federal Clean Water Act purposes, because EPA 22 cannot approve a standard that was enacted in violation of a state law. Does that answer your 23 24 question, Chairman Ruffatto? 25 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, it does. Thank

37 1 you. 2 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: DEQ. MS. BOWERS: Vice Chair Aquirre, members 3 4 of the Board. 5 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Would you please 6 reidentify yourself. 7 MS. BOWERS: I'm Kirsten Bowers, DEQ 8 attorney. DEQ does not agree that the Board's 9 10 stringency determination repealed or invalidated 11 the rule, and the rule is still in effect for 12 Clean Water Act purposes until a new standard is 13 submitted to EPA for EPA's review and approval. 14 CHAIR RUFFATTO: That wasn't my 15 question. My question was: If the Board is 16 correct, is the rule invalid for state and Federal 17 law purposes? 18 MS. BOWERS: Chair Ruffatto, members of the Board, if the Board is correct that it 19 20 invalidated the Montana water quality standard, it 21 doesn't change the fact that EPA reviewed and 22 approved that standard, and that standard would still remain in effect for Clean Water Act 23 24 purposes until EPA reviews and approves a new 25 standard.

1 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Do you have authority 2 for that proposition?

MS. BOWERS: Well, I believe it's 3 consistent with the Clean Water Act Section 303, 4 and also with 40 CFR 131.5. And that Federal 5 regulation goes on to say that if EPA would 6 7 disapprove a state water quality standard, EPA could promulgate their own standard for the state. 8 CHAIR RUFFATTO: But Ms. Bowers, this is 9 not a water quality standard if the Board is 10 11 It's a nullity. So how does that apply? right. 12 I know you disagree with the proposition 13 that the Board might be right, but how would that point you just made even apply if there was no 14 15 standard, it was void from the beginning? It's my position that the 16 MS. BOWERS: 17 Board's voidance of the Lake Koocanusa water 18 column standard does not mean that EPA's review 19 and approval of that standard is also vacated. 20 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member 21 22 Simpson, did you have a question? 23 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I'm pondering. 24 The point I've been turning over in my mind is 25 that what we're debating here is really a fine

39 1 point of law as to what the standard is, given the 2 situation as it's unfolded.

The fact of the matter is that it really doesn't change anything on the ground as far as new permitting or any action that's going to have an impact on selenium levels in Lake Koocanusa beyond what's already there.

8 So we're not talking about an 9 environmental risk here. What we're talking about 10 is a point of law as to the validity of the 11 standard, and then beyond that, the question of 12 proceeding with a new rulemaking.

13 And in my own mind -- and maybe I'm 14 getting ahead of the game here -- but having gone 15 through all of the process that we have, we have 16 the legal question, but there's also a technical 17 question. And I certainly have no quarrel with 18 all the information that was developed in the process of coming up with a selenium standard for 19 20 Lake Koocanusa.

However, I believe there are indications in the record that that conclusion of 0.8 parts per billion micrograms per liter is open to question, and in my mind the reason it's open to guestion is there are suggestions that when you 40
1 review the process, it appears that the -- and I'm
2 not sure this is the case -- but there's certainly
3 an appearance that the result was predetermined,
4 and that the model was backfilled to come up with
5 that standard.

6 I would strongly recommend that in 7 proceeding with the new rulemaking, that that 8 model be revisited, properly calibrated, and 9 subjected to sensitivity analysis, to give us more 10 confidence that it's giving us a reliable answer.

And I sound like a broken record. I've repeated this numerous times during the course of these discussions in various Board meetings, but as of now that's my view of where we stand.

15 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member16 Lehnherr.

17 BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you. Ι 18 had a little problem with the audio there. Ι 19 don't know if we're asking questions. I quess I 20 have a question, and then I have a comment. I can 21 save the comment if we come up with a motion and a 22 discussion period after a motion has been made.

But I think Board Member Simpson raises an interesting point. Maybe I misunderstood what he was saying when he said that the 0.8 standard would have basically no practical effect.

And I think Teck Coal years ago or months ago made that same point, saying whatever the standard was wouldn't really affect them. But I wanted to know if that's really the case, that if this standard didn't have any practical mplications, then why is Teck Coal here, and why have they challenged the standard.

9 That is coming up in my mind, it's come 10 up over and over. Part of it is because Teck Coal 11 is taking different approaches here, and it's been 12 a bit confusing, what approach they're going to 13 stick with. But maybe I'll save further comments 14 until we have a motion. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you.

16 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman, 17 if I could respond briefly. My comment that the 18 0.8 has no impact on the ground is, in my view, in 19 the short term. It certainly has an impact in the 20 longer term. And I'm talking about the time frame 21 between now and the time the administrative 22 procedure is repeated to backfill the rulemaking. 23 Certainly in the long haul it's very material as 24 to what that standard is.

25

15

1

So I just want to make that point. I'm

42 not saying that it's inconsequential. All my 1 2 point is is that there is nothing pending in the way of new activity, new permitting, new 3 proposals, that would have an impact on Lake 4 5 Koocanusa. The big issue has been Teck Coal, and 6 7 Elk River, and the content of selenium in the Elk River flowing into the Kootenai. And of course, 8 we're aware of the efforts that Teck is making to 9 10 mitigate its discharges and so on and so forth. 11 But my point is there is no 12 environmental risk on proceeding with a new 13 rulemaking, and the time frame that will take. That's all I'm saying. 14 15 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Ruffatto. I want to ask both 16 CHAIR RUFFATTO: 17 parties a question, and again, I want to make an 18 assumption -- I know DEQ will not agree with the 19 assumption. 20 But if you accept the assumption that 21 the Board is correct, and DEQ goes forward with 22 establishing various additional standards, total 23 maximum daily loads and allocations -- which I 24 expect are fairly expensive processes -- and if 25 the Board is right, what will be the effect on

43 those further actions that are based on this rule? 1 2 MS. BOWERS: Chair Ruffatto, Vice Chair Aquirre, members of the Board. I'm kind of just 3 guessing here. 4 5 If you're right, and the Lake Koocanusa water column standard is vacated, DEQ is not 6 7 immediately going to go out and start doing an assessment and setting a TMDL based on .8. 8 9 I think more likely -- and I'm guessing. I can't speak for water quality planning folks --10 but I think more likely the next step will be the 11 triennial review process to revisit the standard, 12 13 and look at new data, and answer questions about the model that have been raised, and consult with 14 15 stakeholders. 16 And then after that process, which is 17 supposed to be completed at the end of 2023, after 18 that process, if it seems like the standard needs 19 to be revised, then we would initiate rulemaking 20 to do that. 21 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you. 22 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. MS. MARQUIS: Chairman Ruffatto, members 23 24 of the Board. Vicki Marquis for Teck Coal. Thank 25 you for the question.

1 And the path forward that DEQ has laid 2 out in legislative testimony and in their written documents differs a bit. You've heard them today 3 insist that the .8 standard remains, and that they 4 5 will revise it, if at all, during or after the triennial review. The triennial review would 6 7 conclude in 2023. Typically rulemaking hasn't occurred until the following year, so that would 8 9 put it into 2024.

10 But in the meantime, DEQ's public 11 statements have indicated that they intend to move forward with a water quality assessment of Lake 12 13 Koocanusa, and Teck's view is that a water quality 14 assessment should proceed with the statewide water 15 column standard of five, as well as the fish 16 tissue standards which were not subject to these 17 petitions, and those are still on the books and 18 still govern.

19 So that water quality assessment should 20 be done in that matter. If it's done comparing 21 water quality data to the invalid 0.8 standard 22 that would result in an invalid water quality 23 assessment, which could potentially result in an 24 impairment determination, development of a total 25 maximum daily load, or TMDL, and waste load

45 allocation, those are steps that DEQ has said that 1 2 they would take using the .8 standard. And those steps are time intensive and 3 expensive for the agency. I believe DEQ's 4 statement about the waste load allocation was then 5 that they would seek to have that waste load 6 7 allocation enforced against Canada. All of that would be invalid if it was 8 premised on a water quality standard at .8, unless 9 10 new rulemaking occurs and establishes the standard 11 legally at that level. Does that answer your 12 question? Thank you. 13 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Additional questions from the Board prior to moving to a 14 15 motion? 16 (No response) 17 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: At this time I'd 18 like to call for a motion to grant or deny the 19 joint motion. 20 (No response) 21 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Calling for a 22 motion to grant or deny the Joint Notice and 23 Motion to Submit the Final Agency Action to EPA 24 that was filed by Lincoln County and Teck Coal. 25 Board Member Altemus.

46 BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I guess for 1 2 discussion purposes, I will move the motion forward to accept their motion to send this 3 information to EPA for review. 4 5 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: So motion to grant the Joint Notice and Motion? 6 BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Yes. Thank you. 7 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Is there a second? 8 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: 9 Second. 10 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Discussion on the 11 motion. 12 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman. 13 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member Lehnherr. 14 15 BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Board Member 16 Simpson can go ahead. 17 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. Board Member 18 Simpson. BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: 19 The Board has 20 made a determination that the standard of 0.8 is 21 not valid and hasn't been valid from the time it 22 was adopted. We realize there's not full 23 agreement within the Board on that. 24 But I guess my question is: What is the 25 down side of notifying EPA of that fact?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Are you asking that
 question maybe --

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I'm asking that
question for consideration by the Board, and
points of view or opinions.

I guess my view is that, again, it may have some implications, as was discussed here earlier, about water quality administration moving forward having to do with TMDL's, and impairment determinations, and things of that nature.

And it would essentially -- not knowing the schedule, I would assume that those kinds of activities would be deferred until there is a valid standard in place, be it 0.8 or something else.

16 But I guess that's how I see the impact 17 of notifying or not notifying EPA at this point. 18 This is not a -- Obviously we wouldn't be struggling with it so much. It's not a straight 19 20 forward situation. But I think in order to start 21 with a clean slate, EPA needs to be notified of 22 such, which is why I seconded the motion. I don't 23 see a down side of that.

24BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I agree with those25thoughts, Board Member Simpson. I don't see a

48 reason why we wouldn't. We decided this as a 1 2 Board, and I think -- not that it was an oversight -- but by original decision, I think maybe it was 3 an assumption that that would make it to the EPA, 4 5 but I don't see why we wouldn't send that formally to them. 6 7 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member 8 Lehnherr. BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: 9 Thanks for letting me comment, Vice Chair Aguirre. 10 11 Even though this selenium standard 12 process in my mind has been strangely convoluted 13 and fraught with significant errors ever since the new Board took it up, and I won't go into all of 14 15 the various convolutions again, it seems the Board 16 is determined to do whatever it takes to put the 17 interests of the Canadian coal company Teck before 18 the interests of Montana's water quality. 19 Lincoln County politicians jumped in I 20 think to give Teck a sense of legitimacy with 21 Montanans. The route Teck and the Board decided 22 to take was to take a very narrow approach to 23 attack the selenium standard using the concept of 24 stringency, which as I've said before I think was 25 incorrectly applied.

49 But that's all we dealt with. We didn't 1 2 deal with the hundreds of public comments, the thousands of pages of scientific documents and 3 scientific input that the previous Board 4 5 considered. We had a couple of periods of public 6 7 comments. We had a meeting where we listened to an attorney for Teck and an attorney for the DEQ. 8 9 I think the whole process was woefully inadequate, but there seems to be a goal of arriving at a 10 11 certain place regardless. 12 But I invite you to read the letter from 13 the EPA that's on Page 0093 of our packet. It's 14 sort of a nice summary of why the previous Board 15 had it correctly. 16 But it's interesting to see how Teck's 17 legalistic contortions continue. Teck is 18 apparently unhappy it would have to comply with 19 the older, more appropriate selenium standard 20 until the selenium standard is reworked. 21 So now they're trying to do an end run, 22 and have us submit the outcome of our work to the 23 EPA, when the EPA has definite guidelines for when 24 they will consider a state standard, and we 25 haven't met their criteria for resubmitting this

new situation to them. So I think it is just an
unnecessary step.

And as has been pointed out, there's 3 probably no practical implications apparently to 4 5 leaving the standard as it is for now. But regardless, what will be done will be done. 6 The 7 Board I believe is on the wrong side of history, and I think that will be shown with time, and it 8 has been shown by hundreds of scientific documents 9 and public comments. I wouldn't be surprised if 10 11 this ends up before the Supreme Court.

But I have one final comment, because it's been implied by some Board members, at least one Board member, in the meetings that the DEQ is looking for trouble, or manufacturing numbers, and then trying to manipulate things to justify those numbers.

18 And I think that perspective is just a slap in face to DEQ, and to the citizens of 19 20 The DEQ is charged with protecting Montana. 21 Montana's air and water quality, and believe me, 22 there are plenty of people out there and 23 corporations that are willing to do whatever they 24 want regardless of the consequences for air and 25 water quality in Montana, and to the air and water quality of our neighbors and their communities,
 and goodness knows, we have enough Superfund sites
 in Montana.

If people are attacking the integrity of 4 5 DEQ and undermining its work, then we'll end up with more Superfund sites. If the only thing you 6 7 care about is dollars, it's a heck of a lot of 8 cheaper to keep air and water clean proactively 9 than it is to clean up the mess, sort of the classic, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound 10 of cure." 11

12 Anyway I know I'm not going to change 13 anyone's mind. I just wanted this perspective to I just think it's too bad that 14 be on the record. 15 Teck Coal didn't spend the money they've been 16 spending trying to fight the selenium standard, 17 it's too bad they didn't spend that money on 18 cleaning up their acts, so that they don't get fined \$60 million again for selenium pollution. 19 20 Anyway, thanks for letting me comment. 21 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member 22 Altemus. 23 BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you, Vice 24 I guess we're kind of off topic of the Chair. 25 motion, but I understand the frustration of some

52 1 of the Board members, but I do feel like the Board 2 was also just attacked as far as our credibility 3 goes.

And I do think that all of us came to this job, came to this Board, with good intentions, and I think we all look at these cases with good intentions, and try to do the best that we can.

9 And we have a very narrow legal issue with this one. I think we made the right decision 10 11 because of that very narrow legal issue that, again, all these comments are on the record, and I 12 13 just also want to be on record that I don't think the Board has some kind of a goal. I don't think 14 15 the Board has some kind of end game on this. We 16 are trying to do the best that we know how, that 17 we can do. And so I just wanted to make that 18 comment. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you.
Chairman Ruffatto, did you have a comment? I saw
your hand up.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I have refrained from arguing with Dr. Lehnherr because I understand his position. I understand he feels strongly about it. But he does insult the Board with his comments.

We are not backing Teck Coal, we are
backing the rule of law, and what's so important
to our process is to follow the law. And so I
think I need to try to set forth again maybe in a
different fashion what I think has gone on here.
In 2020, EPA pushed forward a rule, made
the determination that it was not more stringent
than the Federal guideline, contrary to what is
virtually obvious.
Then DEQ defended its position that it
was not more stringent, and in that process it
says, "But it doesn't matter. We'll just do it.
We'll just make the findings."
And then we issue an order, and DEQ is
now ignoring our order, refusing to comply. And
that is fine. But under our juris prudence, we
don't just refuse to comply and act like the order
didn't happen. What we do is appeal the order,
and get that decision from the Court, because
there is a way to get a final decision, and DEQ is
not doing that.
not doing that. And as far as hurting the credibility of

54 1 analogy that Dr. Lehnherr used last time, the 2 baking of a cake. If you have a recipe for a cake, and you 3 4 take that recipe and you make the cake, but you 5 leave out the key ingredient, two eggs. And you bake the cake, and you pull it out, and it just 6 7 isn't right. What DEQ wants to do is to take those 8 9 two eggs and just spread them over the top and say, "Now we're good," but it doesn't work that 10 11 way. You've got to start all over, and make it 12 right. So those are my comments. I support the 13 motion. 14 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Does the Board have 15 any more questions or comments on the motion? 16 (No response) 17 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: No more comments or 18 questions on the motion? 19 (No response) 20 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Move forward with a 21 vote on the motion. All in favor of the motion to 22 grant the Joint Notice and Motion moving forward 23 to EPA, say aye. 24 (Response) 25 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Opposed.

1	(Deeree ce) 55
1	(Response)
2	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Could you do a roll
3	call.
4	MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
5	CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.
6	MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
7	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
8	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
9	BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
10	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
11	BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
12	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
13	BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
14	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
15	BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye.
16	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
17	BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
18	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carries.
19	Moving on to the new contested case in
20	the matter of appeal and request for hearing by
21	CHAIR RUFFATTO: Vice Chair Aguirre.
22	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes, Chairman.
	CHAIR RUFFATTO: Before you move on, I
23	
23 24	have a motion to make, actually two motions to

56 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: You have the floor. 1 The first motion is 2 CHAIR RUFFATTO: that we should direct Board Counsel working with 3 the Chairman to draft a reasoned decision on the 4 5 -- our decision to deny DEQ's request to amend. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I need to have you 6 7 repeat that, just because you broke up in the You're making a motion to direct the 8 middle. Board Counsel --9 10 CHAIR RUFFATTO: -- to draft a reasoned 11 decision for consideration at the December meeting 12 to explain our decision in denying DEQ's motion to 13 amend. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll second that 14 15 motion. Is there any discussion on that motion? 16 (No response) 17 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll call for a 18 vote. All in favor say aye. 19 (Response) 20 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed. 21 (Response) 22 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We need to do a roll call. 23 24 MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto. 25 CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.

57 1 MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre. 2 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye. MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus. 3 4 BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye. 5 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr. BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: 6 Nay. 7 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten. BOARD MEMBER REITEN: 8 Nay. 9 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson. 10 BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye. 11 MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith. 12 BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye. 13 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carries. Chairman Ruffatto, you said you had a second 14 15 motion. 16 CHAIR RUFFATTO: My second motion is to 17 request Lincoln County -- is that the Board 18 request that Lincoln County and Teck Coal jointly 19 file a proposed letter to EPA transmitting the 20 Board's order, and to submit that to the Board by November 4th. 21 22 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll second that 23 motion. Is there any discussion? 24 (No response) 25 VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Hearing no

1	58 discussion, I'll call for a vote. All in favor
2	say aye.
3	(Response)
4	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed.
5	(Response)
6	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Please do roll
7	call.
8	MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
9	CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.
10	MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
11	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
12	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
13	BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
14	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
15	BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
16	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
17	BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
18	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
19	BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye.
20	MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
21	BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
22	VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carries.
23	(The proceedings were concluded
24	at 10:50 a.m.)
25	* * * *

59 CERTIFICATE 1 2 STATE OF MONTANA) : SS. 3 COUNTY OF LEWIS & CLARK 4) I, LAURIE CRUTCHER, RPR, Court Reporter, 5 Notary Public in and for the County of Lewis & 6 7 Clark, State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the proceedings were taken before me at 8 the time and place herein named; that the 9 10 proceedings were reported by me in shorthand and transcribed using computer-aided transcription, 11 12 and that the foregoing - 58 - pages contain a true 13 record of the proceedings to the best of my 14 ability. 15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of 16 17 October, 2022. 18 19 LAURIE CRUTCHER, RPR 20 Court Reporter - Notary Public 21 My commission expires 22 March 9, 2024. 23 24 25

				6	0
		acceptable -	22:22,	33:1, 33:6,	alter [8] 3:21,
\$	3	12:23	25:13,	33:7, 33:19,	4:8, 4:19,
		accepted -	25:23, 30:8,	33:23, 35:3,	8:20, 15:8,
\$60 - 51:19	3 - 23:22	22:15 accordance	34:18, 41:21 adopt [2]	35:7, 35:13, 36:1, 36:5,	16:4, 17:1, 17:7
	303 - 38:4 31st - 2:5	[9] 19:20,	24:5, 27:1	37:2, 37:3,	alternative -
0	3rd - 18:7	19:25,	adopted [9]	37:5, 38:21,	26:16
0.8 [7] 32:8,		23:25,	21:25,	40:15,	amend [10]
39:22,	4	24:24,	22:19,	41:15,	3:21, 4:8,
40:25,		26:12, 28:6,	26:11, 28:5,	42:15, 43:3,	4:19, 8:21,
41:18,	4 - 27:5	28:10, 30:7, 36:18	28:9, 28:23, 34:6, 34:9,	43:22, 45:13,	15:8, 16:5, 17:1, 17:8,
44:21,	40 [2] 28:22,	achieved - 5:6	46:22	45:17,	56:5, 56:13
46:20, 47:14 0093 - 49:13	38:5 401 - 2:5	acknowledge -	adopting -	45:21, 46:5,	amendment -
08 - 3:11	45 - 11:23	10:9	28:7	46:8, 46:10,	5:1
	4th - 57:21	acknowledged	adoption -	46:13,	ample - 6:3
1		[3] 23:16,	25:3	46:17, 47:1,	analogy -
	5	31:11, 31:14	affect - 41:4	48:7, 48:10,	54:1
10:50 - 58:24		act [21] 20:2, 22:2, 22:3,	affixed - 59:16	51:21, 52:19,	analysis – 40:9
	5 - 31:12	22:14,	against - 45:7	54:14,	Ann - 1:6
131.5 [2] 28:22, 38:5	521 [2] 12:16, 13:10	23:15, 24:2,	agencies -	54:17,	Annotated [3]
13th - 11:20	57 - 11:22	24:25,	31:22	54:20,	3:9, 8:25,
14 - 1:14	58 - 59:12	25:13,	agency [9]	54:25, 55:2,	25:25
1500 - 2:5	59 [3] 11:11,	25:13, 26:7, 26:8, 27:2,	8:21, 18:4, 19:1, 21:14,	55:6, 55:7, 55:18,	answered [2] 9:6, 34:2
1520 - 1:13	11:11, 11:13	28:11,	21:17,	55:21,	anyone's -
17.30.632 -	59101 - 2:5 59601 - 2:10	28:13, 30:8,	22:11,	55:22, 56:1,	51:13
22:1 17.30.632(7)(a	-	32:14,	28:21, 45:4,	56:6, 56:14,	Anyway [2]
[2] 1:6, 3:8	55020 2.14	36:21,	45:23	56:17,	51:12, 51:20
18th - 18:8	6	37:12,	agency's -	56:20,	apologize -
1995 - 12:17		37:23, 38:4, 53:18	26:8 agree [5]	56:22, 57:1, 57:2, 57:13,	12:14 apparently [2]
	6 [2] 9:3,	acted - 31:21	35:20,	57:22,	49:18, 50:4
2	25:24	action [13]	35:22, 37:9,	57:25, 58:4,	appeal [2]
2 [4] 23:22,		3:5, 8:21,	42:18, 47:24	58:6, 58:10,	53:19, 55:20
26:23, 27:5,	7	18:4, 19:1,	agreement -	58:11, 58:22	appearance -
27:6	75 - 11:22	20:12,	46:23	ahead [3] 6:6,	
2-4-305 -	75-5-203 [4]	20:14, 21:15,	Aguirre [105] 1:16, 3:4,	39:14, 46:16 allege - 21:22	APPEARING [3] 2:2, 2:6,
25:24	1:6, 3:9,	21:17,	4:4, 5:17,	allocation [3]	2:11
200901 - 2:13	8:24, 23:22	22:11,	5:22, 6:6,	45:1, 45:5,	appears -
2020 [5] 19:10,		28:21, 30:2,	7:5, 8:2,	45:7	40:1
21:19,	8	39:5, 45:23	8:12, 8:16,	allocations -	applicable -
21:24, 22:7,	8 [6] 19:5,	actions - 43:1 activities -	9:20, 9:23,	42:23 allow [2]	28:6 application -
53:7	19:15, 43:8,	47:13	10:4, 10:7, 10:20,	20:14, 21:2	35:5
2021 [2]	44:4, 45:2,	activity - 42:3	10:23, 11:4,	already [7]	applied -
19:13, 21:20	45:9	acts - 51:18	12:8, 12:22,	3:25, 7:13,	48:25
2021-04 - 3 :11	8th - 11:22	add - 21:5	12:25, 13:4,	11:15,	apply [2]
2022 [3]		additional [2]	13:14,	16:11,	38:11, 38:14
1:14, 18:5,	9	42:22, 45:13 additionally -	13:17, 13:22, 14:3,	16:16, 20:16, 39:7	approach [2] 41:12, 48:22
59:17	9 [2] 31:23,	27:18	14:20,	Altemus [21]	approaches -
2023 [3]	59:22	address [5]	14:24, 15:2,	1:19, 3:16,	41:11
24:15, 43:17, 44:7	9:15 - 1:14	3:14, 20:11,	15:4, 15:11,	9:24, 9:25,	appropriate
2024 [2]		23:8, 24:20,	15:14, 16:2,	10:5, 14:22,	[7] 5:12,
44:9, 59:22	A	35:23 adequate -	16:7, 16:20,	17:17,	5:18, 6:1,
203 - 2:9	a m [2] 1.14	4:9	16:23, 17:5, 17:10,	17:18, 33:8, 33:9, 45:25,	11:11, 11:25, 30:2,
20th - 18:5	a.m [2] 1:14, 58:24	administered -	17:12,	46:1, 46:7,	49:19
22nd - 59:16	ability - 59:14	31:21	17:15,	51:22,	approval [14]
25th [2]	able [2] 10:1,	administration	17:16, 18:2,	51:23, 55:8,	19:9, 19:11,
11:21, 19:12 26 - 11:23	10:23	- 47:8	18:21, 21:8,	55:9, 57:3,	19:16,
	accept [2]	administrative	21:11, 29:2,	57:4, 58:12,	20:11,
	42:20, 46:3	[7] 22:2,	29:8, 32:20,	58:13	21:21,

				6	1
21:23,	51:4	32:21, 52:7,	22:18,	52:15,	branch -
22:9, 22:12,	attorney [10]	52:16, 59:13	22:21, 23:6,	52:25,	19:14
28:21,	2:2, 2:4,	better - 7:2	23:12, 25:9,	54:14, 55:8,	break [2]
28:25,	2:8, 2:11,	beyond [2]	26:17,	55:9, 55:10,	32:21, 32:22
31:12,	2:12, 6:19,	39:7, 39:11	27:15,	55:11,	briefing -
32:17,	21:12, 37:8,	Bill [3] 12:16,	29:12,	55:12,	25:14
37:13, 38:19	49:8, 49:8 audio - 40:18	12:17, 13:10 Billings - 2:5	29:21,	55:13,	briefly [3]
approve [5] 20:4, 23:5,	August [2]	Billings - 2:5 billion - 39:23	29:24, 30:16,	55:14, 55:15,	11:8, 29:4, 41:17
23:15,	18:7, 18:8	bit [2] 41:12,	30:18,	55:16,	briefs - 6:1
36:16, 36:22	authority [10]	44:3	32:23, 33:8,	55:17, 56:3,	bring - 30:16
approved [2]	22:1, 23:4,	Bloom - 19:13	33:9, 33:10,	56:9, 57:3,	broke - 56:7
20:6, 37:22	23:14,	Board [196]	33:11,	57:4, 57:5,	broken -
approves [2]	23:23, 24:3,	1:1, 1:4,	33:12,	57:6, 57:7,	40:11
28:23, 37:24	26:8, 27:23,	1:17, 2:6,	33:13,	57:8, 57:9,	Building -
approving -	28:10,	3:6, 3:16,	33:14,	57:10,	1:13
28:4 approximately	36:12, 38:1 available -	4:2, 4:9, 4:11, 4:20,	33:15, 33:16,	57:11, 57:12,	<u> </u>
- 18:23	23:20	4:22, 5:11,	33:17,	57:12,	C
April [3] 5:2,	Avenue - 1:13	6:10, 7:3,	33:20,	57:20,	cake [4] 54:2,
11:22, 19:22	aye [25]	7:9, 7:18,	33:23,	58:12,	54:3, 54:4,
argue - 21:16	14:25, 17:8,	8:2, 8:4,	33:25,	58:13,	54:6
argues - 22:7	17:14,	8:7, 8:14,	34:12,	58:14,	calibrated -
arguing –	17:16,	8:17, 8:22,	34:13,	58:15,	40:8
52:23	17:18,	9:6, 9:24,	34:16,	58:16,	calling [3]
argument [12]	17:24, 18:1, 54:23, 55:5,	9:25, 10:5,	34:25, 35:8,	58:17, 58:18,	3:20, 3:25,
10:18, 11:9, 12:6, 12:10,	55:7, 55:9,	10:16, 11:16,	35:17, 37:4, 37:15,	58:19,	45:21
14:15,	55:15,	11:18,	37:19,	58:20, 58:21	can't [5] 4:7, 7:20, 27:16,
18:11,	55:17,	11:25,	37:19,	Board's [30]	27:21, 43:10
18:12,	56:18,	12:16,	38:10,	8:18, 8:21,	Canada - 45:7
18:15,	56:25, 57:2,	12:21, 13:2,	38:13,	8:23, 9:3,	Canadian -
18:18,	57:4, 57:10,	13:4, 13:6,	38:21,	11:21,	48:17
29:10, 29:17, 33:20	57:12, 58:2,	13:8, 13:11,	38:23,	15:13, 19:1,	cannot [5]
arguments [3]	58:9, 58:11, 58:13,	13:24, 14:11,	40:13, 40:15,	20:18, 21:2, 21:14,	20:4, 26:15, 36:19,
14:17,	58:19, 58:21	14:15,	40:15,	22:17,	36:20, 36:22
14:18, 34:2		14:19,	40:23,	22:23, 23:3,	care - 51:7
ARM [3] 1:5,	В	14:22, 15:6,	41:16,	23:16,	carried - 18:2
3:8, 21:25		15:9, 15:12,	42:21,	23:23, 24:9,	carries [5]
arriving -	backfill -	15:16,	42:25, 43:3,	25:5, 27:23,	15:5, 20:18,
49:10 ascertain -	41:22	15:21, 16:6, 16:14,	43:24, 45:14,	28:12, 28:15,	55:18,
27:12	backfilled - 40:4	16:18,	45:25, 46:1,	29:13,	57:13, 58:22 case [15]
asking [3]	backing [2]	16:21,	46:7, 46:9,	29:17,	10:1, 11:12,
40:19, 47:1,	53:2, 53:3	16:24, 17:2,	46:12,	30:20,	11:16,
47:3	bad [2]	17:17,	46:13,	31:25,	22:23,
assessment	51:14, 51:17	17:18,	46:15,	32:11,	25:15,
[5] 43:8,	bake - 54:6	17:19,	46:15,	32:16, 32:18, 37:9,	25:20,
44:12, 44:14,	baking - 54:2 base - 6:12	17:20, 17:21,	46:17, 46:19,	38:17, 57:20	25:21, 29:19,
44:19, 44:23	basically [2]	17:22,	46:19,	books [3]	29:19, 29:19,
Assistant -	5:1, 41:1	17:23,	46:23, 47:3,	31:13,	30:14,
2:12	Basin - 35:11	17:24,	47:4, 47:24,	31:13, 44:17	34:17, 36:8,
assume [2]	beat - 14:5	17:25, 18:1,	47:25, 48:2,	Bowers [18]	40:2, 41:5,
30:11, 47:12	beginning [2]	18:9, 18:16,	48:7, 48:9,	2:12, 5:18,	55:19
assuming [2] 35:20, 35:25	20:23, 38:15	19:12,	48:14,	8:15, 9:22, 21:10,	cases - 52:6
assumption	behalf [4]	19:22, 20:22,	48:15, 48:21, 49:4,	21:10, 21:12, 34:1,	certain - 49:11
[4] 42:18,	2:2, 2:6, 2:11, 11:6	20:22, 20:24,	49:14, 50:7,	34:12,	certainly [7]
42:19,	believes -	20:25, 21:5,	50:13,	34:23, 35:7,	8:5, 13:9,
42:20, 48:4	30:12	21:11,	50:14,	37:3, 37:7,	35:23,
attack - 48:23	benefit - 4:13	21:16,	51:21,	37:7, 37:18,	39:17, 40:2,
attacked -	BER [2] 3:11,	21:25,	51:23, 52:1,	38:3, 38:9,	41:19, 41:23
52:2 attacking -	28:20	22:10,	52:1, 52:5,	38:16, 43:2 Box - 2:13	certification
allacking -	best [4]	22:15,	52:14,	Box - 2:13	[6] 19:18,

				6	
20:7,	51:21,	Chief - 22:4	24:10,	conclude -	3:24, 6:25,
20:8, 21:25,	51:24,	choose -	24:14,	44:7	13:19,
22:5, 22:8	52:19,	18:14	24:23, 25:4,	concluded -	13:22, 16:6,
certify - 59:7	52:22,	chooses -	26:6, 26:11,	58:23	16:20,
certifying -	54:14,	31:4	28:8, 29:16,	conclusion -	34:10,
19:19	54:17,	chose - 24:8	31:7, 31:24,	39:22	34:13,
CFR [2]	54:20,	circulated -	32:1, 38:18,	concur - 34:7	34:23, 35:4,
28:22, 38:5	54:25, 55:2,	4:13	43:6, 44:15	condition -	35:17,
Chair [135]	55:5, 55:6,	citations -	coming [2]	23:11	37:16,
1:16, 3:4,	55:7, 55:18,	31:25	39:19, 41:9	conducted [3]	37:19, 42:21
4:4, 4:6,	55:21,	cite - 22:4	comment [13]	19:25,	correctly -
4:18, 5:17,	55:21,	cited - 13:11	6:11, 7:23,	24:24, 28:9	49:15
5:22, 5:23,	55:22,	cites - 25:14	9:17, 27:8,	confidence - 40:10	couldn't [2]
6:6, 7:1, 7:5, 7:7,	55:23, 56:1,	citizens - 50:19	28:1, 40:20, 40:21,	conflict - 26:2	7:4, 7:5 Counsel [2]
8:2, 8:12,	56:2, 56:6, 56:10,	clarify [3]	41:17,	conform [2]	56:3, 56:9
8:16, 8:17,	56:14,	20:13, 30:5,	48:10,	9:13, 26:21	Counsel's -
9:20, 9:23,	56:17,	30:9	50:12,	confused -	22:4
10:4, 10:7,	56:20,	Clark [4]	51:20,	4:24	County [25]
10:20,	56:22,	25:15,	52:18, 52:20	confusing -	1:4, 1:5,
10:23, 11:4,	56:25, 57:1,	25:21, 59:4,	comments	41:12	2:6, 2:7,
12:8, 12:22,	57:2, 57:13,	59:7	[11] 11:19,	consequences	3:7, 3:7,
12:25, 13:4,	57:16,	classic -	32:3, 41:13,	- 50:24	10:10,
13:14,	57:22,	51:10	49:2, 49:7,	consider [3]	10:15, 11:7,
13:17,	57:25, 58:4,	clean [12]	50:10,	3:21, 28:4,	18:5, 18:12,
13:22, 14:1,	58:6, 58:9,	19:14,	52:12, 53:1,	49:24	18:18,
14:3, 14:20,	58:10,	20:19,	54:12,	consideration	18:19,
14:24, 15:2,	58:11, 58:22	22:14,	54:15, 54:17	[4] 22:18,	21:16,
15:4, 15:11,	Chairman [27]	23:15,	commission -	28:18, 47:4,	21:22,
15:14, 16:2,	1:15, 3:17,	32:13,	59:21	56:11	22:16,
16:7, 16:20,	4:2, 5:20,	36:21,	Commissioners	considered [2]	24:18, 29:6,
16:23, 17:5,	5:22, 6:10,	37:12,	[5] 1:5, 2:7,	22:21, 49:5	30:15,
17:10,	6:11, 7:6,	37:23, 38:4,	3:7, 10:10,	consistency -	45:24,
17:12,	13:10, 13:18,	47:21, 51:8, 51:9		26:7	48:19, 57:17,
17:14, 17:15,	13:21, 15:9,	cleaning -	communication [2] 19:4,	consistent [5]	57:17, 57:18, 59:4,
17:16, 18:2,	17:13, 33:4,	51:18	20:13	19:4, 24:5, 25:11, 26:1,	59:6
18:21, 21:8,	35:1, 36:24,	clear [8]	communities -	38:4	County's -
21:10, 29:2,	41:16,	5:12, 5:13,	51:1	construction -	21:14
29:8, 32:20,	42:15,	19:3, 24:1,	company -	27:11	couple [6]
33:1, 33:5,	43:23,	29:13,	48:17	consult -	5:15, 8:5,
33:6, 33:7,	46:12,	29:22,	comparable	43:14	12:11,
33:19,	52:20, 55:4,	30:18, 32:5	[6] 22:25,	contain -	12:13, 19:2,
33:23, 35:3,	55:22, 56:4,	client - 11:6	23:7, 23:18,	59:12	49:6
35:7, 35:13,	56:24,	coal [17] 1:4,	24:6, 26:18,	contained -	course [2]
35:13,	57:14, 58:8	2:2, 3:6,	27:3	27:13	40:12, 42:8
35:15, 36:1,	challenge [2]	18:5, 18:13,	comparing -	content - 42:7	Court [8]
36:5, 36:25,	26:5, 26:12	18:18, 36:4,	44:20	contested [2]	1:23, 11:13,
37:2, 37:3,	challenged -	41:2, 41:7,	completed [3]	22:23, 55:19	11:16,
37:5, 37:14,	41:8	41:10, 42:6,	7:14, 24:14,	continually -	25:16,
37:18, 38:1,	chance -	43:24,	43:17	12:2	50:11,
38:9, 38:20,	30:18	45:24,	compliance -	continue [2]	53:20, 59:5,
38:21,	change [6]	48:17,	30:13	32:6, 49:17	59:20 cover - 11:9
40:15,	7:15, 15:13, 15:21,	51:15, 53:2,	complied - 22:18	continued - 29:10	
41:15, 42:15,	37:21, 39:4,	57:18 Coalition -	comply [6]	contortions -	credibility [2] 52:2, 53:23
42:15, 43:2,	51:12	25:15	8:24, 9:12,	49:17	criteria [3]
43:2, 43:21,	changed [3]	Code [4] 1:6,	26:19,	contrary -	23:9, 28:17,
43:22,	34:21,	3:9, 8:25,	49:18,	53:9	49:25
45:13,	34:22, 34:24	25:24	53:16, 53:18	convoluted -	Crowley -
45:17,	charged -	column [20]	computer-aided		10:11
45:21, 46:5,	50:20	9:1, 9:8,	59:11	convolutions -	CRUTCHER [3]
46:8, 46:10,	cheaper -	21:19,	concept -	48:15	1:22, 59:5,
46:13,	51:8	22:13,	48:23	corporations -	59:19
46:17, 47:1,	check [2]	22:20,	concerns -	50:23	cure [2] 25:8,
48:7, 48:10,	36:15, 36:17	23:17,	24:20	correct [14]	51:11

				6	3
current -	Department	determines -		23:14, 28:3,	Exhibit -
30:10	[9] 1:12,	26:17	Е	28:21,	19:10
cut [2] 11:1,	2:11, 2:13,	developed -		28:23,	expect -
14:7	6:14, 7:10,	39:18	earlier [2]	29:25, 30:2,	42:24
	7:11, 10:1,	development -	16:19, 47:8	31:11,	expensive [2]
D	26:19, 27:1	44:24	East - 1:13	31:12,	42:24, 45:4
	Department's	differs - 44:3	effect [10]	31:14,	expires -
daily [2]	[2] 15:20, 34:6	direct [2]	25:17,	32:16,	59:21
42:23, 44:25	DEQ [49]	56:3, 56:8 direction -	27:20,	36:12, 36:21,	explain [2] 53:25, 56:12
data [3]	3:12, 5:18,	16:15	30:20, 32:11,	37:13,	express -
24:19, 43:13, 44:21	6:7, 7:22,	directly -	32:11,	37:21,	23:10
Dave - 4:7	8:22, 9:9,	16:13	36:20,	37:24, 38:6,	extent [2]
David [3]	9:15, 18:6,	disagree [2]	37:11,	38:7, 45:23,	6:2, 29:6
1:17, 1:20,	18:15,	8:5, 38:12	37:23, 41:1,	46:4, 46:25,	
14:2	20:23, 21:9,	disagrees -	42:25	47:17,	F
deal [3] 8:9,	21:12, 22:4,	25:2	effective -	47:21, 48:4,	• •
8:13, 49:2	23:1, 23:16,	disapprove [3]	26:1	49:13,	face - 50:19
dealt - 49:1	23:23, 24:2,	23:5, 23:15,	effectuate -	49:23,	factors - 28:3
death - 14:6	24:8, 24:12,	38:7	26:3	49:23, 53:7,	failed - 8:24
debating -	24:20, 25:2,	disapproves -	effort - 6:8	54:23, 57:19	fairly - 42:24
38:25	25:5, 26:24,	28:23	efforts - 42:9	EPA's [8]	fashion - 53:6
December [3]	27:23,	discharges -	eggs [2] 54:5,	19:11,	favor [5]
19:10,	29:10, 30:5,	42:10 discuss - 5:19	54:9	19:16, 20:18,	14:24, 17:6,
21:18, 56:11	31:1, 31:4,	discussed [3]	eight [2]	21:23, 22:9,	54:21,
decided [2]	32:2, 32:6, 32:12, 37:2,	4:25, 11:20,	26:24, 28:3	28:25, 22.9,	56:18, 58:1
48:1, 48:21	37:7, 37:9,	47:7	either [4]	37:13, 38:18	February [2] 11:21, 19:12
decision [21] 12:1, 18:9,	42:18,	discussion	20:11, 24:4, 26:20, 32:2	erroneous [3]	Federal [22]
20:19,	42:21, 43:6,	[15] 5:14,	electronic -	20:8, 22:9,	9:9, 9:13,
20:24, 21:2,	44:1, 45:1,	5:24, 6:5,	13:1	22:10	22:14,
21:3, 22:24,	49:8, 50:14,	9:24, 14:4,	Elk [2] 42:7,	error [7]	22:25, 23:7,
23:3, 27:12,	50:19,	14:5, 14:7,	42:7	19:21,	23:19, 24:6,
28:15,	50:20, 51:5,	14:14,	email [2]	19:23,	25:10,
29:25, 30:1,	53:11,	16:14,	13:12, 13:23	20:10,	26:18,
32:16, 48:3,	53:15,	40:22, 46:2,	emailed -	20:17, 25:3,	26:21, 27:3,
52:10,	53:21,	46:10,	14:11	29:23, 29:25	27:25,
53:20,	53:24, 54:8 DEQ's [16]	56:15,	enacted [3]	errors [2]	28:22,
53:21, 56:4,	3:21, 4:8,	57:23, 58:1 discussions -	12:18,	21:18, 48:13 ESQ [3] 2:3,	29:19, 30:3,
56:5, 56:11, 56:12	4:19, 9:19,	40:13	36:13, 36:22 ends - 50:11	2:8, 2:12	32:13, 35:21,
declare -	11:19, 15:8,	dispute [3]	enforce -	essence -	36:10,
27:12	15:13, 16:4,	26:10, 30:6,	36:12	16:18	36:21,
defended -	16:25, 17:7,	30:10	enforceable -	essentially [2]	37:16, 38:5,
53:11	22:7, 23:24,	distributed -	9:1	6:24, 47:11	53:9
defensible -	44:10, 45:4,	13:1	enforced -	established -	feel - 52:1
20:20	56:5, 56:12	divide - 18:13	45:7	29:14	feels - 52:24
defer [3]	designated [2]	document [2]	ensure [2]	establishes	felt - 30:17
10:13,	23:9, 28:17	12:24, 20:25	19:3, 36:17	[2] 19:23,	fight - 51:16
18:19, 34:19	desired -	documents [4]	environmental	45:10	figure - 12:25
deferred -	23:11 determination	12:15, 44:3,	[5] 1:1, 1:12,	establishing -	file - 57:19
47:13	[11] 9:6, 9:9,	49:3, 50:9	2:13, 39:9,	42:22 everybody [6]	filed [5] 18:4,
definite -	23:17,	dollars - 51:7 Dr [3] 5:10,	42:12 EDA [E0]	5:8, 5:24,	18:6, 18:8,
49:23 deleting - 5:6	23:24,	52:23, 54:1	EPA [50] 8:10, 18:4,	11:3, 14:9,	18:25, 45:24 filing [2] 5:2,
denied -	24:10, 25:5,	draft [2]	19:1, 19:5,	14:13, 35:6	19:11
29:12	28:12,	56:4, 56:10	19:1, 19:5, 19:14,	everybody's -	filings - 32:2
deny [11] 4:8,	37:10,	duly - 21:25	20:4, 20:6,	6:2	final [11]
4:19, 15:8,	44:24,	duplicating -	20:9, 20:14,	evidence [2]	8:21, 18:4,
15:12,	46:20, 53:8	6:8	20:24,	27:8, 28:2	21:14,
15:20, 16:4,	determinations	duty [2] 23:5,	20:25, 21:2,	evolves - 7:20	21:17,
16:25, 17:7,	- 47:10	23:14	21:2, 21:15,	Ewing - 2:9	22:11, 23:3,
45:18,	determine -		21:18,	exceed -	28:20,
45:22, 56:5	27:24		21:18,	26:24	31:10,
denying -	determined -		21:20, 22:6,	exceeded -	45:23,
56:12	48:16		22:12, 23:4,	26:9	50:12, 53:21

				6	4
finding - 23:6		49:25	implications	35:21, 36:6,	
findings [12]	G	having [4]	[3] 41:7,	36:7, 36:9,	K
9:15, 9:16,		4:17, 5:24,	47:7, 50:4	37:16,	
23:21, 24:7,	game [2]	39:14, 47:9	implied -	44:21,	key - 54:5
24:9, 25:6,	39:14, 52:15	he's [2]	50:13	44:22, 45:8	kinds - 47:12
26:22, 27:4,	General - 2:12	10:14, 10:21	improper [2]	invalidated	Kirsten [4]
27:7, 27:10,	given [3]	hear [7] 7:4,	34:18, 34:18	[2] 37:10,	2:12, 5:18,
27:25, 53:14	20:10,	7:5, 7:8,	improvidently	37:20	21:12, 37:7
finds - 25:9	27:20, 39:1	10:2, 11:3,	[2] 6:18, 6:22	invalidates -	knowing -
fine [3] 31:2, 38:25, 53:17	giving [2]	14:16, 14:18	inadequate - 49:9	25:16	47:11
fined - 51:19	6:7, 40:10	heard [5]	inception [2]	invalidation - 25:11	knows - 51:2
fish - 44:15	goal [2]	1:12, 29:10, 32:5, 35:25,	30:22, 36:7	invite - 49:12	Koocanusa
five [9]	49:10, 52:14 goes [3] 38:6,	44:3	include -	involve - 24:4	[31] 1:7, 3:11, 9:8,
30:23, 31:8,	42:21, 52:3	hearing [7]	25:11	involved -	21:19,
34:10,	gone [3]	9:17, 11:21,	includes -	25:22	22:13,
34:14,	16:13,	11:22, 17:5,	28:17	isn't [4] 6:8,	22:20, 23:6,
34:20,	39:14, 53:6	28:1, 55:20,	inconsequential		23:11,
34:20, 35:5,	goodness -	57:25	- 42:1	27:17, 54:7	23:17,
35:9, 44:15	51:2	hearings -	incorrectly [3]	issue [11]	24:10,
Fleck - 10:11	govern -	27:7	8:7, 16:10,	6:12, 8:9,	24:14,
floor - 56:1	44:18	heck - 51:7	48:25	12:19,	24:23, 25:4,
flowing - 42:8	governing [2]	Helena [3]	indicated -	15:20,	25:7, 26:6,
focus - 29:11	30:22, 32:7	1:13, 2:10,	44:11	22:17,	26:11, 28:8,
folks - 43:10	governs [2]	2:14	indications -	29:21,	29:16,
follow [2]	30:24, 31:7	hereby - 59:7	39:21	31:17, 42:6,	30:25, 31:8,
6:23, 53:4 followed [2]	grant [5] 2:9,	herein - 59:9 hereunto -	information [3] 13:7,	52:9, 52:11, 53:15	31:18, 32:8,
20:22, 20:23	45:18,	59:15	39:18, 46:4	issued [3]	34:5, 34:15,
foregoing -	45:22, 46:5,	Hi - 10:8	informed -	6:17, 6:18,	35:11,
59:12	54:22 grants - 24:2	history [3]	20:9	6:22	38:17, 39:6, 39:20, 42:5,
Fork [2]	ground [2]	19:7, 29:18,	ingredient -	issues - 12:7	43:5, 44:13
25:15, 25:21	39:4, 41:18	50:7	54:5	item - 8:13	Kootenai [2]
formally [2]	guaranteed -	Holland - 2:4	initially - 7:12	items - 3:5	35:11, 42:8
20:9, 48:5	24:16	however [3]	initiate -	itself [2]	000117, 1210
former -	guess [8] 5:5,	18:14,	43:19	19:8, 29:19	L
25:17	7:21, 40:19,	25:17, 39:21	initiated - 9:2	IV - 9:3	
forth [3]	46:1, 46:24,	hundreds [2]	initiation -		laid - 44:1
9:10, 42:10,	47:6, 47:16,	49:2, 50:9	9:18	J	lake [37] 1:7,
53:5	51:24	hurting -	input - 49:4		3:11, 9:1,
forums - 32:13	guessing [2]	53:23	insert [2]	Jackson - 2:9	9:7, 21:19,
forward [12]	43:4, 43:9		27:14, 27:16 insist - 44:4	January -	21:21,
13:12,	guidance -	I	insult - 52:25	11:19	21:23, 22:8,
18:17, 32:7,	24:6 guideline -	ignored -	integrity -	job - 52:5	22:9, 22:13,
42:21, 44:1,	guideline - 53:9	26:15	51:4	join - 29:7	22:19,
44:12, 46:3,	guidelines [8]	ignores -	intend - 44:11	joint [6] 18:3, 18:6, 45:19,	22:24, 23:6,
47:9, 47:20,	9:14, 23:1,	25:18	intended -	45:22, 46:6,	23:11, 23:17,
53:7, 54:20,	23:8, 23:19,	ignoring -	11:14	54:22	23:17, 24:10,
54:22	26:19,	53:16	intends - 32:6	jointly -	24:10, 24:13,
forwarded [3]	26:21, 27:4,	immediately	intensive -	57:18	24:22, 25:3,
13:23,	49:23	[2] 19:9, 43:7	45:3	Jon [2] 1:18,	25:7, 26:5,
29:24, 30:1		impact [5]	intent [3] 5:9,	14:2	26:10, 28:8,
frame [2]	Н	39:6, 41:18,	7:25, 25:12	JOSEPH - 1:18	29:16,
41:20, 42:13		41:19, 42:4,	intentions [2]	judicial - 12:4	30:24, 31:8,
fraught -	hand-outs -	47:16	52:6, 52:7	Judy - 19:13	31:18, 32:7,
48:13 front - 12:15	12:13	impairment	interesting [2] 40:24, 49:16	Julia [3] 1:19,	34:5, 34:15,
frustration -	happen [2]	[2] 44:24,	interests [2]	14:2, 14:22	35:11,
51:25	12:4, 53:19	47:9 implement [3]	48:17, 48:18	July - 18:5 jumped -	38:17, 39:6,
full - 46:22	Hart - 2:4	23:1, 24:3,	interpretation	48:19	39:20, 42:4,
Furthermore -	hasn't [3] 34:24, 44:7,	27:2	- 23:25	juris - 53:17	43:5, 44:12 anguage [2]
26:25	46:21	implemented	invalid [12]	justify - 50:16	27:14, 27:15
fuzzy - 5:9	haul - 41:23	[4] 9:10,	32:9, 34:17,		LAURIE [3]
	haven't -	23:19, 25:6,	35:18,		1:22, 59:5,
		25:20	35:18,		· - ·

				6	5
59:19	57:6, 58:14,	12:3, 36:7	member [105]	57:6, 57:7,	10:16, 11:2
lauriecrutcher@		making [5]	3:16, 4:2,	57:8, 57:9,	money [2]
- 1:24	length - 11:20	23:21, 25:6,	4:9, 4:11,	57:10,	51:15, 51:17
law [15] 2:4,	let's [3] 6:5,	26:22, 42:9,	4:20, 4:22,	57:11,	Mont - 1:6
2:8, 6:21,	14:7, 14:16	56:8	5:11, 6:10,	57:12,	Montana [28]
20:2, 29:19,	letter [5]	Manager -	7:3, 7:9,	58:12,	1:2, 1:5,
29:20,	19:11,	19:14	7:18, 8:2,	58:13,	1:12, 3:7,
32:10, 36:8,	19:13,	managing -	8:4, 8:14,	58:14,	3:9, 8:25,
36:18,	31:12,	16:3	9:24, 9:25,	58:15,	11:13, 19:5,
36:23,	49:12, 57:19	manipulate -	10:5, 13:2,	58:16,	19:18, 20:2,
37:17, 39:1,	letting [2]	50:16	13:4, 13:6,	58:17,	22:1, 22:2,
39:10, 53:3,	48:10, 51:20	manufacturing	14:22, 15:9,	58:18,	24:2, 24:25,
53:4	level [3]	50:15	15:12,	58:19,	25:13,
laws [5]	30:4, 31:15, 45:11	manuscripts - 7:21	15:16, 16:6,	58:20, 58:21	25:24, 27:2, 28:11,
19:20,	levels - 39:6	MAPA [4]	16:18, 16:21,	members [21] 1:17, 8:16,	28:13, 30:8,
19:25, 20:6, 22:3, 36:14	Lewis [2]	24:25,	17:17,	12:21, 13:8,	35:21,
lawyers -	59:4, 59:6	25:23,	17:18,	13:24,	36:10,
35:16	likely [2]	26:12, 28:10	17:19,	14:11,	37:20,
least [2]	43:9, 43:11	March - 59:22	17:20,	14:15,	50:20,
19:17, 50:13	Limited [2]	Marquis [23]	17:21,	14:19, 15:6,	50:25, 51:3,
leave - 54:5	1:4, 3:6	2:3, 10:2,	17:22,	16:25, 17:3,	59:2, 59:7
leaving - 50:5	Lincoln [21]	10:7, 10:8,	17:23,	21:11,	Montana's [4]
left-hand -	1:5, 2:6,	10:11, 12:6,	17:24,	33:24,	19:5, 21:24,
31:24	3:7, 10:10,	12:9, 12:24,	17:25, 18:1,	34:13, 35:8,	48:18, 50:21
legal [18]	10:15, 11:7,	13:9, 13:16,	33:8, 33:9,	37:3, 37:18,	Montanans -
6:19, 7:16,	18:5, 18:12,	18:20,	33:10,	43:3, 43:23,	48:21
11:10,	18:18,	18:21,	33:11,	50:13, 52:1	month - 12:11
19:18,	18:19,	18:22, 21:9,	33:12,	memories -	months [4]
19:23,	21:13,	29:3, 29:9,	33:13,	4:16	5:16, 14:6,
20:10,	21:16,	34:2, 35:23,	33:14,	memory -	26:24, 41:3
20:17,	21:22,	36:3, 36:3,	33:15,	10:3 mass - 51:0	morning [2]
21:18, 22:4, 22:7, 25:3,	22:16, 24:18, 29:6,	36:6, 43:23, 43:24	33:16, 33:17,	mess - 51:9 met - 49:25	10:8, 11:9 motion [95]
28:6, 29:23,	30:15,	material -	33:25,	Metcalf - 1:13	3:14, 3:15,
29:25,	45:24,	41:23	34:12,	micrograms	3:16, 3:18,
30:20,	48:19,	matter [10]	34:16,	[4] 30:24,	3:19, 3:21,
39:16, 52:9,	57:17, 57:18	1:4, 3:5,	34:25,	31:9, 32:8,	3:21, 3:23,
52:11	listened -	8:13, 12:1,	38:21,	39:23	3:24, 3:24,
legalistic -	49:7	15:7, 33:21,	38:23,	middle - 56:8	4:3, 4:5,
49:17	listening -	39:3, 44:20,	40:15,	million -	4:8, 4:8,
legally [2]	34:1	53:13, 55:20	40:17,	51:19	4:12, 4:18,
20:20, 45:11	liter [4]	maximum [2]	40:23,	mind [8]	4:21, 5:13,
legislative [3]	30:24, 31:9,	42:23, 44:25	41:16,	7:15, 34:3,	5:13, 7:17,
29:18, 32:3,	32:8, 39:23	maybe [7]	45:25, 46:1,	38:24,	8:18, 8:19,
44:2	litigation -	7:25, 39:13,	46:7, 46:9,	39:13,	8:20, 9:5,
Legislature -	30:10	40:24,	46:12,	39:24, 41:9,	9:19, 11:10,
12:18	load [4]	41:13, 47:2,	46:13,	48:12, 51:13	11:25,
legitimacy - 48:20	44:25, 44:25, 45:5,	48:3, 53:5 means - 30:22	46:15,	minute - 32:22	14:21, 14:25, 15:4,
Lehnherr [27]	45:6	meantime [2]	46:15, 46:17,	minutes [7]	15:7, 15:8,
1:20, 5:10,	loads - 42:23	31:7, 44:10	46:19, 47:3,	4:13, 4:24,	15:10,
5:11, 8:3,	longer - 41:20	meeting [19]	47:24,	13:13,	15:11,
8:4, 8:14,	looking -	3:15, 3:20,	47:25, 48:7,	18:13,	15:12,
13:2, 13:5,	50:15	4:14, 4:23,	48:9, 50:14,	18:15,	15:18,
13:6, 17:19,	looks - 4:25	5:8, 5:16,	51:21,	18:23, 32:24	15:19,
17:20,		7:19, 10:18,	51:23, 55:8,	misspoke -	15:23, 16:1,
33:10,	M	13:11,	55:9, 55:10,	16:2	16:4, 16:4,
33:11,		15:15,	55:11,	misunderstood	16:8, 16:10,
40:16,	Madam [5]	15:17,	55:12,	- 40:24	16:16,
40:17,	4:2, 6:10,	15:24, 16:3,	55:13,	mitigate -	16:19,
46:14,	15:9, 41:16,	16:5, 16:7,	55:14,	42:10	16:25, 17:1,
46:15, 48:8,	46:12	16:9, 33:2,	55:15,	model [4]	17:6, 17:7,
48:9, 52:23,	main - 34:22	49:7, 56:11	55:16,	24:21, 40:4,	17:7, 18:2,
54:1, 55:10, 55:11, 57:5,	maker - 27:12	meetings [2]	55:17, 57:3,	40:8, 43:14	18:3, 18:7,
<u> </u>	makes [2]	40:13, 50:14	57:4, 57:5,	moment [2]	18:8, 18:9,

				6	6
18:25,	47:10		53:15,	petitioned -	- 40:3
21:13,	Nay [8]	0	53:16,	27:24	premised [2]
21:14, 25:14, 29:7,	17:20, 17:22,		53:18, 53:19, 57:20	petitioner [3] 23:21,	19:17, 45:9 PREPARED -
29:12,	55:11,	obvious [3] 19:2, 36:14,	ordering -	25:19, 26:14	1:22
31:23,	55:13, 57:6,	53:10	6:13	Petitioners -	present [3]
40:21,	57:8, 58:15,	Obviously -	orders - 31:25	18:7	4:14, 4:23,
40:22,	58:17	47:18	original - 48:3	petitions [6]	33:18
41:14,	necessary [4]	occur [2]	others - 13:8	1:4, 3:6,	presented [3]
45:15,	6:9, 24:7,	24:23, 32:12	ounce - 51:10	22:16,	11:15,
45:18, 45:19,	26:3, 29:22 needed -	occurred [2]	outcome [2] 24:17, 49:22	22:17, 22:21, 44:17	11:18, 22:17 prevention -
45:22,	30:17	20:17, 44:8 occurs - 45:10	outstanding -	planning -	51:10
45:23, 46:2,	needing - 4:7	October [2]	25:2	43:10	previous [4]
46:3, 46:5,	needs [6]	1:14, 59:17	oversight -	please [7]	8:7, 16:10,
46:6, 46:11,	12:3, 15:18,	older - 49:19	48:2	4:3, 10:3,	49:4, 49:14
47:22,	15:25,	omit - 27:14		14:12,	prior [3]
51:25, 54:13,	20:12, 43:18, 47:21	omitted -	P	30:11, 36:1, 37:5, 58:6	15:7, 28:25, 45:14
54:15,	neighbors -	27:14 open [5] 14:5,	P.O - 2:13	plenty - 50:22	proactively -
54:18,	51:1	18:16,	packet -	point [18]	51:8
54:21,	neither [2]	33:20,	49:13	12:11, 13:2,	probably [3]
54:21,	22:22, 27:9	39:23, 39:24	pages [4]	18:10,	13:14,
54:22,	nice - 49:14	opening –	11:21,	18:15,	13:18, 50:4
55:18,	non-formal -	32:23	11:23, 49:3,	31:10,	problem [2]
55:24, 56:2, 56:8, 56:12,	22:22 nondegradation	opinion [2] 8:10, 12:2	59:12 panelist [2]	31:16, 31:20, 34:8,	5:23, 40:18 procedure [5]
56:15,	[2] 23:10,	opinions -	10:22, 11:2	38:14,	6:23, 22:2,
56:15,	28:19	47:5	paragraph [5]	38:24, 39:1,	34:18,
57:13,	none - 17:5	opportunity	3:13, 5:2,	39:10,	34:19, 41:22
57:15,	nor - 22:23	[7] 5:25, 6:3,	5:6, 8:1, 9:3	40:24, 41:3,	procedures [3]
57:16,	North [2] 2:5, 2:9	11:6, 14:9,	Pardon -	41:25, 42:2,	25:13, 28:6,
57:23, 58:22 motions -	notarial -	14:13, 20:10, 24:19	13:21 participating	42:11, 47:17 pointed - 50:3	30:8 proceed [2]
55:24	59:16	opposed [5]	[2] 10:14,	pointing -	8:16, 44:14
move [14]	Notary [3]	15:2, 17:10,	12:14	15:19	proceeding [3]
3:4, 3:13,	1:23, 59:6,	54:25,	parties [2]	points [3]	39:12, 40:7,
3:19, 14:14,	59:20	56:20, 58:4	11:14, 42:17	8:5, 36:15,	42:12
14:17, 17:6, 18:10,	nothing - 42:2 notice [8]	options [2] 7:22, 9:11	pass - 12:20	47:5 policy - 28:19	proceedings [6] 1:10, 3:1,
18:14,	9:17, 18:3,	oral [7]	passed - 12:18	politicians -	58:23, 59:8,
18:17,	18:6, 18:25,	14:17,	path - 44:1	48:19	59:10, 59:13
32:23,	31:22,	18:11,	PC - 2:9	pollution -	process [20]
44:11, 46:2,	45:22, 46:6,	18:11,	pending [3]	51:19	6:14, 7:12,
54:20, 55:23	54:22 notified -	18:15,	8:20, 30:11,	pondering -	7:13, 8:6,
moving [6] 18:3, 33:19,	47:21	18:18, 33:20, 34:2	42:2 per [5] 30:24,	38:23 portion [3]	11:19, 12:4, 21:1, 22:22,
45:14, 47:8,	notify - 21:18	order [28]	31:9, 32:8,	8:22, 10:17,	24:17, 27:9,
54:22, 55:19	notifying [3]	6:13, 8:21,	39:23, 39:23	11:8	39:15,
MT [4] 1:13,	46:25,	8:23, 8:25,	period [5]	position [8]	39:19, 40:1,
2:5, 2:10,	47:17, 47:17	9:4, 13:3,	7:23, 9:17,	6:7, 10:3,	43:12,
2:14 Murdo - 2:9	notion - 8:6 November -	15:13,	26:23, 28:1,	11:24, 12:5, 36:11,	43:16,
Murry [4] 2:8,		15:21, 19:22,	40:22 periods - 49:6	38:16,	43:18, 48:12, 49:9,
10:9, 10:13,	nullity - 38:11	20:19,	permitting [2]	52:24, 53:11	53:4, 53:12
29:5	numbers [2]	21:15,	39:5, 42:3	possible -	processes -
myself - 14:2	50:15, 50:17	21:17,	perspective	10:2	42:24
	Numeral - 9:3	22:11, 23:6,	[2] 50:18,	potential -	promoted [2]
<u>N</u>	numeric [6]	23:12,	51:13	7:24 potentially -	10:21, 11:2 promulgate -
named - 59:9	21:21, 21:23, 22:8,	29:14, 29:15,	persuaded - 7:15	44:23	38:8
narrow [5]	22:9, 22:24,	29:15, 29:17,	pertaining [2]	pound - 51:10	promulgated
9:7, 22:17,	23:6	30:20,	1:7, 3:10	practical [3]	[6] 19:10,
48:22, 52:9,	numerous -	32:12,	petition [3]	41:1, 41:6,	19:20, 20:5,
52:11	40:12	32:18, 33:2,	15:13,	50:4	30:7, 32:9,
nature -		47:20,	15:21, 30:16	predetermined	36:17

				6	7
properly -		26:23	57:8, 58:16,	23:1, 29:15,	revision -
40:8	Q	reasonably -	58:17	31:3	12:3
proposals -		26:2	related - 25:3	requirement	revisions -
42:4	quality [42]	reasoned [2]	relevant -	[2] 6:21,	24:22
proposed -	1:12, 2:13,	56:4, 56:10	22:3	27:16	revisit - 43:12
57:19	3:12, 19:6,	reasons - 19:2	reliable -	respect [2]	revisited -
proposition	20:2, 20:5,	rebuttal [4]	40:10	8:17, 15:22	40:8
[3] 25:16,	22:2, 22:5,	18:24, 21:7,	reliance -	respected -	revoking -
38:2, 38:12	23:4, 23:9,	29:3, 29:4	19:17 relied - 21:24	27:23	20:11 reworked -
propriety - 13:7	23:13,	recess [2] 32:24, 32:25	rely - 32:14	respond [2] 20:10, 41:17	49:20
protect -	23:13, 24:2, 24:12,	recipe [2]	remade -	responding -	right-hand -
28:17	24:22, 24:25,	54:3, 54:4	15:18	21:13	32:1
protecting -	25:12, 26:7,	recognize -	remain -	response [21]	risk [2] 39:9,
50:20	27:2, 28:11,	23:23	37:23	15:1, 15:3,	42:12
provide [3]	28:13,	recognized -	remainder -	17:4, 17:9,	River [3]
9:18, 24:19,	28:16,	22:16	21:6	17:11, 18:6,	35:11, 42:7,
28:25	28:24, 29:1,	recommend -	remains -	24:9, 25:4,	42:8
provided [4]	31:4, 31:21,	40:6	44:4	33:22,	roll [5] 17:12,
13:8, 26:14,	36:13,	record [14]	remedies [3]	45:16,	33:3, 55:2,
26:22, 31:23	36:16,	4:5, 14:7,	7:24, 25:8,	45:20,	56:23, 58:6
provides [7]	37:20, 38:7,	14:9, 21:11,	25:10	54:16,	Roman - 9:3
8:23, 9:11,	38:10,	27:8, 28:2,	remedy [17]	54:19,	room [2]
12:24,	43:10,	30:19, 36:2,	9:10, 9:17,	54:24, 55:1,	1:13, 10:6
25:19, 25:25,	44:12,	39:22, 40:11,	23:2, 23:20, 24:3, 24:4,	56:16, 56:19,	route - 48:21 RPR [3] 1:22,
	44:13,	51:14,		56:21,	59:5, 59:19
26:16, 27:1 provision [2]	44:19,	52:12,	25:6, 25:19, 25:20,	57:24, 58:3,	Ruffatto [49]
25:24, 27:6	44:21, 44:22, 45:9,	52:12, 59:13	26:13,	58:5	1:15, 3:17,
provisions [4]	47:8, 48:18,	refrained -	26:16, 27:6,	rest [2]	4:6, 4:18,
24:1, 27:19,	50:21,	52:22	27:20,	18:24, 30:12	5:20, 5:22,
27:21, 28:14	50:25, 51:1	refresh [2]	28:14,	resubmit -	5:23, 6:11,
prudence -	quarrel -	4:15, 10:2	29:11,	22:11	7:1, 7:6,
53:17	39:17	refuse - 53:18	29:13, 29:17	resubmitting -	7:7, 8:17,
public [13]	quick - 32:21	refusing -	repealed -	49:25	13:10,
1:23, 7:23,	quorum - 3:18	53:16	37:10	result [4]	13:18,
9:16, 27:7,	quotations -	regarding -	repeat [4]	28:16, 40:3,	13:21, 14:1,
27:7, 27:25, 32:3, 44:10,	32:2	5:14 regardless [3]	4:3, 4:12, 14:14, 56:7	44:22, 44:23 return - 25:17	17:13, 17:14, 33:4,
49:2, 49:6,		49:11, 50:6,	repeated [5]	review [21]	33:5, 35:1,
50:10, 59:6,	R	50:24	7:15, 15:24,	1:1, 1:5,	35:14,
59:20	raised [2]	regards -	15:25,	1:7, 3:8,	35:15,
pull - 54:6	12:10, 43:14	11:10	40:12, 41:22	3:10, 14:10,	36:24,
pulled [2]	raises - 40:23	Region [2]	reply - 18:7	14:12,	36:25,
31:24, 32:1	rational -	19:5, 19:15	reported -	24:13,	37:14,
purpose [3]	28:18	regulation [4]	59:10	24:17,	37:18, 38:1,
5:5, 25:12,	rationale [2]	24:6, 28:22,	Reporter [3]	28:21, 31:2,	38:9, 38:20,
26:3	35:9, 35:12	28:24, 38:6	1:23, 59:5,	31:3, 31:5,	42:15,
purposes [11]	re-argue -	regulations	59:20	31:6, 37:13,	42:16, 43:2,
22:14,	11:15	[8] 9:14,	represent -	38:18, 40:1,	43:21,
32:14,	re-explanation	22:3, 22:25, 23:8, 23:19,	10:11 representing -	43:12, 44:6,	43:23, 52:20,
35:21, 35:21,	9:21	26:18,	36:3	44:6, 46:4 reviewed -	52:20, 52:22, 55:4,
36:10,	ready - 18:9	26:21, 27:3	represents [2]	37:21	55:5, 55:21,
36:20,	realize - 46:22	rehashing -	10:10, 10:14	reviewing -	55:23, 56:2,
36:21,	really [4]	14:8	request [8]	28:4	56:10,
37:12,	38:25, 39:3,	reidentify [2]	4:15, 4:19,	reviews [2]	56:24,
37:17,	41:4, 41:5	36:2, 37:6	21:20,	24:12, 37:24	56:25,
37:24, 46:2	reargue - 8:18	reinvent - 5:7	22:12,	revise - 44:5	57:14,
pursuant [2]	reason [8]	Reiten [11]	55:20, 56:5,	revised [4]	57:16, 58:8,
1:6, 3:8	4:15, 8:19,	1:18, 17:21,	57:17, 57:18	23:13,	58:9
pushed - 53:7	9:5, 9:19,	17:22,	requests -	24:16,	rule [32] 1:7,
	19:3, 20:16,	33:12,	8:22	28:16, 43:19	3:10, 6:15,
	39:24, 48:1	33:13, 55:12,	require [2] 27:6, 27:9	revising [4] 9:13, 12:2,	6:17, 6:22, 9:13, 11:11,
	reasonable -	55:12, 55:12, 55:13, 57:7,	required [3]	26:20, 28:7	11:11,
1	1	, ././,	required [5]	20.20,20.7	· · · · · · /

				6	8
11:13,	17:23,	short - 41:19	sort [2]	34:20,	stated - 7:1
24:5, 25:11,	17:25, 33:4,	shorthand -	49:14, 51:9	34:21,	statement [3]
25:16,	33:6, 33:8,	59:10	speak [3]	34:22,	6:13, 34:10,
25:17,	33:10,	shown [2]	10:24, 11:6,	34:24, 35:8,	45:5
25:23,	33:12,	50:8, 50:9	43:10	35:10,	statements -
25:25, 26:17,	33:14, 33:16,	signed [2]	Special - 2:12	36:13, 36:16,	44:11 statewide [11]
26:20, 27:1,	33:18, 35:1,	19:13, 19:22 significant -	specific [8] 14:15,	36:22,	30:23, 31:8,
27:24, 30:7,	55:4, 55:6,	48:13	14:16,	37:12,	31:11,
30:21,	55:8, 55:10,	significantly -	14:18, 15:5,	37:20,	31:15,
34:17,	55:12,	11:18	29:15,	37:22,	31:17,
35:18,	55:14,	Simpson [39]	31:25,	37:22,	31:19, 34:9,
35:20, 36:7,	55:16,	1:17, 4:2,	35:10, 35:12	37:25, 38:7,	34:14,
36:9, 37:11,	56:24, 57:1,	4:10, 4:11,	spend [2]	38:8, 38:10,	34:20, 35:8,
37:11,	57:3, 57:5,	4:20, 6:10,	51:15, 51:17	38:15,	44:14
37:16, 43:1,	57:7, 57:9,	7:3, 7:9,	spending -	38:18,	stating - 7:7
53:3, 53:7	57:11, 58:8, 58:10,	15:9, 15:12,	51:16 Spoke - 16:0	38:19, 39:1, 39:11,	statute [21]
rulemaking [32] <u>6:14,</u>	58:10,	15:16, 16:6, 16:18,	spoke - 16:9 spread - 54:9	39:19, 40:5,	6:17, 9:11, 12:19, 20:1,
6:23, 7:12,	58:12,	16:21,	SS - 59:3	40:25, 41:4,	22:19, 20.1,
8:6, 8:24,	58:16,	17:23,	St - 2:5	41:6, 41:8,	23:25,
9:2, 9:18,	58:18, 58:20	17:24,	Stacy [2]	41:24, 43:6,	25:18, 26:2,
15:22,	science - 25:1	33:14,	1:16, 4:6	43:12,	26:4, 26:13,
19:24,	scientific [5]	33:15,	stakeholders	43:18, 44:4,	26:15,
19:24, 20:3,	28:18,	33:25,	[2] 24:18,	44:15,	26:25,
20:18,	35:12, 49:3,	34:12,	43:15	44:21, 45:2,	27:11,
20:23, 22:23, 24:5,	49:4, 50:9	34:16,	stand - 40:14	45:9, 45:10,	27:13,
24:24, 26:8,	seal - 59:16 seconded [7]	34:25, 38:22,	standard [110] 1:7,	46:20, 47:14,	27:15, 27:17,
27:9, 27:16,	3:17, 15:10,	38:23,	3:11, 6:20,	48:11,	27:19,
28:9, 29:14,	15:14,	40:23,	6:21, 7:16,	48:23,	27:21,
30:12, 31:5,	15:17, 16:9,	41:16, 46:9,	9:1, 9:8,	49:19,	27:22,
35:17, 36:6,	16:11, 47:22	46:12,	11:10, 19:8,	49:20,	28:15, 29:18
39:12, 40:7,	section [9]	46:16,	19:19, 20:5,	49:24, 50:5,	statutes -
41:22,	1:6, 3:9,	46:18,	20:7, 20:20,	51:16	30:13
42:13,	3:14, 8:24,	46:19, 47:3,	21:20,	standards [9]	statutorily -
43:19, 44:7, 45:10	9:12, 23:21, 25:24,	47:25, 55:14,	21:21, 21:23, 22:5,	19:6, 24:12,	
rules - 6:23	26:20, 38:4	55:14,	22:8, 22:10,	28:7, 28:24, 29:1, 31:4,	statutory [4] 23:2, 23:20,
run - 49:21	seek - 45:6	57:10,	22:13,	31:21,	25:8, 25:10
	seems [3]	58:18, 58:19	22:20,	42:22, 44:16	step [6]
S	43:18,	site [3]	22:24, 23:4,	start [8] 6:7,	20:13,
	48:15, 49:10	29:15,	23:7, 23:13,	6:14, 6:24,	29:22,
Sandy [4]	selenium [17]	35:10, 35:12	23:14,	18:17,	29:23,
13:16,	1:7, 3:10,	sites [2] 51:2,	23:18, 24:8,	35:19, 43:7,	32:12,
13:18,	6:15, 22:13,	51:6	24:11,	47:20, 54:11	43:11, 50:2
13:25, 33:2	25:7, 30:23, 31:17, 34:4,	situation [4] 11:14, 39:2,	24:14, 24:16,	state [28] 1:2, 8:19,	steps [4] 20:21,
save [4]	39:6, 39:19,	47:20, 50:1	24:23, 25:4,	10:1, 19:4,	20:21, 20:22, 45:1,
18:23, 21:6, 40:21, 41:13	42:7, 48:11,	Sixth - 1:13	25:7, 25:9,	19:20,	45:3
saying [4]	48:23,	slap - 50:19	26:6, 26:11,	19:25, 20:6,	Steve - 6:25
40:25, 41:3,	49:19,	slate - 47:21	28:5, 28:5,	20:8, 21:24,	STEVEN - 1:15
42:1, 42:14	49:20,	Smith [14]	28:8, 28:16,	28:4, 28:19,	stick - 41:13
says - 53:13	51:16, 51:19	1:18, 4:22,	29:16, 30:3,	28:23, 29:1,	stop [2]
schedule -	send [4]	7:18, 17:25,	30:23, 31:7,	29:19,	14:17, 14:18
47:12 SCHEDED [42]	13:16, 32:15, 46:3,	18:1, 33:16, 33:17,	31:8, 31:11, 31:13, 32:7,	31:22, 32:10,	straight - 47:19
SCHERER [42]	48:5	47:24,	32:9, 32:15,	36:12,	strangely -
5:10, 5:20, 10:21,	sense - 48:20	55:16,	32:15,	36:14,	48:12
10:21, 10:25,	sensitivity -	55:17,	32:16,	36:16,	Street - 2:9
13:20,	40:9	57:11,	32:17, 34:4,	36:18,	strike - 8:22
17:13,	setting - 43:8	57:12,	34:4, 34:6,	36:20,	striking - 8:1
17:15,	several -	58:20, 58:21	34:8, 34:9,	36:23,	stringency
17:17,	27:18	solely - 26:13	34:9, 34:14,	37:16, 38:7,	[20] 1:6,
17:19,	shall - 26:19	sorry [3] 7:3,	34:15,	38:8, 49:24,	3:10, 6:17,
17:21,	she's - 10:5	11:1, 31:16	34:19,	59:2, 59:7	9:6, 9:10,

				69	
12:18,	29:18, 35:9,	Thank [40]	topic - 51:24		46:8, 46:10,
20:1, 22:19,	36:8	5:11, 5:16,	total [2]	v	46:13,
24:1, 24:7,	supporting -	8:4, 8:11,	42:22, 44:24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	46:17, 47:1,
25:5, 25:18,	7:17	8:14, 8:16,	touched -	vacate [3]	48:7, 48:10,
26:13,	suppose - 6:6	9:20, 9:22,	20:17	21:20, 30:3,	51:21,
26:25,	supposed -	9:25, 11:5,	transcribed -	32:17	51:23, 52:19,
27:21, 28:12,	43:17 Supreme [2]	12:8, 12:9, 13:15,	59:11 transcript [2]	vacated [2]	52:19, 54:14,
28:14,	11:13, 50:11	16:23,	1:10, 5:25	38:19, 43:6 vacatur [2]	54:17,
28:15,	surprised -	18:22, 21:7,	transcription -	22:12, 28:25	54:20,
37:10, 48:24	50:10	21:8, 21:10,	59:11	valid [6]	54:25, 55:2,
stringent [12]		29:1, 29:2,	transmitting -	8:25, 25:25,	55:6, 55:7,
9:8, 22:25,	Т	29:9, 32:18,	57:19	29:15,	55:18,
23:7, 23:18,		32:20,	triennial [6]	46:21,	55:21,
24:8, 24:11,	table [4]	33:19,	31:1, 31:3,	46:21, 47:14	55:22, 56:1,
25:9, 26:18,	15:8, 16:12,	34:25,	31:6, 43:12,	validity [2]	56:6, 56:14,
27:3, 27:24, 53:8, 53:12	16:17, 31:23	35:13, 36:5, 36:25,	44:6, 44:6 triggered -	25:22, 39:10	56:17, 56:20,
strongly [2]	tabled [2] 3:15, 3:19	38:20,	28:14	various [3] 40:13,	56:22, 57:1,
40:6, 52:24	taken [2]	40:17,	trouble -	40.13, 42:22, 48:15	57:2, 57:13,
struggling -	32:25, 59:8	41:14,	50:15	versus - 25:21	57:22,
47:19	takes - 48:16	41:15,	true - 59:12	via [5] 1:15,	57:25, 58:4,
stuff [2] 6:4,	taking [2]	43:21,	Tubbs [2]	1:18, 1:19,	58:6, 58:10,
14:8	20:12, 41:11	43:22,	25:15, 25:21	1:20, 2:8	58:11, 58:22
sub [3] 9:3,	talks - 31:1	43:24,	turning -	Vice [106]	Vicki [4] 2:3,
23:22, 25:24	technical -	45:12, 46:7,	38:24	1:16, 3:4,	10:11, 36:3, 43:24
subject [4] 9:16, 12:2,	39:16	51:23, 52:18, 52:19	Typically - 44:7	4:4, 5:17,	view [8] 4:9,
12:19, 44:16	Teck [35] 1:4, 2:2, 3:6,	thanks [2]		5:22, 6:6, 7:5, 8:2,	34:6, 34:7,
subjected -	10:12, 18:5,	48:9, 51:20	U	8:12, 8:16,	40:14,
40:9	18:13,	themselves -		9:20, 9:23,	41:18,
submission -	18:18,	53:24	unclear - 29:6	10:4, 10:7,	44:13, 47:5,
21:19	21:13,	there's [6]	undermining -	10:20,	47:6
submit [10]	21:16,	11:17, 19:3,	51:5	10:23, 11:4,	violated -
8:10, 18:3,	21:22, 22:7,	39:16, 40:2,	understand	12:8, 12:22,	20:3
19:1, 21:1, 21:14,	22:15,	46:22, 50:3 therefore [3]	[5] 7:10,	12:25, 13:4,	violation [4] 20:6, 32:10,
21:17,	24:17, 25:14, 26:5,	22:10,	35:24, 51:25,	13:14, 13:17,	36:14, 36:23
28:20,	26:10, 30:6,	23:12, 35:18	52:23, 52:24	13:22, 14:3,	virtually [4]
45:23,	30:11,	they're [4]	understood -	14:20,	10:14,
49:22, 57:20	30:15, 36:4,	32:14,	6:20	14:24, 15:2,	12:14,
submitted [5]	41:2, 41:7,	41:12,	undertaken -	15:4, 15:11,	13:24, 53:10
19:8, 19:12,	41:10, 42:6,	49:21, 53:24	7:14	15:14, 16:2,	void [3]
20:24,	42:9, 43:24,	they've -	unfolded -	16:7, 16:20,	30:21,
20:25, 37:13 Subsection [4]	45:24,	51:15 thing [2]	39:2	16:23, 17:5,	30:21, 38:15 voidance -
26:23, 27:5,	48:17, 48:20,	30:5, 51:6	unhappy - 49:18	17:10, 17:12,	38:17
27:5, 27:6	48:20, 48:21, 49:8,	though [5]	unless [3]	17:12,	vote [8] 3:20,
substance [2]	49:17,	4:12, 7:10,	21:4, 26:1,	17:16, 18:2,	4:1, 8:9,
15:25, 27:13	51:15, 53:2,	7:11, 35:4,	45:9	18:21, 21:8,	15:7, 17:6,
substantive -	57:18	48:11	unnecessary	21:10, 29:2,	54:21,
12:7	Teck's [5]	thoughts -	[2] 16:19,	29:8, 32:20,	56:18, 58:1
successful [3]	21:13,	47:25	50:2	33:1, 33:6,	
23:20, 25:19, 26:14	26:12,	thousands - 49:3	updated -	33:7, 33:19,	W
suggestions -	36:11, 44:13, 49:16	throughout -	24:19 upheld -	33:23, 35:3,	wait - 31:5
39:25	ten [4] 18:13,	11:18	19:23	35:7, 35:13, 36:1, 36:5,	wanted [4]
Suite - 2:5	18:14,	timelines -	upon [2] 9:9,	37:2, 37:3,	4:12, 41:5,
summary -	32:22, 32:24	30:17	31:22	37:5, 38:21,	51:13, 52:17
49:14	term [2]	tissue - 44:16	uses [2] 23:9,	40:15,	wants [3]
Superfund [2]	41:19, 41:20	TMDL [2]	28:17	41:15,	20:14, 21:5,
51:2, 51:6	terminate [2]	43:8, 44:25	using [4]	42:15, 43:2,	54:8
support [4]	14:4, 14:14	TMDL's - 47:9	45:2, 48:23,	43:22,	Warhank [9]
18:8, 24:8, 25:7, 54:12	terms - 27:13	today [2] 32:6, 44:3	53:25, 59:11	45:13,	2:8, 10:9,
supported [3]	testimony [2]	top - 54:9		45:17,	10:13, 11:1,
sabborred [2]	32:4, 44:2	10P 54.9		45:21, 46:5,	11:5, 18:19,

			70		
21:4, 29:4, 29:5	9:15, 9:16, 26:22, 27:4,				
waste [3]	27:7, 44:2				
44:25, 45:5, 45:6	wrong - 50:7				
we'll [8] 3:4,	Y				
18:14, 18:16,	you'd - 13:12				
32:22, 33:20, 51:5,	yourself [3]				
53:13, 53:14	13:25, 36:2, 37:6				
we're [17] 3:25, 6:8,					
14:8, 16:24,	Z				
17:1, 18:10, 18:11,	zoom [5] 1:15, 1:18,				
18:12, 18:17,	1:19, 1:20,				
32:24,	2:8				
38:25, 39:8, 39:9, 40:19,					
42:9, 51:24,					
54:10 we've [2]					
4:13, 30:19 weeks - 14:12					
weigh - 10:17					
weren't - 4:14 what's [3]					
29:22, 39:7,					
53:3 whatever [4]					
20:14, 41:3, 48:16, 50:23					
wheel - 5:7					
WHEREOF - 59:15					
WHEREUPON -					
3:1 whether [5]					
8:9, 9:7, 22:18, 26:7,					
28:5					
whole - 49:9 willing -					
50:23					
withdraw - 16:22					
within [2] 26:23, 46:23					
WITNESS -					
59:15 woefully -					
49:9 won't [3]					
8:18, 12:9,					
48:14 wondering [3]					
5:5, 7:25, 8:8					
worth - 51:10					
wouldn't [5] 41:4, 47:18,					
48:1, 48:5,					
50:10 written [6]					
	1	1			