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(Board Member Reiten not present) CHAIR SIMPSON: Sandy, we're ready to proceed?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, sir, we are. CHAIR SIMPSON: Take roll, please.

MS . MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, sir. Chairman
Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Aguirre.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Here.
MS . MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Bruner.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Rankosky.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Reiten.
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I'm not seeing he's arrived yet. Board Member Smith.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We do have a quorum. And $I$ do want to apologize. For some reason my camera is not working.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Sandy. The first order of business is to review and approve the minutes from our February 24 th meeting. Are there any comments, additions, or changes to the minutes to be considered?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, do we have a motion?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I did a second, but I was on mute. Sorry.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'll second it. It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 24 th meeting without changes. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed, nay.
(No response)


#### Abstract

CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. The next order of business is introduction of new Board members. I'm pleased to say we have a full seven member Board once again. And what $I$ would like to do is just go down the list, and if you wouldn't mind, have everybody just take about a minute and tell us a little bit about yourself, and also where you're from. Hopefully we'll be able to have a meeting in person before too long where we can meet, and become a little bit better acquainted.


But $I$ will start off. My name's Dave
Simpson. I was appointed to the Board by Governor Gianforte two years ago. I'm retired, have been retired for quite awhile. In my other life I spent 34 years working for Westmoreland Coal Company as -- primarily in coal mine permitting, so it's a subject about which $I$ know probably enough to be dangerous at this point.

But $I$ have also served on some other boards in Helena, including Fish, Wildiffe and Parks Commission a number of years ago. So that is my story. Board Member Aguirre.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I'm Stacy
Aguirre. I have been on the Board for two years,
filling a position that was vacated early, and then reappointed for a term through January 2027. Grew up in Deer Lodge; and lived for quite awhile in Butte; went to school at Montana Tech; have an engineering degree -- go Diggers -and have a career really professional hands-on experience focused in the energy industry, mining, oil and gas, including upstream, midstream, downstream. So $I$ am filling a public member role, and live in Glendive.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Stacy. Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Good morning, everybody. Julia Altemus. I, too, served a two year term prior to this, and $I$ was filling in for Judge Lynch who was out of Missoula. I reside in Missoula. So $I$ was reappointed by the Governor to do a term, four year term, so my term will expire in January 2027 as well.
I'm still working. I'm not retired.

I'm the Executive of the Montana Wood Products Association, but my background is in
energy/national resources policy work, because I worked for the US Senate for twelve years and the US House for two years, and then have served in
other capacities along the way.
But I do also sit on other boards in addition to this one, and as $I$ said, $I$ reside in Missoula, and I also am the public, one of the public representatives as well along with Stacy. But welcome, everybody, and good to see everyone. Thank you, Dave.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Julia. Board Member Bruner.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thanks, guys. I looked at everybody's file before the meeting. It looked like a real good crew. I'm happy to be here.

I'm a fifth generation farmer out of
Montana. I was in the Air Force for a number of years, got out, went to Bozeman, got a degree in physics, and then went to --

There wasn't a lot of work for
theoretical physicists at the time, so $I$ went to law school in Missoula, and $I$ practiced for about 30 years as a litigation attorney at a large defense firm here in Montana. We did a bunch of environmental law. We represented Atlantic Richfield, was probably the flagship client, and then a number of others.

I taught environmental law at Montana Tech as needed for Kumar for a number of years, still do that whenever he calls, but he hasn't called in awhile, which is good, because there never seems to be enough time.

I served on the petro board. I was appointed there by Governor Racicot. And I recently served on the Water Pollution Control Advisory Council, appointed by Governor Gianforte, which $I$ resigned to take this position. I'm really looking forward to it. Glad to be here. CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Lee. Board Member Rankosky.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: My name is Jen Rankosky, and I'm with the Flathead City-County Health Department. I'm serving the Health Officer role. And $I$ was born and raised in Kalispell. I got my MPH at the University of Montana.

And $I$ work, $I$ oversee the environmental health program here in Flathead County, and have worked within environmental health with them. For twenty years I've been in public health. So that's about it.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much. Do you prefer Jen, Jennifer?

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Jen is fine. You can do Jennifer. I'll answer to pretty much anything.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you, Jen. Has Board Member Reiten joined us yet? I don't see him on the screen.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: No, sir, he has not.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Apparently not. Okay. Apparently not. Board Member Smith.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'm Joe Smith. I was appointed two years ago to the Board in the community planning role. I'm an engineer by trade, also Montana Tech grad, in primarily civil engineering.

The first ten years of my career was in water resources, dams, flood plain modeling, and done a ton of work in development. I've served on Ravalli County Planning Board for ten years now as well. And for the last eight years I've been working for utilities, both electric cooperative, and now I'm managing the Grizzly Broadband, an internet service provider in Hamilton, Montana. And I live in Florence, Montana.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Joe. Welcome
to all of our new members, and welcome back to those who have been on the Board up to this point. So let's proceed to Item $B$ in the agenda, the briefing items. And I guess let's just focus for the time being on Item 1 (a). This is the Oreo issue. Are there any comments or questions from the Board? I have a few, but I'll hold off for just a moment.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, I see that this is scheduled for action by the Board at our next meeting on June 9 th, and $I$ just want to be clear on the status of the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and all of the filings and cross-filings with respect to exceptions.

Where do we stand on that, and what documents are available? What are we waiting on? I'm not sure who to direct that question to, I suppose to either Ms. Oomens or Ms. Brown.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman, Nick
Whitaker from DEQ has his hand up.
MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, can you hear me?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, I can.
MR. WHITAKER: Since no one else is
speaking up, this is Nick Whitaker, attorney for the Department on this case. And just I guess procedurally $I$ can fill you in, if that's appropriate.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, please.
MR. WHITAKER: So the Hearing Examiner in this has issued a summary judgment order, and then issued an order on exceptions just setting forth the procedure for filing exceptions to the Hearing Examiner's summary judgment motion.

The deadline for filing those I think is in a few weeks, $I$ believe, and then it would be ready for $I$ guess the Board's, full Board's consideration at the next meeting. So right now we just have a summary judgment order issue, and there's been no additional filings yet because those deadlines haven't come up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I see. Okay. Well, the reason $I$ 'm asking the question is sometimes these, when the cases come to the Board, more often than not it's a rather involved process of going through exceptions, and then issuing the Board's decision.

And I suppose what I'd prefer to do at this point is I'll keep in touch with Board

Counsel. Once we have at least the first round of filings on that, plus the summary judgment, I'd like to take a look at it, and make an assessment whether or not, or how long, I should say how much time this is likely to take at our next meeting.

And if it is a complex process we may want to consider meeting in person. If not, if it looks like it will be a fairly brief discussion, then we can continue with the -- or proceed with a Zoom meeting.

So just a heads up that $I$ would like to have as much lead time on that as possible to assess how it will be approached at our next meeting. Thank you.

The next item is 2(a). These are cases in court. I see that this case was scheduled for hearing $I$ believe -- yes -- April 3rd, so it should have been heard this week, earlier this week. Is there any information to be -- that's appropriate to pass on to the Board at this time regarding that hearing before the state Supreme Court?

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: This is Lee. I actually serve as the Deputy Clerk of the Montana Supreme Court right now, and $I$ can confirm we did
do oral argument on that case, $I$ think it was down in Missoula, and it's before the Supreme Court, and in a couple months we'll probably get a decision out of them.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Lee. Moving on. I don't see anything on Page 3. We have MEIC versus the Department, having to do with Signal Peak. That one is pending. Any questions there on any of these on this page? (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: 2(b) through 3(a).
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, in the matter of Item 3(a), Westmoreland Resources Appeal of the Final MPDES Permit No. 21-229, I notice there hasn't been any activity on this since June of ' 20 , and $I$ was wondering if there's anyone who can give a status report as to what is going on on this case. Are they still working on settlement? Is it likely that this will come back to the Board, or is there any update on this case? MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Kirsten Bowers of DEQ has her hand up. CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, please. MS. BOWERS: Good morning, Chair

Simpson, members of the Board. I've been working with Westmoreland on this MPDES permit appeal, and we are filing status reports with the Board, but I think you're right. We haven't filed one for awhile. And we're still continuing to work through the mining system issues to update their permit.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Ms. Bowers.
Anything on Item 3(b)?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I gather that from reading this that this issue is tied in somehow with the AM4 decision, and I'm not sure $I$ understand what that linkage is, and especially since we have several new Board members, I wonder if anybody can provide information of what the relationship is between these two cases and what the status is. Ms. Bordelon.

MS. BORDELON: Yes, Chair Simpson and Board members. I represent Westmoreland in the Area $F$ proceeding, and this case has been stayed because many of the procedural arguments that are before the Supreme Court in AM4 would be precedential and guiding in how Area $F$ is resolved. Obviously it's a different area of the
mine, but there are procedural issues in how the contested case would proceed, and rather than go forward and then perhaps redo in the event that the -- depending on how the Supreme Court resolves AM4, this case has been stayed waiting for the Supreme Court's resolution there.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Bordelon. Any other comments or questions on Item $3(c)$, or (d) or (e) on the next page?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chairman Simpson,
can I go back up (b) for a second?
CHAIR SIMPSON: Certainly.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: There was
supposed to be oral argument before the Supreme Court on April 3rd. I guess I'm just wondering if that happened or not.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: (Indicating)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, I believe so.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: We're waiting for that decision then.

CHAIR SIMPSON: That's correct. We had a brief review on that earlier, but it did happen, so it will be a few months before we hear anything, I'm sure.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Board Member Reiten is now joining the call.
(Board Member Reiten present)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Sandy. I'm looking at my screen here. Hearing nothing on (d) and (e), how about (f), Sidney Sugars?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I see with respect to this case that Hearing Examiner Brown has issued an order granting the motion for stay on february 28 th.

And $I$ guess one of the questions I've had is $I$ saw in the news that Sidney Sugars plant is shutting down. So is this case likely to go away for that reason, if $I$ could ask -(inaudible) --

MS. BROWN: Chairman Simpson, this is Aislinn Brown. I'm the Hearing examiner on it. So that's the reason for the stay is Counsel for Sidney Sugars is figuring out what's going to happen, and just needed some time to -- I asked for an update, so she just needed some time to figure that out, and then we'll be updating. CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you very much, Aislinn.

Next is Item (g), request for hearing by Harry Richards. There has been -- I see there's been some exchange of letters on this. I'm still unclear as to what this is about and what rule -and under what rule it's being challenged. Is this an MPDES issue, or is it something else? Is there any information that -- let's see. Who is -- Is there anything to be offered on this? Just an update by the Department would be helpful.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Nick Whitaker of DEQ has his hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Oh, thank you.
MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, members of the Board. Nick Whitaker again on behalf of the Department. I don't want to get too much into the substance of this one, but $I$ mean $I$ can let you know that this is an appeal of an administrative order issued by DEQ for violation of the Montana Hazardous Waste Act. It's relating to the dumping of used oil.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Whitaker, and we'll --

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I think this might be a good place to bring it up, and it's just a procedural
question about these.
Typically the cases that go to contested case hearing, do the Hearings Examiners set discovery, dispositive motions, those sorts of things, and then once the dispositive motions are resolved, do they then set a hearing, or is the hearing date set as part of the initial scheduling order?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Brown, could you respond to that, please.

MS. BROWN: Sure. So there's usually a prehearing order that goes out, and then the parties get together and kind of decide on how much time is needed for discovery, and then the Hearing Examiner issues a scheduling order in my experience. Terisa might be able to speak more to that as well.

MS. OOMENS: No, I think you covered it.
I mean the parties kind of run the discovery section, and then the Hearing Examiner sets a scheduling order, so --

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Sorry. My
question was more when that scheduling order comes out, does it include a hearing date, or is it like some of the District Courts in Montana where they
set the discovery schedule, expert witness disclosures if there are some, and dispositive motions briefed by this date, dispositive motions are resolved, and they then set the hearing date, or is the hearing date set when the scheduling order initially comes out?

MS. OOMENS: I believe that the hearing dates aren't set until dispositive motions are resolved.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thank you.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Ms. Oomens.
Okay. Moving forward. Any questions or comments on Items (h), (i), or (j), or Item (k)?

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on Item (j).

CHAIR SIMPSON: Item (j)?
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Yes.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Please proceed.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: The last sentence of that says, "CHS filed an objection and request for oral argument on March 17 th, 2023." Who is that oral argument before? Is that before this Board, is that before the Hearing Examiner, or is that before some other entity?

CHAIR SIMPSON: It's before the Hearing

Examiner, I'm sure. Ms. Oomens?
MS. OOMENS: Yes, before the Hearing Examiner.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Cases not assigned to a Hearing Examiner. Under 4(a), this has to do with the selenium issue, and that concludes the background items. Before we move on to action items, are there any further comments or questions regarding any of these cases? (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Let's move forward to Item 3(a), in the Matter of Appeal and Request for Hearing by Westmoreland Rosebud Mining, LLC, regarding issuance of MPDES Permit No. MT0032042 in Colstrip, BER Case 2022-06 WQ.

At our last meeting, a settlement agreement was presented to the Board which was approved, but with some follow-up questions on the mechanics of implementing the settlement agreement.

We have a copy of the final agency decision, the order that was prepared. This was primarily at my insistence, because having some background in this issue, and having dealt with trying to characterize water quality in ephemeral streams that essentially by definition have no water most of the time, I've found in my personal experience to be quite challenging.

So I'm curious as to how the parties were going to approach this. They have responded, and my first question would be: Is there - Are the parties represented here to make a brief statement to address this settlement agreement and the questions that have been raised?

And $I$ have some comments on it, but I'll hold off until we've had a chance to hear from the parties. Keep in mind this -- please correct me if I'm wrong -- this came to us as contested case, but we now have a settlement agreement before us, so it's not a matter of proponent and opponent, it is a matter of the means in which the parties plan to resolve this issue.

So is there someone from -- representing either the Department or Western Energy that could brief us for a few minutes on the issues here?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Mr. Mercer has his hand up.

MR. MERCER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Bill Mercer. Thank you.
MR. MERCER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Bill Mercer on behalf of Westmoreland. And I know Ms. Bowers is here on behalf of the Department.

We believe that we have satisfied the Board's order by the filing that we made on the 24 th of March, and we know that there is an interest in some reporting to keep the Board apprised of progress that parties are making pursuant to the stipulation.

I think our thought would be that a quarterly report would be something that we'd recommend to the Board, if that's acceptable. And we hope that we have answered the questions in a way that is responsive to the order that you issued. We believe that we have responded in a comprehensive way.

And $I$ guess the only other thing $I$ would like to add at this point is that we have a new complaint that's been filed in State District Court -- obviously not a matter in front of the Board, but a matter in State District Court - challenging actions of the Department, and taking issue with what the Department has done with respect to my client.

And so $I$ think our preference would be to rely on what we've submitted to you as
responsive to the requests, and not go into further dialogue on that, as we are likely to be trying to intervene in that litigation, and defending what the Department has done, and what the applicant is seeking to do.

So happy to follow up on that, but I'm sure Ms. Bowers would like to be heard as well, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Mercer. Ms. Bowers.

MS. BOWERS: Chair Simpson, members of the Board. Yes, I agree with Mr. Mercer's comments. We were just filed with the complaint on this MPDES permit, and some of the claims at issue are hydrologic condition of the receiving waters, as well as protection of uses, and avoidance of downgradient impact.

So DEQ would prefer not to go into too much further detail than what we provided in our written responses, because we're developing a response to the complaint at this time.

And then just to add. We could provide regular updates to you, if you want to move this to your briefing agenda. We would be happy to do that. In the Rosebud case, which I kind of call
the main MPDES permit, that did stay on the Board's agenda, and we regularly updated you on what the status of the litigation was, just in a general way, just to say that we were briefing motions, or that a matter was fully briefed and pending before the District Court. It would just be a simple update of the litigation.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is it appropriate or inappropriate to ask what the subject of the District Court litigation is?

MS. BOWERS: Chair Simpson, Board Members, the complaint is on the MPDES permit for the AM5 expansion, and the claims are based on the ephemeral, DEQ's ephemeral rule, and protection of uses for receiving waters. That's pretty general, but that's basically what the complaint is.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
Board Members, any comments or questions?
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: This is Lee. I
have a question for either Bill or Kirsten, whoever. Who is going to be the Judge in that case?

MR. MERCER: Judge Murnion has been assigned the case. I think it is conceivable that any of the parties could seek reassignment under 33-1-804, but for now, the case is assigned to him.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thanks, Bill.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Board Member Aguirre has her hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Board Member Aguirre. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Based on the responses from Mr. Mercer and Ms. Bowers, I want to make sure $I$ 'm clear that we're really being asked by both parties, based on their joint response to the questions, to just accept the responses, and because they were -- it was a joint agreed-to responses, and to move on then to -move on to getting updates, and that there's another matter going on there that we're not part of. Is that a correct general statement about where we're at with this action?

MR. MERCER: Let me start, and I'm sure Ms. Bowers will have additional thoughts as well, but I would --

My starting point on this, Board Member Aguirre, would be to say we had initiated an appeal, but then both Westmoreland as the appellant and DEQ as the appellee agreed to resolve the appeal pending before the BER pursuant
to the stipulation that we filed on the $10{ }^{25}$ of December of 2023.

And so we believe that by doing the -by filing the stipulation and having the stipulation accepted by the Board, we have resolved on a preliminary basis the matter that we had initiated in front of the Board.

The Board has retained $I$ think a continuing jurisdiction, and that's why we responded to the order, but $I$ do believe -speaking on behalf of Westmoreland -- that we believe that we have resolved the matters through the stipulation, and that we have responded to the Board's order, and that that should, at least at this point in time, resolve the matter as it was initiated.

And we certainly believe it would be appropriate to come back to you and explain what we're doing pursuant to the stipulation; and then as Ms. Bowers has noted, and as I noted as well, with the pendency of this new litigation, $I$ think for us to get into further detail beyond what we've done pursuant to our response, our joint response to your order, really goes beyond what would be appropriate, but in the first instance we
think we've resolved the matter based upon the stipulation which you accepted in your last meeting.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Further questions from the Board?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chairman Simpson, I guess I would take Ms. Bowers up on her and Mr. Mercer's offer to keep us informed as things move forward, just as maybe a matter of information and courtesy, but $I$ do agree that since they've stipulated, and we agreed to that, that $I$ think ends our involvement at this point in time.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any other comments?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I would agree 100 percent with that. It sounds like they've resolved things. We don't really have to -- you know. I think we can go along with their resolution.

So anyway, $I$ want to apologize for being late today, but $I$ normally do this out of my office, and Montana Tech computers were down today, so that's my -- I finally had to run home and figure out how to get on, so that's why I'm
here. Thanks.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Jon. Welcome to the meeting. My voice is struggling here a little bit. Any other comments on this?

MR. MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I guess I think we would benefit from clarification from the Board as to whether a quarterly update is acceptable, or whether you wanted a different time period. We want to -- it was our impression from the agenda that the Board would like to have an update, and if that's the case, we just want to make sure we have clarity on the frequency of the update.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'll respond to that, Mr. Mercer, if I might. I guess we have two options here. One is a quarterly or scheduled reporting. Another is reporting as milestones are met.

And in looking at Response No. 2, which talks about the collection or evaluation of existing data, compilation of existing data, do you have any idea how long that process will take?

MR. MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I think at this point we don't. I don't think we could give you an immediate forecast.

We know from Paragraph 21 of the stipulation that we're hoping within 60 days that DEQ will provide a quality assurance plan, and then we've got a review period after that. So there are, with those fairly limited number of exceptions, some time frames in the stipulation, and some of those would occur within the quarter, this quarter, and probably we could have a report that was filed, say, by July 1 that would capture that, if that was something the Board was interested in.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, quarterly
reporting doesn't exactly jibe with the Board's schedule. We meet every two months, and $I$ don't know that in two months there will be sufficient progress.

But maybe the way to approach this would be the way we -- in sync with the way we report progress on all of the cases that are before us, that is, just an update at each meeting, and then when you get to a point where there's a product to present, that is, the compilation of data and what was learned from it.

I mean I'm assuming that Rosebud Mine has been operating for fifty years or more, and
there has to be a considerable data base out there. I don't know how far back in time you'd want to go, but there are numerous, certainly numerous permitted discharge points there where the data collection can be compiled.

So does that make any sense? Just to give us a status report, even if it's a single sentence saying, "Work is continuing," as we approach an end point, so we can be informed at that time.

MR. MERCER: That's satisfactory for my client, if it's satisfactory for DEQ, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Bowers.
MS. BOWERS: Chair Simpson, members of the Board. So just to clarify, would you then just put this on your briefing items, and every meeting we'll just let you know where we're at, both with the stipulation, the tasks under the stipulation, and maybe update you on the litigation?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, please. That's what $I$ have in mind. Is that satisfactory to the Board?

MS. BOWERS: That's acceptable to DEQ.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Do we need a motion on that? I'm asking Counsel.

MS. ALTEMUS: I was just going to ask that.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Oomens.
MS. OOMENS: Sorry. I'm having issues with my mike this morning. Yes, I would make a motion on it, yes.

CHAIR SIMPSON: DO I hear a motion?
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I can take a stab at it. Go ahead. Board Member Bruner, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: So moved.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Second?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second it.
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed, nay.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion passes. Thank you very much.

```
Before we leave this subject, there is a
```

comment or two that $I$ wanted to follow up with.
When we first saw this subject come up, that is, the settlement agreement that we reviewed at the last meeting, it occurred to me that probably more than half of our contested cases that we have before us have to do with MPDES permits or permit renewals, and that over the last several years there have been a significant number of those that have had to do with coal mine sediment ponds.

So I got to thinking whether or not there is some programmatic way we could approach this if we could understand just what the issues are. Given the fact that there's litigation out there now on this particular subject, that seems to me to be perhaps not a road we want to go down right now.

But it just seems to me that we need to -- where we have an opportunity, this Board should be proactive when we have similar matters coming before us time after time.

So just something to keep in the back of our minds. I won't pursue that any further at this point. I guess I'd ask if there are any other thoughts on that before we move on. I don't
think we need a motion or anything.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: I think that would be a great idea.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I think we talked about that previously on these matters, is to, on reoccurring type matters, to really start maybe taking those kinds of actions or approaching it in that way. So --

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman --
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's rather difficult -I'm sorry. Sorry to interrupt.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I would agree that it seems like if there's a lot of issues that are very similar, we should be able to look at it in a programmatic way. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, $I$ don't want to get too far into the weeds here, but this issue of sediment pond regulation is -- you know, it's driven from several different angles.

One is the EPA rules under 40 CFR 434, which has to do with the coal mine category, and of course that is enforced in Montana through the MPDES program.

Also under the reclamation act, sediment ponds and discharges therefrom are regulated
pretty rigorously, and the DEQ in their implementation of the reclamation act looks very closely at protection of the hydrologic balance.

And so I'm wondering if there is a way administratively and as a matter of policy to somehow divide this responsibility, so that we don't have the duplication that we have now.

This is called thinking out loud. It's food for thought. I'm not proposing anything specific right now, but as we move forward, something that $I$ plan to keep in mind.

Anything else on this subject?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Next item. Next item. Let's see. I see it's ten minutes to ten. This discussion may or may not take awhile. Why don't we take a ten minute break, convene at 10:00, nine minutes now, and discuss item 3(b), the matter of Luke Ployhar.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR SIMPSON: One thing we neglected to do was go through the list of everyone else on the call, just so we have a complete record. MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We can do that. CHAIR SIMPSON: We can do that when we
reconvene.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: And maybe Jon
could introduce himself since he wasn't able to do that.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Great idea. Yes.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. Thank you. MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, we also have some people in 111 that showed up thinking that it was an in-person meeting today, so I do have 111 with microphones.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. Okay.
It's 10:00. Let's resume the meeting, please. Sandy, would you take the roll, please. MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson. CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Aguirre.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Bruner.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Rankosky.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We have a quorum
here.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. So before we move on to the Luke Ployhar matter, two items.

One is at the beginning of the meeting, we went around the room, and each Board member gave a brief, just a brief statement of who we are, and where we come from.

Board Member Reiten, you weren't here unfortunately for that part of the meeting, but $I$ wondered if you'd mind just giving a brief statement for the benefit of the other Board Members as to what your background is, and anything else you think appropriate.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Okay. Yes. My name is Jon Reiten. I work with Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology in Billings, and I've been here for about 35 years or so. But I've got background
as a hydrogeologist. I started out working as a coal hydrologist in looking at the issues associated with groundwater, and coal mining, and went to work in several other areas in the groundwater thing.

I did some -- looked at the oil and gas mine contamination up in northeastern Montana over the years, and have stepped away from that.

Right now $I$ deal mainly with irrigators in eastern Montana, in Sheridan County and Richland County, where they're using groundwater for a resource for irrigation, and basically helping the local farmers in -- manage and develop their resource.

So that's kind of what I've been doing. I've been with the Bureau of Mines forever, and I came out of North Dakota, schooling at University of North Dakota, and experience at the State Water Commission over there. So yeah, that's kind of a brief summary of where I've come from. So any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Jon. Moving forward, one item we neglected at the beginning of the meeting is to identify others on the call besides the Board members. If we could do that,
please, Sandy.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Laurie Crutcher,
Court Reporter; Aislinn Brown, Agency Legal Services; Deputy James Fehr, Montana DEQ; Kaden Keto, attorney; Kirsten Bowers, attorney, DEQ; Terisa Oomens, Board Counsel, Agency Legal Services. We do have some people in Room 111, if you would identify yourselves.

MR. KING: Good morning. Sam King from DEQ.

MS. WILKERSON: Jessica Wilkerson from DEQ, an attorney.

MS. GALVAN: Amanda Galvan on behalf of Intervenors, and an attorney.

MR. COULTER: I'm Robert Coulter, one of the attorneys representing the Fort Belknap Indian Community, one of the Intervenors.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Moving on, Angie Colamaria, Legal Counsel, DEQ; Elena Hagen, Paralegal, Agency Legal Services; Nick Whitaker, Attorney, DEQ; Sarah Bordelon, attorney, Holland and Hart; Shiloh Hernandez, attorney, EarthJustice; William Mercer, attorney, Holland and Hart.

We have somebody on the phone with the
last three digits 955. Would you identify yourself, please?
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Hello?
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Okay. They have not identified themselves. Ann Hedges, MEIC; Barbara Chillcott, attorney; Bob Smith, DEQ; Catherine Armstrong, DEQ; Colson Williams, attorney, DEQ; Derf Johnson, MEIC; Emily Lodman, DEQ; Kurt Moser, attorney, DEQ; Luke Ployhar; and Owen Voigt.
(Also present Ray Stout, Kootenai Valley Record; Noelle Boyer; Moira Davis, DEQ; Lee McKenna, DEQ)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Is there anybody else on the meeting that has not been identified?
(No response)
(Luke Ployhar matter bound separately)
(10:06 a.m. and reconvened 10:34 a.m.)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. The next
item is general public comment. Under this item, members of the public may comment on any public matter within the jurisdiction of the Board that's not otherwise on the agenda for the meeting.

Individual contested case proceedings are not public matters on which the public may comment. Is there any comment?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, let's move on to the next item. Board Counsel update.

Anything to add that we haven't already discussed, Ms. Oomens or Ms. Brown?

MS. OOMENS: I don't believe we have anything to add, no.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. At this point, do we have a motion to adjourn and move on to our executive session?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn the formal meeting and move on to our executive session. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Meeting is adjourned.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:37 a.m. )
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