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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR SIMPSON: Good morning, everyone.
Shall we bring the meeting to order. Sandy, would you call the roll, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Aguirre.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Present. Good morning.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Bruner.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Rankosky. She's here. I just asked her to unmute.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: I'm sorry. I was on a call. I'm here. Can you hear me? MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We can. Board Member Reiten.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We have a quorum.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Shall we identify others who are attending the meeting, please.

> MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I'm Sandy

Moisey-Scherer, Board secretary. Rebecca Harbage, DEQ; Laurie Crutcher, Court Reporter; Angie Colamaria, DEQ; Terisa Oomens, Agency Legal Services; Colson Williams, DEQ; Kirsten Bowers, DEQ; Sarah Bordelon; Nick Whitaker, DEQ; Andy Janes; Libby Langston; Mary Cochenhour; Ray Stout; Terry Martin-Denning; Vicki Marquis; Whitney Bausch, DEQ.
(Catherine Armstrong, Jeremiah Langston, Ruby Hopkins, Bailey Tasker, Dan Walsh, Aislinn Brown, Elena Hagen, Alan Zackheim, Diane Conradi, Jane Grachowski, Derf Johnson, John, Shelly Mitchell, also attending via Zoom)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. The first order of business is to review and approve the
minutes of the April Board meeting. Are there any comments or corrections to the minutes?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, do we have a motion?

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I'll make a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the April 7th, 2023 meeting.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the April Board meeting. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed, nay.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion passes. Thank you.

Item $B$ is a presentation by DEQ regarding the relationship, the administrative attachment between $D E Q$ and BER. This is a matter that came up. It's part of the orientation package that was reviewed with new members here a couple of weeks ago, but we thought it would be a good idea just to ask the Department to take a few minutes and explain how this administrative
attachment works. Who will be making that presentation?

MS. COLAMARIA: Mr. Chair, this is Angie Colamaria, the Chief Legal Counsel at DEQ. Can you all hear me?

I was not obviously part of that discussion, so $I$ can, $I$ 'll talk for a few minutes and just generally explain the relationship, but then if you have questions, obviously $I$ can try to answer those if it doesn't get to what you're wanting me to cover.

So as you mentioned, the Board is attached to the Department of Environmental Quality for administrative purposes only. There are a lot of boards across the state that are attached to agencies for administrative purposes only.

This Board is designated as a quasi-judicial board. What that means is that BER still exercises its authorities and it functions independently of the DEQ. As far as day-to-day operations, we treat it as a different entity, almost like we would treat a court, and we have no approval authority or control over the Board subsequently in what it does.

However, because it is administratively attached to $D E Q$, the $B E R$ does not have its own budget, but the BER budget is included in DEQ's budget each year, so we, as part of our annual budget process, we estimate a BER budget based on costs from previous years, and we include that in our annual agency budget proposal where we go before the Legislature. That's part of the budget that gets approved.

So we do supervise and control the budgeting part, the recordkeeping, and reporting, and some of the administrative and clerical functions for the BER.

So for example, we provide staff for the Board in the form of the BER secretary. So Sandy's position is actually a DEQ position with DEQ duties, but then part of her regular duties is to act as the Board secretary. So she has to wear two hats, and keep her role separate when conducting her various $B E R$ duties versus her $D E Q$ duties, as if she's working for two separate organizations.

So for example, we maintain ex parte restrictions. When we're discussing any case specific matter, we don't involve Sandy in those
discussions and vice versa. So we try to keep those roles separate, and Sandy is an angel for doing a really good job of keeping those lines in intact.

In terms of additional other staff, like the BER attorneys, the paralegals, the Hearing Examiners, the BER contracts with ALS or an outside law firm, as you know, to provide those services, but the invoices for those external services get sent to $D E Q$, and then we pay them out of our budget.

That's pretty simple. It's kind of a weird relationship, but that's been the general gist of how it works. Any questions?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Angie. I believe it's pretty straight forward. Did I hear a comment?

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I just want to say that $I$ feel like it is weird to use the word weird, so $I$ just kind of wanted to go on the record about the use of that weird relationship characterization.

MS. COLAMARIA: Understood. I guess I mean it's not like a typical agency budget where you guys have your own budget line item that you go to the Legislature, and defend that budget, and get budget approval. You have to go through another agency. But other than that, it's pretty straight forward.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any other comments or questions?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Once again, thank you very much, Angie. I think -- Well, I'll just back up a second.

The attachment with DEQ I think relieves the Board of having to deal itself with administrative matters such as hiring staff, management of budget, etc. That's taken care of by the Department, although the Board does have some contact with the Department where the budget is concerned.

Just for information, $I$ will be meeting with James Fehr here sometime, well, next week to talk about Board budget. Apparently there are some concerns about the budget with all of the cases that we have going on, and the litigation
that's in progress. So we will be involved in that to some degree, but unless there are further questions, why don't we move on.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: The next item, Item C, one item that's not on the agenda, but $I$ wanted to mention it. I neglected to mention at the last meeting that shortly after $I$ received notification I had been appointed Chair, I contacted Vice Chair Aguirre, and asked her to continue as Vice Chair, which she agreed to do. So I wanted to be sure that was included in the record.

The next item, nomination of
subcommittee for Department of Environmental Quality versus the Board of Environmental Review.

I've been turning over in my mind for some -- well, ever since this litigation surfaced, what would be the best approach to managing that. And after thinking it over pretty carefully for a couple of weeks, my conclusion was that it makes sense to have an ad hoc committee to manage this.

Now, we are restricted by public meeting
laws to having -- any time we have a quorum together, it is technically a public meeting. So where I've decided to go with this is to appoint
an ad hoc committee of three to be the primary contact for this litigation. That would consist of Vice Chair Aguirre, and Board Member Bruner. I would --

So we'll be handling the day-to-day contact with Counsel and strategic issues as it relates to this litigation. However, there's no intention to exclude the rest of the Board, and it's just that there's going to be, at some point there's going to be quite a bit of -- I was going to say paper, but it's not really paper in this modern world -- more communication on this litigation.

So if you would like to be kept in the loop as far as any documentation that comes out of this case -- legal briefs, filings, etc. -- please contact Counsel, and be sure that you're included in the mailing.

Otherwise what we'll do is as this thing runs its course, it will be a regular item on our agenda to have an executive session to review the status of the case and any pending issues.

I guess $I$ would ask our Counsel whether we need a vote on this. I presume that we don't, but it's not something we've discussed. Terisa.

MS. OOMENS: If you're going to create a subcommittee, $I$ would suggest that you make a motion and vote on it.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Well, 1 will make that motion that we establish an ad hoc committee to manage the $D E Q$ versus $B E R$ litigation to handle the day-to-day, just the day-to-day communications that will be required. Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been made and
seconded, a motion made and seconded. Any discussion?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I assume there's -do the other members of that group or committee accept the nominations, or do we need to do that?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. I've visited with both Lee and Stacy, and we're all on board.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: (Indicating)
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: (Indicating)
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Perfect.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chair Simpson, I guess $I$ have a question. I think on the agenda farther down, MEIC has also filed a lawsuit, so I'm assuming it is not just DEQ that you will be -- the subcommittee will be reviewing both?

CHAIR SIMPSON: That's correct. BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. So maybe that needs to be stated.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Perhaps. Would you care to amend the motion?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I guess I would move that a subcommittee be formed in order to look at the day-to-day communications on the lawsuits filed by DEQ and MEIC against the Board of Environmental Review, if that makes sense.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Makes sense to me. I'll second that.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Second. Okay. We have a second for the amended motion. Any further discussion? Thank you very much, Julia.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Let's move on to the briefing items, and what I'd ask here is that Counsel update us with any material developments on these cases as we go through them.

Just as a matter of information, I expect at the next meeting we'll take a closer look at these. Right now, in connection with the budget discussion mentioned earlier, I've been going through these, and just trying to get a handle on where they stand, and how much effort is going into them in terms of billable hours from Counsel, hoping to get a little better understanding of just what the level of effort is that's going into these cases. Some of them have been hanging on for quite awhile. I think we have one that goes back to 2015 involving Westmoreland Resources. I believe it's an MPDES issue.

But we'll be -- one of the things that I anticipate discussing at the next meeting is how we might move some of these things along to keep them from just hanging in limbo for years, but that discussion $I$ think is a little premature now, but as you go through the agenda for the next meeting, it's something we should be thinking about.

Terisa, do you have any -- Rather than go through these point-by-point, are there any developments on these cases that are worth discussing at this point?

MS. OOMENS: Not at this point. The only thing $I$ would say is as far as $A(1)(a)$, we talked about it at the last meeting, they did hear oral argument on April 3rd, but $I$ think it has been taking six months, eight months, to get a decision. So just as a heads-up to everyone, this one will probably be hanging out for awhile.

Other than that, $I$ think they're all moving forward slowly, unless anyone has a specific question.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm just leafing through here. I made a bunch of notes on my agenda, but $I$ don't see any --

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: I have a question. Item 2(a) in the matter of Westmoreland Resources. The last line there says, "On 31 May ' 23 , the Hearings Examiner received a notice of change in Hearings Examiner." Who to whom?

MS. OOMENS: So I am now the Hearing Examiner.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Okay. So that was -- you issued an order saying that the Hearing Examiner had been changed to you?

MS. OOMENS: Correct. The previous Hearing Examiner has left ALSB, and so we needed a
new one.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Terisa. MS. OOMENS: You're welcome.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: One more. On Item 2(b), is Patrick Riskin still the Hearings Examiner on that case? No. I'm sorry. Rob Cameron came on.

MS. OOMENS: Yes, I believe that that's Rob Cameron's case.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thank you.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. Rob Cameron was appointed December 9th, 2022.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: That's all I've got. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I have nothing further on any of the briefing items, I don't believe. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, on Item $2(d)$, it says that a hearing in this matter is scheduled for June 2023. Has that been scheduled or is there an update on that item? MS. OOMENS: It has been scheduled for the 19 th through the $21 s t$ of June. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Thank you. MS. OOMENS: You're welcome. CHAIR SIMPSON: Any further discussion
of the briefing items?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let's move on to action
items Roman Numeral III.
The first has to do with the appeal and request for hearing by Westmoreland Rosebud Mining regarding issuance of MPDES Permit No. MTOO32042, Colstrip, Montana.

This is a case that we discussed at the last meeting with respect to the discharges, salinity limitations on discharges into ephemeral drainages, and we approved a settlement agreement which involved establishing the natural salinity level in these drainages as the standard ultimately.

So the parties were going to investigate the data that's available through past monitoring, and develop any new data necessary in order to establish these standards.

And we had asked that a status report be given at each Board meeting. It doesn't need to be all that detailed, but we would like to keep track of the progress on this to be sure that there's an end point somewhere down the line.

So is there a representative from --
representatives from Westmoreland Rosebud Mining and the Department that could bring us up to date on the status of this process. Ms. Bowers.

MS. BOWERS: Good morning, Chair Simpson, members of the Board. I'm the attorney representing DEQ on this matter, and $I$ believe Sarah Bordelon is on the call today.

And we actually jointly provided a written update, which is at the end of your item, that we are currently working on finalizing the quality assurance project plan for this project, for the nonanthropogenic standard assessment. And we'll be gathering existing data, and then deciding if we have some data gaps and need more data.

But $I$ don't have anything in addition to what is in your briefing item unless you have questions.

CHAIR SIMPSON: So if $I$ understand this correctly, you're still developing, working on a process that will be involved to -- that will be utilized to develop the data, the data in question; is that an accurate statement?

MS. BOWERS: Yes, Chair Simpson, members of the Board, that's correct.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. I've got nothing further on that. Anything else from the Board? BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: This is Lee. I missed that in our materials. Where is it located? Can anybody point me to it?

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Bruner, members of the Board. It's on your action items III(A) at the bottom. There's an update that starts, "On May 31st, 2023 the parties provided an update," and then it summarizes the update. The attorneys for Westmoreland and DEQ jointly worked on that language, and provided it to the Board secretary.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Okay. So was that language included -- I probably misunderstood. I thought someone said that update was provided in the materials that we were provided with the meeting, and I didn't see it there, but that probably means I missed it.

MS. BOWERS: Board Member Bruner, members of the Board. I don't think there was anything provided in the Board materials. It's just in the agenda, just summarized at the end of that item.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thank you.

MS. BOWERS: You're welcome.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Further comments or
questions for the Department?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, we'll move on.

$$
\begin{gathered}
* * * * * \\
\text { (Recessed at (9:27 a.m. and } \\
\text { reconvened at } 10: 45 \text { a.m.) } \\
\text { (In the matter of Oreo's Refining } \\
\text { transcript bound separately) } \\
* * * * *
\end{gathered}
$$

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'd like to defer Item (c), the action by the Montana Environmental Information Center, et al., to Item 7, I think. I guess maybe $I$ ought to ask a question here.

Montana Environmental Information
Center, Clark Fork Coalition, MEIC has filed a petition for judicial review and declaratory judgment. This is essentially a duplicate of the DEQ versus BER case. I don't know that there's much we can say about it except that it's there.

I guess I'd ask our attorney Ms. Oomens if there is some action that the Board needs to take.

MS. OOMENS: The Board needs to appoint an attorney to represent it. Again, based on what you've done previously, that would be appointing Agency Legal Services.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I guess we're getting into the issue of legal representation, and $I$ don't know if the full Board is aware, but Ms. Oomens informed us that she had a conflict, and so she is no longer representing the Board with respect to this litigation, and it has been reassigned to Alan Zackheim, who we'll be talking with here just shortly.

MS. OOMENS: Which is to me a great example of why you would appoint Agency Legal Services, so that when an attorney, or if an attorney happens to be conflicted out of a case, we don't have to come back to the Board to have the Board reassign it to a different attorney. CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, I'm presuming this would be assigned to Mr. Zackheim. MS. OOMENS: Correct. BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chair Simpson, I have a question, please. CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: So in the past,
the last one, we had this discussion in closed meeting. Can we -- I don't feel comfortable talking about our legal representation now because there may be other --

CHAIR SIMPSON: That's what I'm turning over in my mind here before going any further, and that's why $I$ wanted to put it off. I guess we can take that step and assign it, but just as another matter, we may want to rethink our assignment of Counsel in this case altogether. Let me put it that way.

So with that in mind, $I$ suppose maybe what we ought to do is assign this to Mr. Zackheim rather than $A L S$ at this time, and then go from there. I would make that motion, that we as the Board assign this case to our current Counsel on the DEQ versus BER case, Alan Zackheim.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded. Discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries.
New contested cases. Item 4. The first case, the matter of a hearing request for exploration license 00680 , Butte Highland site. And then we can probably handle all these at once.

We have Item (b), the matter of formal appeal challenging the Department of Environmental Quality's approval of Riverside Contracting's opencut mining permit.

And then Item (c), the matter of appeal and request for hearing by Protect the Clearwater regarding issuance of opencut mining permit No. 3473 .

Again, I'd ask Counsel. Can we handle these together and assigning them to ALS?

MS. OOMENS: That's fine if you want to make one motion for all three of them. Sure.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I would present a motion that we consider these, that we assign these to ALS, all of these.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second it.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and
seconded that these three cases -- Butte Highland
site, approval of -- appeal of Riverside Contracting's opencut mining permit, and the matter of appeal and request for hearing regarding opencut mining permit No. 3473 be assigned to Agency Legal Services Hearing Examiner. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries.
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 is not otherwise on the agenda for the meeting. Individual contested case proceedings are not public matters for which the public may comment. Is there any public comment?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Apparently there isn't. Moving on to the Board Chair update. I think we kind of got duplicated on a couple of items here on the agenda. I think what we had intended to cover here has already been covered with respect to the appointment of the Vice Chair and the ad hoc committee to manage the litigation with DEQ.

One other item I think I'd like to bring up there is we had decided here last year that we would attempt to have at least one meeting per year in person in Helena. Last year it was the October meeting.

It's been suggested that we schedule the August meeting in Helena in person. I would certainly support that. I guess what I would like to do is to hold off, though, until we see what the agenda looks like, because if it looks like it is just going to be a routine one hour meeting, maybe we don't want to have everybody driving to Helena for it. On the other hand, if we have an agenda that will require extended discussion, $I$ would certainly be in favor of having that, trying to or scheduling that meeting in Helena. Any other thoughts on that?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I totally agree with you on that. I think it would be good to have -- you know, if it's just a simple meeting, $I$ don't think there's a reason for us to go to the expense of everyone driving to Helena. Thank you.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson,
Board Member Bruner has his hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Lee.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: I note that we do have a number of members from the eastern part of the state, and Dave, and Jon from Billings. There's no requirement that we do this in Helena. We also could consider the option of having one in Billings, perhaps allowing folks from Billings who want to attend or observe the Board that opportunity.

One person in five in the state of Montana lives in Yellowstone County. So I'm not advocating that we change that. I just want to throw it out as a point for discussion that we don't have to -- the default doesn't have to be Helena.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Lee. Interesting thought. Other boards do have meetings around the state. I have not known BER to do that. Perhaps they have in the past.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: DEQ has an office in Billings, so that's not unreasonable. I mean maybe it starts to make sense then that maybe a meeting is in Billings and a meeting is in Helena, and we actually get together more than once a year in person. Thought as well.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, does anybody on the Board object to just holding off on making a decision whether this will be an in-person or Zoom meeting? And ask the question. What kind of lead time would we need in order to plan for it? Because calendars do tend to get filled up. BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Can you explain -would two weeks ahead of the meeting be sufficient to make the call?

CHAIR SIMPSON: That's within the time frame where the Department pulls together all of the items that are going to go onto the agenda, so I think that would make sense.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: I would make a motion that we leave it in the Chairman's discretion whether the next meeting would be live or by Zoom, based on his review of the agenda, and as timely as possible to allow people to make travel arrangements.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I have a motion. Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded. Discussion.
(No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, all in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: We'll be sure and notify everyone at least two weeks before how we're going to handle the meeting in August.

That concludes our agenda exclusive of the executive session to discuss the $D E Q$ versus BER and also MEIC versus BER, the two of which are tied together. Our agenda adjournment comes after the executive session. I think adjournment should come now, and then move to the executive session. Is that appropriate, Ms. Oomens?

MS. OOMENS: Yes. That's fine if you want to do it that way.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion to adjourn our regular session?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that we adjourn the regular session.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and
seconded that we adjourn our regular meeting.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:59 a.m. ) adjourned.
Discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. We are

*     *         *             *                 * 
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