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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I'll call the meeting to order, and let's start out, Sandy, will you please call the roll.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: GOOd morning, everybody. Chairman Ruffatto.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Here. Good morning.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Here.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We have a quorum, sir.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Sandy. And are you in a position to for the record state who else is on the call, on the meeting.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, sir. Laurie Crutcher, Court Reporter; Michael Russell, Board Counsel; Kurt Moser from DEQ; Vicki Marquis, Legal Counsel; Andy Janes; Catherine Armstrong; Brian Balmer, United States Forest Service; Derf Johnson; Elena Hagen, Agency Legal Services; Emily Lodman; Francesca Fionda; Deputy Director Fehr, Montana DEQ; Katie Makarowski, DEQ; Kirsten Bowers, DEQ; Lauren Sweeney, DEQ; Loryn Johnson, DEQ; Linsey Gaudisio; Mary Cohenour; Ray Stout; Rebecca Harbage, DEQ; Samuel Yemington, Holland and Hart; Sarah Ogden; Nicholas Whitaker, DEQ. That is all $I$ have, sir.
(Also present Chris Dorrington; Jessica Wilkerson; Jeremiah Langston; Ed Hayes; Moira Davin; Nick Danielson; Lindsey Krywaruchka; Heidi Barnes; Rachel Clark; Murry Warhank; Jennifer Eckstrom; Hayden Blackford; Corey Bullock, CBC News; Stephen Pfeiffer; Brad Smith, ICL; Peggy Trenk, Treasure

State Resources Association; Haley Williams; Emily Qiu; Barbara Chillcott, WELC; Grace Judge; Tonya Fish, EPA; Adanks; Sean; Amanda Eggert, Montana Free Press; Grace Judge; Chelsea Colwyn)

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Sandy. I would just, for your scheduling, I expect that we'll be done within two hours -- I could be wrong -- maybe even within one hour, but $I$ think it will be a relatively short meeting.

The first order of business is the review and approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 14 th, and $I$ would ask for a motion from a Board member for approval.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I move to approve.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: A motion has been made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 14th. Discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Is there any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, $I$ will
call the question. All in favor of approving the
meeting minutes of the Board of October 14 th, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed, same sign.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion carries.
Then we will go to our next administrative item, and a little background on this one for your recollection.

In February of this year, a motion was passed that an order regarding informal procedures go out with every new matter.

What we have learned is that no one is likely to agree to informal procedures, or at least not the cases that we've -- where it's been considered, and sending out an order for every new case has resulted in additional time and more expense.

So I'm going to move that only when the Chair or a Board member believes informal procedures may be more likely will an order be issued.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, David.
Discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: I've given you my rationale for making the motion. A little more beyond that would be that $I$ think for 90 percent, give or take, of our cases, the parties are not going to want to go by informal procedures. I think there may be a case now and then when the parties would be agreeable to informal procedures, and $I$ think we can identify those possibilities when they come in.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes. Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, this is Dave. I certainly agree with that, and I think we recognized from the beginning that a large number, very possibly, and probably the majority of cases that come before the Board would not lend themselves well to the informal procedure, particularly permit appeals which tend to be complex, often with intervening parties and so on. So $I$ agree that your motion certainly makes sense.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: David Lehnherr, do you have your hand up?

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: No. Sorry,

Chairman Ruffatto. I don't.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any more discussion? I can see you don't, David. I had a hand on your box, but it was my cursor so -- any more discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: All right. A motion has been made and seconded that an informal order will go out only when the Chair or some member of the Board believes that informal procedures may be likely or more likely to be agreed to. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion carries.
Our next administrative item relates to Hearing Examiner reassignments. We continue to have turnover at ALS. We have lost two of our Hearing Examiners since the last meeting. Caitlin Buzzas has two cases, and she has left ALS.

And Mike Russell, our Counsel, has taken another position with the Attorney General's Office, so he's not able to handle -- he's moved out of ALS, and is not able to handle Hearing

Examiner matters. Fortunately at least for the time being, the powers that be are going to allow Mike Russell to continue as Board Counsel, but he will not have the capacity to handle Hearing Examiner matters.

Caitlin Buzzas has two cases that need to be reassigned, and Mike Russell has six cases to be reassigned. The potential Hearing Examiners that we have, or that I've identified and I'm going to talk about, are three. Rob Cameron, Michelle Dietrich.

If you recall, Rob Cameron has been handling two cases, and he's an outside lawyer. Michelle Dietrich is with ALS, and Liz Leman with ALS, $I$ think a relatively new lawyer with ALS. Mike, could you give us briefly the credentials of Michelle and Liz.

MR. RUSSELL: Sure. Both Michelle and Liz are licensed attorneys practicing here in Montana state and federal courts.

> Michelle has been at ALSB for approximately three years, $I$ believe. She handles a pretty diverse portfolio of cases, including a fair number of Hearing Examiner cases, or has a fair bit of Hearing Examiner experience.

She served as the Chief and Deputy, Chief Legal Counsel for the State Auditor for approximately one and a half years, and she was at the Department of Revenue as Counsel there for just under seven years. She's very familiar with MAPA and handling administrative proceedings.

As far as Liz goes, she's been with ALS since $I$ believe May of this year. Before that she was at the Department of Public Health and Human Services as an Administrative Law Judge, so she has a fair bit of experience in that capacity, administering oaths, admitting evidence, deciding cases, doing all of those tasks involved in Hearing Examiner work. And she's also got significant familiarity with MAPA and administrative proceedings.

I think that's a synopsis of their relevant experience as far as I'm aware, but I could obtain more information if necessary.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Mike. I think that gives us a picture of their experience. So before we start the reassignment process, there's kind of a housekeeping matter that we need to deal with, and that is to extend, to agree to extend the contract for Rob Cameron. His contract
is due to expire after one year, which is in January.

So I would move that the Board approve the extension of the contract for Rob Cameron.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Is there any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, then a motion has been made and seconded that Rob Cameron's contract be extended. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion passes. Now as far as the assignments, I visited with Mike, and Mike checked with $A L S$, and we're recommending that Liz Leman be assigned to the Rippling Woods case.

So $I$ would move that Liz Leman be assigned to the Rippling Woods case in place of Caitlin Buzzas.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll second that. CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank You. Discussion? (No response)

CHAIR RUFFATTO: A motion has been made and seconded that Liz Leman be assigned as Hearing Examiner to the Rippling Woods case.

The next recommendation, and $I$ move that Michelle Dietrich of ALS be assigned the Ployhar and Oreo's Refining cases. The Ployhar case was with Mike Russell, and the Oreo's Refining case was with Caitlin Buzzas. I move that Michelle Dietrich be assigned to those two cases as Hearing Examiner.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Is there any
discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, all in
favor of the motion that Michelle Dietrich be assigned to the Ployhar and Oreo's Refining cases, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, did we need to vote on the first motion? Did I miss it? CHAIR RUFFATTO: Did we not?

MS . MOISEY-SCHERER: NO.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: We didn't vote on the Liz Leman motion?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: (NOds head)
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: The first one,
the very first motion that you made, we did not vote on that one.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: To extend Rob Cameron's contract?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: No, to assign
that case to the first one. Did I miss that vote?
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Let's make sure we get
it. A motion has been made and seconded that Liz Leman be assigned to the Rippling Woods case. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion carries.
And thank you for catching that. Did you get the motion for Michelle Dietrich?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: And it passed?
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: (NOds head)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Now I move that the remaining cases that were assigned to Mike Russell be assigned to Rob Cameron. That's a total of five cases. I'll go through them if you want me to, but otherwise that's my motion. BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second. CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any discussion? BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, I guess $I$ would ask. Does he have cases aside from the five you're assigning?

CHAIR RUFFATTO: There are no other cases. There are no other pending cases that we're needing to reassign.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Does he have current cases, though, besides the five that you would reassign to him?

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, he has the Ployhar case, which we just moved to assign that to Michelle Dietrich.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. So he'll have five.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: He'll have five. He
currently -- well, he had two. One of them closed, and then he has the Richards case.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any more discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: A motion has been made and seconded that the remainder of the cases currently assigned to Mike Russell be assigned to Rob Cameron, and that's all of his cases except for the Ployhar case. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Motion carries. Next we'll go to the 2023 BER calendar, and that was in our packet at Page 5. And so before we make a motion, let's see if there's any discussion or comments that folks want to talk about.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, this
is my last meeting. Three of us fall off the Board after this meeting. So I guess I will recuse myself.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Any more comments or discussion?
(No response)

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Do $I$ have a motion to approve that calendar?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So moved.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: DO $I$ have a second?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: A motion has been made and seconded to approve the calendar as presented in the meeting packet. Any more discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: If none, a motion has been made and seconded to approve the calendar. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion passes. Now we're going to go to the briefing items, and I am going to go through those page by page and ask for any questions, comments, or updates, if anybody has any updates that they're aware of after the agenda came out. So on the first page, there's only one case. Is there any questions, comments, or updates?

MR. RUSSELL: Chair Ruffatto, my understanding is that there should be an order entered on the pending dispositive motion in short order. I know that Ms. Buzzas had hoped to get it out sooner, but wasn't able to before she left ALS. So that should be coming down the pike pretty soon.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: It did not -- It is a dispositive motion that was made?

MR. RUSSELL: That's my understanding, yes.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: And so she didn't get it out, so that will pass to Michelle to finish up; is that right?

MR. RUSSELL: Right.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Thank you.
Going to -- Any more questions or comments on that first page?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Then we'll go to the second page. Questions or comments?

MR. RUSSELL: Chair Ruffatto, regarding the Item No. (a), cases in court, I believe we're still waiting for a decision on that, but my update for item letter (b) would be that as we discussed at the previous meeting, I filed a motion to dismiss the Board from that judicial review case, consistent with our position in the case directly above that in front of the Supreme

Court, and that is now fully briefed.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you. Was there opposition to your motion?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: By whom?
MR. RUSSELL: By MEIC.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Thank you. Did anybody else file a brief?

MR. RUSSELL: No. MEIC was the only party to oppose the motion.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Thank you. Any more questions, comments, or updates on Page 2?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: We'll go to Page 3. Questions, comments, or updates?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Page 4, any questions, comments, or updates?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Mike, do you have an update on Item (e)? I think that's where we're at.

MR. RUSSELL: That's Western Sugar?
CHAIR RUFFATTO: No, Rippling Woods.
MR. RUSSELL: Oh, Rippling Woods.

CHAIR RUFFATTO:
(c) I should say. I'm sorry.

MR. RUSSELL: I know that Ms. Buzzas was working on a final decision in that case, so that will be transferred to Liz Leman to finish that up. I know that's in progress.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you. Any more questions, comments?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Go to Page 5.
Questions, or comments, updates?
MR. RUSSELL: As far as the letter (e) goes in Western Sugar, a new stipulated scheduling order has been entered in that case.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Thank you. Let's go to Page 6. Any questions, comments, or updates?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Let's go to Page 7.
Questions, comments, or updates?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: On Page 6, for the Sidney Sugars, it says the Hearing Examiner granted a request for oral argument for January

13th. That's something that we are involved in? CHAIR RUFFATTO: No.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR RUFFATTO: You bet. A more complete response is that will be oral arguments in front of the Hearing Examiner, who is ALS Attorney Aislinn Brown.

Page 7 again, any questions or comments? MR. RUSSELL: Regarding item (i), Valley Gardens, the parties submitted a request to vacate the scheduling order, and set a status conference. That was submitted earlier this week after I left ALS, so $I$ wasn't sure if $I$ had authority to grant that, but $I$ would recommend to $M r$. Cameron that after he assumes jurisdiction of the case, to vacate the scheduling order, and hold a status conference to establish a new schedule.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you. Please follow up with Mr. Cameron on that one.

MR. RUSSELL: Sure.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you. Any more questions on Page 7, updates?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, yes, one, Mr. Chairman, please. With regards to Item (h), do we have any better idea what this appeal is about? I see there was supposed to be some correspondence, but no further information.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: $I$ was told that it's an appeal about applying oil to a road that could affect a stream, is what $I$ heard about that. And the Hearing Examiner -- who by the way, he's not named on here, but it's Rob Cameron is the Hearing Examiner -- asked or required a more definite statement on the appeal; and Mr. Richards submitted a letter, which apparently is supposed to be that more definite statement. That's all I know about that, Board Member Simpson.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you. CHAIR RUFFATTO: So it is progressing. It's a case where the person that appealed is not very sophisticated on these matters, so it's kind of slow getting things to a conclusion, is what my understanding is.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Going to Page 8. Any
questions or comments?
MR. RUSSELL: On matter (k), the Ployhar case, there is a pending motion that was just recently fully briefed regarding the removal of the case from the contested case docket, so that
will be something that the new Hearing Examiner, Ms. Dietrich, will need to rule on before that matter proceeds.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Very good. And you will communicate with her to make sure that it's handled expeditiously?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Okay. Thank you. Going to Page 9 now, the one case before the Action Items. Any updates?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, we'll go to the Action Items.

The only item under Action Items is some carry-over business from the prior meeting on the selenium matter, the petitions by Teck Coal and the Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County.

We have two things to deal with there. At the last meeting the Board voted to deny DEQ's motion to amend, and the Board voted to direct that a written decision be prepared and presented to the Board for this meeting. That was in our packet at Page 14. We need a motion to approve or reject that decision, and then we can have
discussion.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll move to approve, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Julia. Do we have a second?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Stacy.
Discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Is there any
discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, $I$ will call the question. A motion has been made and seconded to approve the proposed written decision denying DEQ's motion to amend. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Let's take a roll call vote, please.

MS . MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Lehnherr.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you. The motion passes.

The second carry-over item, at the last meeting the Board voted to grant the joint motion to submit a letter to EPA with the decision of the Board, and the Board voted to request proposed letters from the petitioners.

Those letters were received. I have worked -- I have revised those proposed letters primarily to shorten them, and they appear at Page

20 of our packet materials. So we need a motion to accept or reject the draft letter to EPA that appears at Page 20 of our meeting materials.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to accept the draft letters as presented for submittal to EPA.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second. CHAIR RUFFATTO: A motion has been made and seconded to accept the draft letter at Page 20 to send to the EPA. Discussion.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion for a minor revision to the language, on Page 2 of the letter, first paragraph under "Background on the lake water column standard."

About the middle of that paragraph it says, "In both the initial publication and response to comments the Board misinformed the public that the lake water column standard," etc. I would like to strike "misinformed the public," and replace it with "asserted;" and then further on in that sentence after "water column standard" insert "using EPA approved methods, and hence was not more stringent than the Federal guideline." I think it's a more accurate
description of the action that was taken by the Board at that time.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Dave, help me out here.
What page are you on?
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: I'm on Page 2 of the letter, Page 21 of the materials, the first paragraph after "Background on the lake water column standard."

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Got it.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: And the sentence starts at the end of Line 4, "In both the initial publication and in response to comments, the Board misinformed the public," and $I$ would like to strike "misinformed the public," and replace that with the word "asserted."

And then after, continuing on with the sentence, "that the lake water column standard," and then insert after "standard," "using EPA approved methods, and hence was not more stringent," etc.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I'm trying to recall the best parliamentary procedure. Would you make that as an amendment to the motion? I think that would be the appropriate thing to do, Dave.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes, Mr.

Chairman. I would make an amendment to the motion to revise that sentence as discussed.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Is there a second? VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll second.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: A motion has been made and seconded to amend the original motion as stated. Discussion.

BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Chairman
Ruffatto, can we have that revision restated one more time, please?

CHAIR RUFFATTO: I will read the sentence the way that the amendment would change it. It would now read, "In both the initial publication and in response to comments, the Board asserted --" I think you'd have to put -"asserted to the public that the lake water standard was not set more stringent than the federal guideline, and that the stringency statute therefore did not apply."

And then in the next sentence, "The lake water standard using the EPA approved method --" no.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Could I --
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Yes, you do it, Dave.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Would you like me
to read it, please? As revised the sentence would read, "In both the initial publication and in response to comments, the Board asserted that the lake water column standard using EPA approved methods and hence --" or excuse me -- "used EPA approved methods, and hence was not set more stringent than the federal guideline, and that the stringency statute therefore did not apply." CHAIR RUFFATTO: Discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: I am opposed to this amendment, and the reason I'm opposed is because a critical factor in our decision was that the Board did misinform the public because the appropriate guidance was the 1.5 standard, so $I$ think it's important to call out that there was a misinformed public because that's part of what made the rulemaking -- that's one of several factors that made the rulemaking invalid.

When you misinform the public in advance of the rulemaking, then they cannot effectively participate because they don't have accurate information. So I'm opposed to the motion to amend. Any more discussion?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I
guess $I$ would just ask the question for my own enlightenment. If $I$ understand correctly, you feel that the way it is worded is important to the decision that was made.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: It's important for two reasons. The misinformation is a critical factor in the -- one of many that caused the rule to be invalid, because what the statute says is that the Board at that time was supposed to tell the public whether or not the proposed standard was more stringent than the comparable federal guideline, and we concluded that the comparable federal guideline was 1.5 and not that methodology that DEQ argued was the guideline.

So the accurate statement is that it was a misinformation to the public, and $I$ think that's valuable for two reasons: One, that's part of our basis for decision, and if you have read the decision that we just approved, that is made clear in that decision; and two, $I$ think it's important to make that point to EPA so it is clear to EPA that that occurred.

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Given that explanation, Mr. Chairman, I request to withdraw my motion to amend.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Will the second withdraw? Yes, Stacy, go ahead.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: The way that Board Member Simpson revised it $I$ don't feel undoes what you were trying to accomplish. I think the word "misinformed" is sort of willful, which I don't believe is what happened, and that's why I seconded the change using the word "asserted," because that really is what the Board -- it sounds like that is -- $I$ wasn't on the Board -- but it sounds like that's what the Board, exactly what the Board did. It wasn't an intentional misinformation, but an assertion maybe based on not making a fact clear.

But $I$ won't -- if discussion on that seems that it really needs to say "misinformation" or "misinformed," $I$ will pull my second.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Before you answer that, let me tell you that it's my view that the word "misinformed" does not imply one way or another whether it was intentional. It was just misinformation. Whether it was intentional or not is a different question, but it did misinform the public because they were told one thing and the fact of the matter was different. So that's my
response to that.
So with that, Board Member Simpson has withdrawn his motion. Are you prepared to withdraw your second?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I will withdraw my second.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you both. That was a good discussion, and valuable. Is there any more discussion on the original motion to approve the letter?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, a motion has been made and seconded to approve the draft letter to EPA that appears at Page 20 of our materials. All in favor, say aye.

Let's not go through that. Let's have a roll call vote.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Ruffatto.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member

Lehnherr.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Nay.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Nay.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Board Member Simpson.
BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion passes.
Now we're going to move on to the new contested case. It's the matter of the renewal of MPDES permit No. Montana 264 issued to CHS, Inc. for discharges from the Laurel Refinery, and it's BER Case No. 2022-07. And we need to decide if we're going to keep the case as a board, or we're going to assign it in part or in total to a Hearing Examiner. Do I have a motion?

BOARD MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll move that the case be assigned in total to a Hearing Examiner.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Board Member
Simpson. Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: Second.
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Dr.

Lehnherr, for the second. Any discussion? (No response)

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, a motion has been made and seconded that the Laurel Refinery case be assigned in total to a Hearing Examiner. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: The motion carries.
Then I'm going to move that we assign Rob Cameron to this case. Do I have a second?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second. CHAIR RUFFATTO: Discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, a motion has been made and seconded that Rob Cameron be assigned as Hearing Examiner to the Laurel Refinery case. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, the motion carries. Board Counsel, do you have any updates?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't think $I$ have any update other than those I've already provided, unless there's a specific question or request.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Questions from Board members to Board Counsel?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, we will move on to public comment. Is there any public comment?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Hearing none, I have a few comments. First, $I$ want to thank those of you who would be rolling off the Board for your service and your hard work. It's been an honor working with you.

But then $I$ also want to tell you that $I$ am resigning from the Board. This will be my last meeting, and so $I$ want to thank everyone for the opportunity to work with you, and it truly has been an honor to work with you in serving Montana.

And I also want to ask forgiveness for those of you who $I$ may have been unkind to at any point. I know I get worked up sometimes, and I ask your forgiveness. It's never appropriate to be unkind. So those are my comments. Anything
else that anybody wants to say?
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, I just want to say thank you for your leadership. It's been an honor to work with everybody, and I'm going to miss you all. So you guys do great work, and you do great work for the State of Montana's constituents. So keep it up. That's all I can say. Thank you.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, Julia.
BOARD MEMBER LEHNHERR: (Indicating)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you, David.
Anything else?
(No response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Then $I$ move for adjournment. Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second. My last one.

CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thanks, Julia. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR RUFFATTO: Thank you all.
(The proceedings were concluded
at 9:54 a.m. )
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| record [2] | 12:22, 14:5, | 5:24, 6:2 | 31:25, 32:3, | 3:11, 9:10 | 25:18, |
| 3:4, 35:13 | 14:11, | 6:12, 6:23, | 32:8, 32:10, | serving - | 26:17, |
| recuse - 14:22 | 14:13, | 7:1, 7:2, | 32:14, | 33:20 | 26:21, 27:4 |
| Refinery [3] | 14:25, 15:9, | 7:7, 7:14, | 32:16 | seven | 27:15, 28:10 |
| 31:14, 32:5, | 15:13, | 7:16, 9:20, | 32:21, | several - | start [2] 2:5, |
| 32:19 | 16:15, | 10:6, 10:8, | 32:23, 33:4, | 27:18 | 9:22 |
| Refining [3] | 17:13, | 10:11, | 33:7, $33: 11$, | she's [3] 9:5, | starts - 25:11 |
| 11:9, 11:10, | 17:16, 17.18 , | 10:16, ${ }^{10} 11.2$ | 34:9, $34: 11$, | 9:7, 9:14 | state [8] 1:2 |
| 11:22 | 17:19, 18:9, | 10:18, 11:2, | $\begin{array}{lll}34: 14, \\ 34: 18, & 34: 21\end{array}$ | short [2] | $3: 4,4: 1$, $8: 20,9$, |
| regarding [4] | 18:18, 19:5, | 11:4, $11: 15$, | 34:18, $34: 21$ | 4:10, 15:24 | 8:20, 9:2, |
| 5:11, 16:18, | $21: 11,22: 9 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 17, \\ & 11: 20, \end{aligned}$ | rule [2] 21:2, $28: 7$ | shorten - $23: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 6,35: 2, \\ & 35: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 19:9, 20:24 | 22:18, | 11:25, 12:4, | rulemaking | shorthand | stated - 26:7 |
| 19:24 | 22:20, | 12:6, 12:16, | [3] 27:18, | 35:10 | statement [3] |
| Reiten [10] | 24:18, | 12:21, | 27:19, 27:21 | Sidney - | 20:9, $20: 11$, |
| 1:16, 2:19, | 25:12, | 12:23, 13:2, | Russell [24] | 18:24 | 28:15 |
|  | 26:14, 27:3, | 13:4, 13:10, | 3:7, 7:22, | sign-5:4 | States - 3:10 |



