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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We'll move to the action items, and the first matter is the petitions of Teck Coal, Limited, and the Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County, Montana, for review of ARM 17.30.632(7)(a) pursuant to Montana Code Annotated Section 75-5-203, stringency review of rule pertaining to selenium standard for Lake Koocanusa, BER 2021-04 and 08, Water Quality, DEQ.

I'd like to move to the last paragraph of this section and address that motion first. At the last meeting, this motion was tabled -- a motion was made by Board Member Altemus and seconded by Chairman Ruffatto -- based on the fact that there was not a quorum, so the motion was tabled. So I'd like us to move that motion to a vote at this meeting, and so I'm calling for a motion to consider DEQ's motion to alter or amend be made at this time.

I don't think we need a new motion.
That's correct, right? No new motion? The motion has already been made, so we're calling for the
vote at this time.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman, could we please repeat the motion.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes. We will have to go back in the record to find the motion.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Stacy, I don't think Dave is needing it word for word. Can't we -- The motion was to deny DEQ's motion to alter or amend. Is that adequate from your view, Board Member Simpson?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes, it is. I just wanted to repeat the motion, even though we've circulated the minutes for the benefit of those who weren't present at the last meeting. That's the reason for the request, just to refresh our memories as to what it was about, and I remember, having been there.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: So the motion was to deny DEQ's request to alter or amend.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll make that motion.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So $I$ was not present at the last meeting. I've read through the minutes. I'm still a little confused about what all was discussed, and it looks like
basically the amendment would be just the one paragraph, right, of the filing from $I$ think April or May.

But I'm not sure how to get at it, but I'm wondering, I guess, what the purpose of deleting the one paragraph, what will be achieved by that. And $I$ don't want to reinvent the wheel for everybody who was in the meeting, but I'm still just a little fuzzy on the intent.

MS. SCHERER: Dr. Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you. I think it's appropriate to have a very clear motion, have it be very clear what the motion is regarding, and then have some discussion, since there are new people here, and it's been a couple of months since the last meeting. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I think it's appropriate then to have Kirsten Bowers with DEQ to read that and discuss it.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto has his 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
the briefs, so $I$ don't think it's appropriate to take up everybody's time to any great extent here, because there was ample opportunity to read through that stuff.

But if we want to have discussion, let's go ahead. So Vice Chair Aguirre, I suppose we could start with DEQ giving their position, but $I$ think we're duplicating effort that isn't necessary.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman, I'd ask Chairman Ruffatto to -- his comment. If I'm off base here. But as I recall, the issue has to do with the statement in the order ordering the Department to start a new rulemaking process on the selenium rule.

And the basis for that was that because the stringency statute was not issued, the rule was issued improvidently, and there is a -- not being an attorney, $I$ don't recall the legal basis for that -- but is a standard, as I understood it, it was a standard requirement in the law that if a rule is issued improvidently, that is, if it does not follow the rules of procedure, then rulemaking must start all over again. Is that essentially correct, Steve?

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, you stated it better than $I$ could.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Sorry. I couldn't hear you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We couldn't hear you, Chairman Ruffatto.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes. That is stating it very well. Can you hear me?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes. So it's even though the Department went -- As I understand it, even though the Department went through the rulemaking process. And initially my thought was that since that process had been already undertaken and completed, that it didn't need to be repeated. I was persuaded to change my mind based on the legal standard. And so that's why I'm supporting the motion.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I think for me, my question, if $I$ were here during the last meeting, I think more evolves around -- I can't find it anywhere in the manuscripts, but $I$ guess --

I know one of the options was for DEQ, was to go back into the public comment period, which is one of the potential remedies, and $I$ was just wondering if that was maybe the intent of
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.

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

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

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

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

MS. BOWERS: Thank you.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Is there any more discussion? Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you. Since
the Department was able to state their case, is it possible to hear from Ms. Marquis to refresh the memory of their position as well, please.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I believe she's in the room.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes, Ms. Marquis. MS. MARQUIS: Hi. Good morning. I
would first like to acknowledge Murry Warhank represents the Lincoln County Commissioners. I'm Vicki Marquis with Crowley Fleck. I represent Teck.

I would like to defer to Murry Warhank. I see he's participating virtually. He represents the Lincoln County Commissioners. So if it's okay with the Board, I'd like to give him a moment or two to weigh in, because he had a portion of our argument at the last meeting as well. Is that okay?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes.
MS. SCHERER: He's being promoted to
panelist, so he should be --
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: He should be able to speak.

MS. SCHERER: There he is. Okay.

MR. WARHANK: I'm sorry. I cut out a moment as $I$ was promoted to panelist. Can everybody hear me okay?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes.
MR. WARHANK: Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of my client, Lincoln County.

Just briefly, the portion of the argument that $I$ want to cover this morning is with regards to the legal standard. The motion is based on Rule 59, and Rule 59 is not appropriate in this case.

Rule 59 from the Montana Supreme Court is not intended to be a situation where parties re-argue what has already been presented to the Court, or in this case to the Board.

Here there's no question that this was presented to the Board significantly throughout the process. It was in DEQ's comments on January 13th; and it was discussed at length in the Board's hearing on the 25 th of February at Pages 57 through 75; and at the April 8th hearing at Pages 26 through 45.

So it's our position that this just isn't an appropriate motion. The Board has made
its decision on this matter, and it should not be subject to continually revising every opinion it makes. If there needs to be revision, that should happen through the judicial process.

So that's the position we have, and I know Ms. Marquis has further argument on the substantive issues.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you.
MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. I won't go back through the argument that we raised last month, but $I$ do want to point out a couple things that have come to light since then.

And I have a couple hand-outs. I
apologize for those participating virtually.
These are documents that have been in front of the Board before. The first one is House Bill No. 521 from 1995, and this is the House Bill where the Legislature passed and enacted the stringency statute that is the subject of this issue. So I have a copy I'd like to pass out, if that's okay, to the Board members.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I believe that's, yes, acceptable.

MS. MARQUIS: (Provides document)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We need to figure out how to get an electronic copy distributed. BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: A point of order.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes, Board Member Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: I have a question about the propriety of information being provided to some Board members and not others.

MS. MARQUIS: Certainly. This is House Bill No. 521, and $I$ believe Chairman Ruffatto cited it during the last Board meeting. I can forward that by email. If you'd like me to take a few minutes and do that now, $I$ can do that.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Probably need to. Thank you.

MS. MARQUIS: Should I send it to Sandy?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I believe that would be Sandy and Chairman Ruffatto probably, correct?

MS . SCHERER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN RUFFATTO: Pardon me?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Is that correct, that if the email is getting forwarded to those Board members that are on the call virtually, that it should go to yourself and Sandy?

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

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

I emailed all the members of the Board two or three weeks ago to please review all of that, and so everybody had an opportunity. So I move that we terminate this repeat discussion and argument, and if Board members have specific questions, let's hear those specific questions.

So I move to stop the oral arguments, stop the arguments, and only hear specific questions from Board members.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Is there a second to that motion?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: This is Julia. I second.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. All in favor of that motion, say aye.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed.
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. Motion
carries. So based on that, are there specific questions that the Board members have on this matter prior to a vote on the motion that is on the table to deny DEQ's motion to alter or amend?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman, I don't believe the motion was seconded.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Which motion?
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: My motion to deny DEQ's petition to change the Board's order.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Was it not seconded at the last meeting?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: It was not seconded at this meeting. So $I$ don't know that the motion needs to be remade, but I'm just pointing out that you had asked for a motion on the issue, which was to deny the Department's petition for the Board to change its order with respect to rulemaking.

That motion was made at the last
meeting. I repeated it here. I don't know that it needs to be repeated, but that's the substance
of the motion.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I think I misspoke in my working through managing the meeting that the motion was made to deny DEQ's motion to alter or amend at the last meeting.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Correct.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: And that meeting was made -- or that motion that was made and seconded at the last meeting. So I spoke incorrectly by talking about the previous motion that was already made and seconded and on the table.

I should have gone directly to the discussion, any questions by the Board, and so $I$ think $I$ took that in a direction that it didn't need to go to because the motion was already on the table.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: So the essence is that my motion made earlier was unnecessary?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Correct.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Then I'll
withdraw it.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. So we're at the place where if any of the Board members have questions on the motion to deny DEQ's
motion to alter or amend, that's where we're at. Are there any further questions by the Board members?
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Hearing none, I'd like to move the motion to a vote. All in favor of the motion made to deny DEQ's motion to alter or amend, say aye.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Roll call.
MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
ChAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: AYe.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carried.
Moving to the Joint Notice and Motion to Submit Final Agency Action to EPA that was filed by Lincoln County and Teck Coal on July $20 t h, 2022$.

DEQ filed a response to the joint notice and motion on August 3rd, Petitioners' reply in support of the motion was filed on August 18 th, and this motion is ready for a Board decision. At this point we're going to move to oral argument, and we're going to call for oral argument, and we're going to give Lincoln County and Teck Coal ten minutes. You can divide that up however you choose. And then we'll move to ten minutes for $D E Q$ oral argument. At that point we'll open it up to the Board for questions and then move forward. So we're going to start with oral argument from Lincoln County and Teck Coal.

MR. WARHANK: Lincoln County will defer its time to Ms. Marquis.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Ms. Marquis.
MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. I'll take
approximately three to four minutes and save the rest for rebuttal.

We filed this Notice and Motion to

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

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

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

So we need to do that process again, submit the Board's decision to EPA, and allow EPA to make a decision on that.

And that's all $I$ have unless Mr. Warhank wants to add more, or if the Board has questions, and then $I$ 'll save the remainder of my time for rebuttal. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you, Ms.
Marquis. DEQ.
MS. BOWERS: Thank you, Vice Chair Aguirre, members of the Board. For the record, my name is Kirsten Bowers. I'm an attorney with DEQ, responding to Teck's motion, Teck and Lincoln County's motion to submit the Board's final agency action and order to EPA.

Teck and Lincoln County argue the Board should submit the final agency action and order to EPA to notify EPA of legal errors in the December 2020 submission of the Lake Koocanusa water column standard, and request that EPA vacate its 2021 approval of the lake numeric standard.

Teck and Lincoln County further allege that EPA's approval of the lake numeric standard relied on the State of Montana's 2020
certification that the Board duly adopted ARM
17.30.632 under authority of the Montana Water Quality Act, the Montana Administrative Procedure Act, and all relevant laws and regulations, and they cite to the DEQ Chief Legal Counsel's certification of that water quality standard to EPA.

Teck argues that DEQ's 2020 legal certification of the lake numeric standard was erroneous, and EPA's approval of the lake numeric standard was therefore erroneous, and the Board should resubmit final agency action and order to $E P A$, and request vacatur of its approval of the Lake Koocanusa water column standard for selenium 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
guidelines, and that required $D E Q$ to implement the statutory remedy.

The Board's final decision is not a water quality standard that EPA has the authority or the duty to approve or disapprove, because the Board order finding the Lake Koocanusa numeric standard more stringent than comparable Federal regulations or guidelines does not address designated uses, water quality criteria, or nondegradation, and it does not express the desired condition of Lake Koocanusa.

The Board order is therefore not a new water quality standard or a revised water quality standard that EPA has the authority and duty to approve or disapprove under the Clean Water Act. DEQ acknowledged the Board's determination that the Lake Koocanusa water column standard was more stringent than comparable Federal regulations or guidelines, and implemented the statutory remedy available to a successful petitioner by making the findings under Section 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
rulemaking to adopt a rule that is consistent with the comparable Federal regulation or guidance, or to make the stringency findings necessary to support the more stringent standard, and DEQ chose to make the findings in response to the Board's determination that the Lake Koocanusa water column 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
be based on sound science.
DEQ disagrees there is an outstanding legal error related to the adoption of the Lake Koocanusa water column standard. In response to the Board's stringency determination, $D E Q$ implemented the remedy by making the findings to support the Lake Koocanusa selenium standard, and this is one of the statutory remedies to cure a standard that the Board finds more stringent than Federal, but these statutory remedies do not include invalidation of a rule that's consistent with the intent and purpose of the Water Quality Act and the Montana Administrative Procedures Act. In its briefing and motion, Teck cites 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 administrative rule under MAPA. Under the provision in Section 2-4-305 sub (6), Montana Code Annotated, that provides a rule is not valid or
effective unless it is, "A," consistent and not in conflict with the statute; and "B," reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute.

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

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

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

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

The Board's stringency determination was also made under the Montana Water Quality Act, and triggered the remedy provisions in the stringency statute. The Board's stringency decision did not result in a new or revised water quality standard that includes criteria to protect designated uses, a scientific rational, and consideration of the 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 those state water quality standards. Thank you. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. Ms. Marquis, rebuttal.

MR. WARHANK: Just briefly in rebuttal.
This is Murry Warhank. May $I$ just say that to the extent it's unclear, Lincoln County is part of this motion as well and we join in it.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes.
MS. MARQUIS: Thank you. I think what you just heard from $D E Q$ is continued argument about the remedy which was the focus of their motion that this Board just denied.

The remedy is clear, and this Board's order just established that new rulemaking is required in order to have a valid site specific water column standard for Lake Koocanusa. The remedy argument is done. The Board's order is well supported by legislative history, the statute itself, and case law, both State and Federal case law.

The issue before the Board right now is what's the next step that is necessary to clear up the legal error, and that next step is the same as you did before. This Board before forwarded its decision to EPA. You've now found legal error in
that decision, and that should also be forwarded to EPA to take appropriate action, which we believe is to vacate the standard at the Federal level.

One thing DEQ said $I$ want to clarify. I believe they said that Teck does not dispute that the rule was promulgated in accordance with the Montana Administrative Procedures Act.

I want to clarify that there is a dispute there. There is no current litigation pending on that, but please don't assume that $T e c k$ believes that the rest of the rulemaking was in compliance with the statutes because that is not the case.

Teck and Lincoln County had the right to bring this petition before the Board, and there were timelines in which we felt we needed to do that, and give the Board a chance to clear up the record. That's what we've done.

The legal effect of the Board's order is that the rule is void, and it has been void since its inception. That means that the governing statewide standard for selenium, which is five micrograms per liter, is what governs Lake Koocanusa at this time.

DEQ talks about doing a triennial review, and that's fine. They are statutorily required to do a triennial review of all their water quality standards. So if DEQ chooses to wait and review and go into new rulemaking after the triennial review, they can do that, but in the meantime the water column standard that governs Lake Koocanusa is the statewide standard of five micrograms per liter.

The final point $I$ want to make is that that statewide standard was acknowledged by EPA on Page 5 of its EPA approval letter, so that standard is on the books. It's been on the books for a long time, and EPA has acknowledged that on a statewide level.

I'm sorry. I do have one other point. This is an important issue statewide. Selenium is not just found in Lake Koocanusa, it is found statewide.

It's also an important point for how our water quality standards are administered and acted upon by our State agencies. In our notice and motion on Page 9 we provided a table, and on the first column on the left-hand side we pulled out 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.

And it is clear, and what you just heard today again, is that $D E Q$ intends to continue forward as if the standard governing Lake Koocanusa is 0.8 micrograms per liter. That standard is invalid. It was promulgated in violation of a State law.

And so to give effect to the Board's order, we need that next step to occur. DEQ has said in other forms that for Federal Clean Water Act purposes, they're going to rely on that standard. We need to send that standard, the Board's decision on the standard, up to EPA to have them vacate their approval of the standard, and to give effect to the Board's order. Thank 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)

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'm going to call the meeting back to order. Sandy, will you do a roll call.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Here.
MS . SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Here.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. SCHERER: All present.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. Moving from the oral argument, we'll open up to the Board to ask any questions that you have on this matter.
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Do any Board members have questions?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I have one
question for Ms. Bowers. As $I$ was listening to the oral arguments, $I$ believe Ms. Marquis answered a question that was on my mind, and that was what was the standard up until -- the selenium standard for Lake Koocanusa up until the time that the new standard was adopted in the Department's view.

Do you concur with the view that before that -- her point that before that standard was adopted, the standard was, the statewide standard was five? Is that correct? Is that the statement that would have been in --

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Board Member Simpson, members of the Board. That's correct. The statewide standard is five, and that was the standard also for Lake Koocanusa.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: So that in the case that the rule is now invalid because of improper procedure, improper administrative procedure, that's what the standard would defer to, is the five, statewide standard of five, because that standard has not changed? That's my main question. That standard has not changed? MS. BOWERS: That's correct. That standard hasn't changed.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto has his hand up.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I just want to ask that it has a different basis, though, correct? The five has a different basis of application? I think that is good for everybody to know as well.

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Vice Chair Aguirre, members of the Board. The statewide standard of five is supported by different rationale and different basis, and the site specific standard for Lake Koocanusa and the Kootenai River Basin was based on site specific scientific rationale. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you. Chair Ruffatto.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: My question is -- and I'd like both lawyers to answer this question -but if the Board is correct, and the rulemaking was invalid, and therefore the rule was invalid from the start, the first question is: Would you agree, assuming that, that then the rule is invalid for Montana purposes and Federal purposes? Would you agree with that?

MS. MARQUIS: Certainly. I can address that question first. Make sure $I$ understand the question, as $I$ heard it was it was assuming --

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Would you please just reidentify yourself for the record.

MS. MARQUIS: Vicki Marquis representing Teck Coal.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you.
MS. MARQUIS: The rulemaking is invalid, which makes the rule invalid from its inception, is supported by case law. And then the question was: Does that make the rule invalid for both Montana and Federal purposes?

And Teck's position is that, yes, it does. EPA has no authority to enforce a state water quality standard that was enacted in violation of state laws, and that is obvious from the fact that one of their check points, when they approve a state water quality standard, they have to check to ensure that it was promulgated in accordance with state law.

This one was not, so it cannot be in effect for State purposes, and it cannot be used for Federal Clean Water Act purposes, because EPA cannot approve a standard that was enacted in violation of a state law. Does that answer your question, Chairman Ruffatto?

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, it does. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: DEQ.
MS. BOWERS: Vice Chair Aguirre, members of the Board.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Would you please reidentify yourself.

MS. BOWERS: I'm Kirsten Bowers, DEQ attorney.

DEQ does not agree that the Board's stringency determination repealed or invalidated the rule, and the rule is still in effect for Clean Water Act purposes until a new standard is submitted to EPA for EPA's review and approval.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: That wasn't my question. My question was: If the Board is correct, is the rule invalid for state and Federal law purposes?

MS. BOWERS: Chair Ruffatto, members of the Board, if the Board is correct that it invalidated the Montana water quality standard, it doesn't change the fact that $E P A$ reviewed and approved that standard, and that standard would still remain in effect for Clean Water Act purposes until EPA reviews and approves a new standard.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Do you have authority for that proposition?

MS. BOWERS: Well, I believe it's consistent with the Clean Water Act Section 303, and also with 40 CFR 131.5. And that Federal regulation goes on to say that if EPA would disapprove a state water quality standard, EPA could promulgate their own standard for the state.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: But Ms. Bowers, this is not a water quality standard if the Board is right. It's a nullity. So how does that apply?

I know you disagree with the proposition that the Board might be right, but how would that point you just made even apply if there was no standard, it was void from the beginning?

MS. BOWERS: It's my position that the Board's voidance of the Lake Koocanusa water column standard does not mean that EPA's review and approval of that standard is also vacated.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank You.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member

Simpson, did you have a question?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I'm pondering.
The point $I^{\prime}$ ve been turning over in my mind is that what we're debating here is really a fine
point of law as to what the standard is, given the 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.

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

And in my own mind -- and maybe I'm getting ahead of the game here -- but having gone through all of the process that we have, we have the legal question, but there's also a technical question. And $I$ certainly have no quarrel with all the information that was developed in the process of coming up with a selenium standard for 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 question is there are suggestions that when you
review the process, it appears that the -- and I'm not sure this is the case -- but there's certainly an appearance that the result was predetermined, and that the model was backfilled to come up with that standard.

I would strongly recommend that in proceeding with the new rulemaking, that that model be revisited, properly calibrated, and subjected to sensitivity analysis, to give us more 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.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member
Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thank you. I had a little problem with the audio there. I don't know if we're asking questions. I guess I have a question, and then $I$ have a comment. I can save the comment if we come up with a motion and a 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 implications, then why is Teck Coal here, and why have they challenged the standard.

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

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman, if $I$ could respond briefly. My comment that the 0.8 has no impact on the ground is, in my view, in the short term. It certainly has an impact in the longer term. And I'm talking about the time frame between now and the time the administrative procedure is repeated to backfill the rulemaking. Certainly in the long haul it's very material as to what that standard is.

So $I$ just want to make that point. I'm
not saying that it's inconsequential. All my point is is that there is nothing pending in the way of new activity, new permitting, new proposals, that would have an impact on Lake Koocanusa.

The big issue has been Teck Coal, and Elk River, and the content of selenium in the Elk River flowing into the Kootenai. And of course, we're aware of the efforts that Teck is making to mitigate its discharges and so on and so forth.

But my point is there is no
environmental risk on proceeding with a new rulemaking, and the time frame that will take. That's all I'm saying.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: I want to ask both parties a question, and again, $I$ want to make an assumption -- $I$ know DEQ will not agree with the assumption.

But if you accept the assumption that the Board is correct, and DEQ goes forward with establishing various additional standards, total maximum daily loads and allocations -- which I expect are fairly expensive processes -- and if the Board is right, what will be the effect on
those further actions that are based on this rule? MS. BOWERS: Chair Ruffatto, Vice Chair Aguirre, members of the Board. I'm kind of just guessing here.

If you're right, and the Lake Koocanusa water column standard is vacated, $D E Q$ is not immediately going to go out and start doing an assessment and setting a TMDL based on . 8 .

I think more likely -- and I'm guessing.
I can't speak for water quality planning folks -but $I$ think more likely the next step will be the triennial review process to revisit the standard, and look at new data, and answer questions about the model that have been raised, and consult with stakeholders.

And then after that process, which is supposed to be completed at the end of 2023, after that process, if it seems like the standard needs to be revised, then we would initiate rulemaking to do that.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you.
MS. MARQUIS: Chairman Ruffatto, members of the Board. Vicki Marquis for Teck Coal. Thank you for the question.

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

But in the meantime, $D E Q$ 's public statements have indicated that they intend to move forward with a water quality assessment of Lake Koocanusa, and Teck's view is that a water quality assessment should proceed with the statewide water column standard of five, as well as the fish tissue standards which were not subject to these petitions, and those are still on the books and still govern.

So that water quality assessment should be done in that matter. If it's done comparing water quality data to the invalid 0.8 standard that would result in an invalid water quality assessment, which could potentially result in an impairment determination, development of a total maximum daily load, or TMDL, and waste load
allocation, those are steps that DEQ has said that they would take using the . 8 standard.

And those steps are time intensive and expensive for the agency. I believe DEQ's statement about the waste load allocation was then that they would seek to have that waste load allocation enforced against Canada.

All of that would be invalid if it was premised on a water quality standard at. 8 , unless new rulemaking occurs and establishes the standard legally at that level. Does that answer your question? Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Additional
questions from the Board prior to moving to a motion?
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: At this time I'd like to call for a motion to grant or deny the joint motion.
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Calling for a motion to grant or deny the Joint Notice and Motion to Submit the Final Agency Action to EPA that was filed by Lincoln County and Teck Coal. Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I guess for discussion purposes, $I$ will move the motion forward to accept their motion to send this information to EPA for review.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: So motion to grant the Joint Notice and Motion?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Yes. Thank you. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Is there a second? BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Second. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Discussion on the motion.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Madam Chairman. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Board Member Simpson can go ahead.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. Board Member Simpson.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: The Board has made a determination that the standard of 0.8 is not valid and hasn't been valid from the time it was adopted. We realize there's not full agreement within the Board on that.

But $I$ guess my question is: What is the 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.

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

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I agree with those thoughts, Board Member Simpson. I don't see a
reason why we wouldn't. We decided this as a Board, and I think -- not that it was an oversight -- but by original decision, $I$ think maybe it was an assumption that that would make it to the EPA, but I don't see why we wouldn't send that formally to them.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Thanks for letting me comment, Vice Chair Aguirre.

Even though this selenium standard process in my mind has been strangely convoluted and fraught with significant errors ever since the new Board took it $u p$, and $I$ won't go into all of the various convolutions again, it seems the Board is determined to do whatever it takes to put the interests of the Canadian coal company Teck before the interests of Montana's water quality.

Lincoln County politicians jumped in $I$ think to give Teck a sense of legitimacy with Montanans. The route Teck and the Board decided to take was to take a very narrow approach to attack the selenium standard using the concept of stringency, which as I've said before $I$ think was incorrectly applied.

But that's all we dealt with. We didn't deal with the hundreds of public comments, the thousands of pages of scientific documents and scientific input that the previous Board considered.

We had a couple of periods of public comments. We had a meeting where we listened to an attorney for Teck and an attorney for the DEQ. I think the whole process was woefully inadequate, but there seems to be a goal of arriving at a certain place regardless.

But $I$ invite you to read the letter from the EPA that's on Page 0093 of our packet. It's sort of a nice summary of why the previous Board had it correctly.

But it's interesting to see how Teck's legalistic contortions continue. Teck is apparently unhappy it would have to comply with the older, more appropriate selenium standard until the selenium standard is reworked.

So now they're trying to do an end run, and have us submit the outcome of our work to the EPA, when the EPA has definite guidelines for when they will consider a state standard, and we 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 probably no practical implications apparently to leaving the standard as it is for now. But regardless, what will be done will be done. The Board $I$ believe is on the wrong side of history, and $I$ think that will be shown with time, and it has been shown by hundreds of scientific documents and public comments. I wouldn't be surprised if 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.

And $I$ think that perspective is just a slap in face to DEQ, and to the citizens of Montana. The DEQ is charged with protecting Montana's air and water quality, and believe me, there are plenty of people out there and corporations that are willing to do whatever they want regardless of the consequences for air and 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 $D E Q$ and undermining its work, then we'll end up with more Superfund sites. If the only thing you care about is dollars, it's a heck of a lot of cheaper to keep air and water clean proactively than it is to clean up the mess, sort of the classic, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Anyway $I$ know $I$ 'm not going to change anyone's mind. I just wanted this perspective to be on the record. I just think it's too bad that Teck Coal didn't spend the money they've been spending trying to fight the selenium standard, it's too bad they didn't spend that money on cleaning up their acts, so that they don't get fined $\$ 60$ million again for selenium pollution.

Anyway, thanks for letting me comment. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you, Vice Chair. I guess we're kind of off topic of the motion, but $I$ understand the frustration of some
of the Board members, but $I$ do feel like the Board was also just attacked as far as our credibility 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.

And we have a very narrow legal issue with this one. I think we made the right decision because of that very narrow legal issue that, again, all these comments are on the record, and $I$ just also want to be on record that $I$ don't think the Board has some kind of a goal. I don't think the Board has some kind of end game on this. We are trying to do the best that we know how, that we can do. And so $I$ just wanted to make that 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.

And as far as hurting the credibility of DEQ, I think they're doing it to themselves over and over again. And let me explain why, using an
analogy that Dr. Lehnherr used last time, the baking of a cake.

If you have a recipe for a cake, and you take that recipe and you make the cake, but you leave out the key ingredient, two eggs. And you bake the cake, and you pull it out, and it just isn't right.

What DEQ wants to do is to take those two eggs and just spread them over the top and say, "Now we're good," but it doesn't work that way. You've got to start all over, and make it right. So those are my comments. I support the motion.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Does the Board have any more questions or comments on the motion?
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: No more comments or questions on the motion?
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Move forward with a vote on the motion. All in favor of the motion to grant the Joint Notice and Motion moving forward to EPA, say aye.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Opposed.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Could you do a roll call.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carries.
Moving on to the new contested case in the matter of appeal and request for hearing by -CHAIR RUFFATTO: Vice Chair Aguirre.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes, Chairman.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Before you move on, I have a motion to make, actually two motions to make.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: You have the floor. CHAIR RUFFATTO: The first motion is that we should direct Board Counsel working with the Chairman to draft a reasoned decision on the -- our decision to deny $D E Q$ 's request to amend.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I need to have you repeat that, just because you broke up in the middle. You're making a motion to direct the Board Counsel --

CHAIR RUFFATTO: -- to draft a reasoned decision for consideration at the December meeting to explain our decision in denying DEQ's motion to amend.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll second that motion. Is there any discussion on that motion? (No response)

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll call for a vote. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We need to do a roll call.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.

MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.

MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carries.
Chairman Ruffatto, you said you had a second motion.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: My second motion is to request Lincoln County -- is that the Board request that Lincoln County and Teck Coal jointly file a proposed letter to EPA transmitting the Board's order, and to submit that to the Board by November 4 th.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll second that motion. Is there any discussion?
(No response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Hearing no
discussion, $I$ 'll call for a vote. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: All opposed.
(Response)
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Please do roll call.

MS. SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye.
MS. SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Motion carries.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:50 a.m.)
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