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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR SIMPSON: Second action item, III(b), is the matter of notice of appeal and request for hearing by Oreo's Refining regarding solid waste license expiration.

I believe we had a request from Shelly Mitchell of Oreo to speak before the Board, and what I'd like to do is to provide an opportunity for Oreo and the Department to make their oral comments to the Board before we proceed with a decision on the finding of fact and draft -excuse me -- the proposed finding of fact and conclusion of law that's before us on this case.

And $I$ guess $I$ would suggest that we try to limit comments to fifteen minutes max, maximum, and then five minutes more for follow up. So is Ms. Mitchell on the call?

MS. MITCHELL: Yes, I am.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. You have the floor.

MS. MITCHELL: I want to thank everyone for allowing me to give my oral arguments.

I did not agree with the Hearing

Examiner's findings. I believe that some things were completely left out.

For three years $I$ was operating my business as a mobile unit. With Dusty Johnson's help, she helped with the paperwork to get it submitted and approved, and a part of that was a new site plan and permission from the Missoula Health Department, which Mr. Whitaker has completely glossed over.

I submitted into evidence the email between Dusty Johnson and $I$ during that process of me getting approved to be mobile. Mr. Whitaker has -- and that email has also been produced as evidence. His response was that that's not what the email was talking about, but he has given no other explanation for that email.

And the follow-up email that was in evidence was, "Do you need to come and do an inspection before $I$ turn in the keys to Missoula Ave.?" And the answer was no. So DEQ knew $I$ was not at Missoula Ave. for three years.

So when the next renewal came, I put on the P.O. Box because that was a permanent address. Mobile does not mean permanent. I still had no idea that anything was wrong. I submitted that,
and the renewal, the license came back to me with Missoula Ave. I had -- While the DEQ changed it when $I$ submitted as a P.O. Box, again, they still did not come to me. Now, did it have Missoula Ave. on it after that? Yes, the recycling license.

I have a brain injury. Missoula Ave. was very familiar. I had no idea that it was not supposed to be there. But they still didn't come to me.

The July before $I$ got the letter from the DEQ, Ms. Johnson again knew that $I$ was still mobile. Then $I$ get this letter saying that Ms. Johnson was sent out to verify that $I$ was not at Missoula Ave., that I'm operating illegally, and I need to submit a new address.

I submitted a new address. It was not approved because it wasn't in Missoula County. Ms. Johnson knew that $I$ was not at Missoula Ave.

And I'm the only one that has been put under oath. I've had to do this all by myself. No attorney would take my case because there was no money, because my business was shut down. I was operating illegally without a recycling license, and the prime time of when recycling
picks up is in the summertime.
They had ample time to notify me. They did not act in any good faith. I tried to contact Rick Thompson, tried calling to no avail. I sent him an email asking, "Can you reinstate my license for six months until $I$ look for a permanent place, so $I$ can make money to be able to pay for the rent extra," and I got absolutely no response.

The act of no -- I mean they had no good faith in this whole matter. They knew prior to not reissuing my license what they were going to do. Why didn't they call me? They did nothing. They didn't notify me that $I$ had rights, until $I$ filed with the BER, and then they started conversations with me.

I had to sell off parts of my business supplies to cover the expenses, I lost my housing, and my business is now permanently closed.

I have made the claim that they did this with malice and intent, and the reasons for that is that they knew, and they never reached out, they never called and said, "Hey, we made a mistake."

Mr. Whitaker has claimed that the DEQ is not responsible for their employees. I was, as a
business owner, $I$ wasn't responsible for my employees. And it was like, "Oh, well. You're just a little business."

I did the city's e-waste, I did the
banks' e-waste, $I$ did the community's e-waste.
And within a letter just destroyed everything.
And $I$ believe that -- would it be nice to go back hindsight to say, "Oh, you know, you weren't legally?," well, that's fine now. Then work with me, but they didn't do that.

So what I'm asking for is the judgment in my favor. I had wonderful friends that stepped up to pay my bills. They still need to be paid back. And through a judgment from the Board, I can take that to an actual Court. But again, whoever has the most money wins, and they made sure $I$ had no moneys. I'm a small business.

And the other fact was, that had been overlooked, was that $I$ did get approval from the Missoula health district, and that they could have talked to me besides taking this action. It seems very, very drastic.

So at this point $I$ don't think $I$ have much else to say except my rebuttal to Mr.

Whitaker. But $I$ do think that the facts were not
totally laid out in a way that --
You know, the law states that $I$ can't be mobile. Okay. That's fine. But to me that's a separate issue from the actions of the last three years saying, "Oh, you were not at Missoula Ave." when they had known. And $I$ don't understand.

I'm the one that -- I was put under oath. Ms. Johnson was never put under oath. Oreo's Refining had no money to do that. So why Ms. Johnson acted cowardly and did not say, "Hey, this is what happened. I'm sorry. Let's make this right. Let's fix this." I got nothing.

So I am actually done. I don't think I need fifteen minutes.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Mitchell. We'll defer questions until we've heard from the Department. Who is speaking on behalf of the Department? Mr. Whitaker; is that correct?

MR. WHITAKER: Yes. Good morning, Chair Simpson, members of the Board. Yes, Nick Whitaker on behalf of the Department.

I guess before $I$ get started, $I$ don't think you guys can see my video. Is there a way to get my video showing so you can see me?

CHAIR SIMPSON: No, we can't.

MR. WHITAKER: Okay. Sorry about that. Thank you, Sandy. Like I said Nick Whitaker on behalf of the Department here.

Just to I guess explain this case from DEQ's point of view, and then to respond to Ms. Mitchell's argument there, $I$ think this case is straight forward.

The material facts are not in dispute here, and the material fact being that Ms. Mitchell is no longer operating at the Missoula Avenue location for which she was licensed, and hasn't been for some time.

What was before DEQ was an application renewal for that facility at Missoula Avenue, and as Ms. Mitchell noted, $D E Q$ issued a letter to her after receiving that application, requesting an updated address based on the Department's understanding that she was no longer there. Ms. Mitchell mentioned her mobile
facility. And the Department has argued throughout that it just doesn't have the authority to grant the sort of mobile license that she is talking about.

The proposed order before the Board I think lays that out. There's a number of different criteria, location specific criteria, and the solid waste rules that would apply to her facility that you just simply can't meet with the sort of mobile facility, where you're going to operate everywhere.

And then the other component of this is that the Solid Waste Management Act is situated such that $D E Q$ issues a license, but then that license is validated by the local health officer for the county in which the facility is located.

And so $I$ think the situation here kind of illustrates the issue with a mobile license. And Ms. Mitchell's facility on Missoula Avenue was approved by the Missoula County Health Department. After she transitioned, $I$ suppose, to a mobile facility, she was operating both out of Missoula County and Ravalli County. And obviously if we were just going to issue a mobile license, Ravalli County would have been denied their chance to have an input and validate that license.

So just to summarize, the issue here is narrow. We've got the undisputed fact that there was an application for a license renewal for the Missoula Avenue location of Missoula County; Ms. Mitchell is not operating there. not issue a license on that application, based on the fact that there just isn't a facility at that address.

Just to address a couple of the things that Ms. Mitchell said. I think what I heard from her was primarily $I$ guess frustration with perhaps her view of sort of the communication between DEQ and her. And $I$ think what she was looking for, at least my understanding, was just better communication, "Hey, there's this discrepancy. Let's get it addressed."

And $I$ guess from my perspective, from DEQ's perspective, the letter we sent to her in July of 2021 was exactly what she was looking for, right? We said, "We received your application. You're not at that address. Please provide us with an updated facility address so that we can reissue the license."

Unfortunately since that point we just haven't been able to get this thing resolved, and get her relicensed, but it's not from lack of effort from DEQ's part. DEQ's goal here has been compliance assistance. Obviously we strongly disagree with the characterization that we're
trying to drive her out of business, or just take away her license. All we're trying to do is bring her business into compliance with the Montana Solid Waste Management Act.

And I hope Ms. Mitchell would agree that over the last couple years we spent a lot of time and resources trying to do that. Unfortunately we just haven't been able to resolve this issue.

So having not been able to resolve the issue, DEQ had been moving for summary judgment. The Hearing Examiner correctly granted DEQ's summary judgment motion, issued a proposed order, and $D E Q$ requests that the Board adopt that order as the final agency action and order of the Board.

And I'm happy to answer any questions, but that's all $I$ have for now. Thanks.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Whitaker. Ms. Mitchell, anything further?

MS. MITCHELL: Am I unmuted? I'm unmuted right now?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, you are.
MS. MITCHELL: Okay. Do I believe that the DEQ during that time -- Mr. Whitaker stated that that letter was my communication, but then the question still remains: Why did they wait
until my license had expired to notify me?
If they were really wanting to help, why wouldn't they have contacted me three years ago or two, or before they sent me a letter that $I$ was operating illegally, and they were not going to renew my license.

The other question, the DEQ knew $I$ was not at Missoula Ave., and whether or not having the Missoula health district approve of me being mobile, you know, that -- and maybe $I$ didn't fit all of the other qualifications. They still have the obligation to come to me, and not wait and not renew my license during that time. They have the obligation to have communication way before they took an action that terminated my business.

So I do not agree with Mr. Whitaker's take that the DEQ has gone above and beyond because they lacked the communication for three years.

And $I$ did submit on the application in 2018 an address. They changed it back. They didn't update on their side, or they just flat out ignored it. At that point someone should have come to me in good faith and said, "Hey, we can't have this address," because the DEQ knew for three
years $I$ was not at Missoula Ave., and they waited three years to take this action. No good faith. That's all $I$ have.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Ms. Mitchell. Anything further, Mr. Whitaker, before we proceed with questions from the Board?

MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, nothing from me. Thanks.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I have one question I'd like to ask before $I$ open $u p$ questions in general, and that is an explanation of the nature of your business, Ms. Mitchell. I seem to recall it has something to do with recycling of electronic equipment, but $I$ think it's important that the Board have an understanding of just what it is that we're talking about here.

Solid waste covers a lot of ground, and so could you give us a brief overview of the nature of your business, please.

MS. MITCHELL: Yes. So I collected electronic waste, which is computers, laptops, those things, from businesses and some government agencies in the community. I took those, and dismantled them. Some of the components I actually removed from the circuit boards that
could be put back into play.
Everything then, once dismantled, was recycled locally. The only thing that went to the landfill was the plastic, because it has fire retardant, and to burn that to waste energy would have been highly inappropriate for the environment, and so the safest place for it was in the landfill.

That made my business 90 percent -well, technically zero waste is 90 percent. Everything else then could be taken locally. And I chose to use a local recycler that was ran and Owned here in Missoula, instead of using a corporate one to do my recycling. And that's -- I mean everything had its place once it was dismantled.

I charged very little because people, some people had thought recycling should be free. I had free pick-up for a very long time until the last year of my business, $I$ had to charge a $\$ 10$ fee for that. But that's pretty much it. It was long hours.

CHAIR SIMPSON: What I'm trying to wrap my head around is: Is there any difference in the way you conduct your business between your
permanent location on Missoula Avenue or your mobile business?

That is, when you were in a permanent location, were you storing e-waste equipment on site, or was it going -- you said, you told us a minute ago that whatever wasn't recycled went to the landfill, which $I$ presume is the city landfill or county landfill. It's not something operated by you personally. Is that the case? Do I understand that correctly?

MS. MITCHELL: Some things have to be stored. To make any kind of money, you have to be in bulk. It takes 90 computer towers gutted, just the steel of that, to get one ton of steel. When the tariffs were happening one ton of steel was $\$ 10$.

It was not feasible to go to recycle that. Sometimes you have to store it. Sometimes you only get four, or two, like say computer towers from a business; you may get fifteen to thirty. To make any money with those things, the copper, the wires, do need to be stored.

What made things different was that $I$ could actually go to people a lot easier, and a lot of people did not want the DEQ involved in
their life. Finding businesses to host Oreo's, finding other homeowners, people just did not want the $D E Q$ in their life, and it made things extremely difficult to find places to rent.

So being mobile gave me the freedom to actually go to people, and do their e-waste there, which ended up being more profitable than having to pay rent at a facility because rent is extremely -- rent costs a lot. And in the winter times you don't make a lot. People recycle less.

CHAIR SIMPSON: So you're storing, the materials you're talking about, in the mobile trailer? That's what $I$ 'm trying to get at. MS. MITCHELL: Some of it, yes, was stored there, and things that weren't finished were stored in the back of my truck, like the steel, bagged up copper, those things. So yes, they were stored in the horse trailer until they were -- or my truck until they were taken to the recycling center.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Can I ask a question? What does the board -- the health department -- were they -- how were they involved in this, the local health department?

MS. MITCHELL: I went to -- so when Ms.

Johnson and $I$ were talking to me becoming mobile, she said that $I$ needed approval from the health department, so $I$ went down.

I talked with two people, and then I got to the person that $I$ needed to talk to, and I went over what $I$ did, and he said that $I$ would need permission, if $I$ would like to park like at Rosauer's parking lot or something like that, that they felt there was no hazard, there was no reason not to, and that it was a good idea to be mobile for the community. Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Okay.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Other questions either for Ms. Mitchell or Mr. Whitaker?

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Mr. Whitaker. Mr. Whitaker, actually two questions.

We have before us the proposed findings of fact, conclusion of law, and order on summary judgment. Did DEQ file any exceptions to those? MR. WHITAKER: We did not. BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thank you.

Second, is there -- I read that order, but is there anything in that order or in this proceeding that would prevent the applicant from reapplying
for another license in the future, assuming that the conditions could be met?

MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, Mr.
Bruner, not at all. We've recommended that she reapply, and it's a free application, and it's a free license for a recycle and collection facility licenses.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thank you,
Counsel. That's all I've got.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Another question for Mr. Whitaker. Where is the environmental harm here?

MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, I think -I understand your question. I mean what -- DEQ solid waste program is $I$ think constrained by, you know, to implement the statutes we're tasked with implementing.

One of those things is under the Solid Waste Management Act there's facility specific, location specific criteria that applicants must comply with to be entitled to a license; and there's both the DEQ aspect and the local government aspect with this.

And for $D E Q$ to issue a mobile license would be to -- it would not be in compliance with the Solid Waste Management Act because it would
just ignore those location specific criteria; and then it would also undermine the authority or the role that the local government plays in this.

And just to kind of expand upon this, based on what Ms. Mitchell said, and the question about the Missoula County Health Department approval of this, of a mobile facility.

In the record you'll find that Ms.
Mitchell had been staying and storing e-waste down in Ravalli County for $I$ believe a couple of years preceding this matter, including e-waste stored in a garage at a residence down there.

And obviously Missoula, regardless of any approval from the Missoula County Health Department, there needs to be Ravalli County input and validation of that process, if they could.

So I mean this is simply one of those issues where $D E Q$ can only act in a way in accordance with the Solid Waste Management Act, and the authority we're given to us, and we just simply don't possess the authority to issue these sort of blanket mobile licenses in which Ms.

Mitchell or another person could just be anywhere without really knowledge of either DEQ or the local government. And so really that's the
primary focus point at play here.
And $I$ guess just to follow up and more directly answer your question, Chair Simpson, $I$ mean obviously this e-waste that you have, you know, certain pieces to them that do provide potential for environment harm if not properly disposed of.

Obviously if Ms. Mitchell was operating on the banks of the Clark Fork River or something like that, and there was an incident, all of a sudden you've got 90 computer towers disposed in the Clark Fork River, $I$ guess obviously it's not to the level of other things DEQ deals with, but there's not a lack of environmental harm here.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there, in the solid waste act or the rules implementing the solid waste act, is there separate rules for e-waste, or are the rules of a general nature regarding solid waste disposal or recycle operations?

I guess I'm not familiar with those rules. The question of having to have a fixed address at a fixed site that can be inspected by the Department, that, from what you said earlier, I understand is contained in the statute as opposed to the rules; is that correct?

MR. WHITAKER: Yes. The statute, Chair Simpson, yes. I mean the statutory provision is of a general nature regarding location specific criteria, and there really -- you know, the Legislature sort of deferred to DEQ, gave DEQ rulemaking authority to implement more specific rules regarding the location of the facilities. CHAIR SIMPSON: But there's no specific rules directed at e-waste; is that correct? MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, that's correct. This is a recycling collection facility. There's a few specifics around there, but the location specific criteria $I$ think apply generally to all solid waste management systems.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any further questions from the Board? I see a few hands up. Julia. BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chairman Simpson, actually Vice Chair Aguirre had her hand up first, so if she'd like to go first and then I'll go second.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: That's fine, Julia. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Well, I guess the question $I$ have for Mr. Whitaker, is this -- Do you have other businesses like this in the state,
or is Oreo Refining an anomaly? Do you have other requests to be mobile, or are they all stationary, or maybe this is the only one in the state?

MR. WHITAKER: Ms. Altemus, members of the Board. So my understanding is that there are other businesses that provide a similar sort of, "We'll come to you and pick up your e-waste" sort of service, but each one of those is licensed by DEQ at a specific facility location, and we license the place where essentially that comes back to, right? And it gets consolidated at a warehouse or a certain facility and then stored there, and the actual kind of processing of the solid waste is done there.

But my understanding is there are other businesses out there that do kind of go around business to business to collect e-waste.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR SIMPSON: Stacy. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: So my question is also for Mr. Whitaker.

What actual license did you issue to Oreo to begin with? Was it a recycling license? Like what was the actual license that you issued? MR. WHITAKER: Ms. Aguirre, members of
the Board. So we issued a recycling collection facility license to Oreo's Refining, and that is just a specific type of solid waste management system license.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Okay. In that application, did you have an understanding that there would be mobile collection events that were part of the business?

MR. WHITAKER: Ms. Aguirre, members of the Board. I mean certainly -- I'm not sure if it's in the record what DEQ's understanding was regarding that, but there are --

So we license, right, the actual
facility itself, but we also issue a different license for mobile collection events, and there's household e-waste collection events that go on, and people just submit a brief application -again, it's free -- just to kind of notify DEQ that this is what's going on, and "We're going to be collecting e-waste here at this location, and then we're going to be taking it to 'X' spot."

And so Ms. Mitchell had received, had applied and received for those types of collection event, businesses -- or events in the past.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Could you repeat
that? Ms. Mitchell did apply for those applications to do the e-waste collection events?

MR. WHITAKER: I think on at least one occasion in the past, $I$ think she had applied for and received those e-waste collection event licenses.

Again, $I$ think that's separate. I don't want to get too hung up on that because that's just a separate type of license that's really not relevant here, because it's different from the facility license we're talking about right now.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I kind of feel
like it's relevant in what was the Department's understanding or direction to Ms. Mitchell when the original license application was applied for that it really was --

I understand the rules about the site specific stuff, so $I$ do understand that. I'm just trying to get the context for -- if the Department understood about the mobile part, and then maybe made recommendations working with Oreo that each time they did a collection event, they needed to have that license application for each individual collection event separately, or --

I'm just trying to get context of within
that site specific recycling facility license application, if there was an understanding of this mobile component.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes. Ms. Aguirre, members of the Board. I think if you look at what DEQ submitted in the record, $I$ mean the initial recycling collection facility license application was for the Missoula Avenue, 2206 Missoula Avenue location.

And you'll see in the record, if you went back and looked, you would see there was maps of exactly where the e-waste was going to be collected, and stored, and what was going to be done specific at that location.

Ms. Mitchell alluded to this in her initial testimony, but there was back and forth between her and Dusty Johnson in 2018 related to a mobile facility, or her doing some sort of mobile license -- or mobile operations. Excuse me. And that's in the record, and obviously DEQ's position is that this isn't --

I apologize. It keeps bouncing you around, Ms. Aguirre.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I apologize. I raised my hand again, just for a follow up
question, so $I$ apologize for that.
MR. WHITAKER: No worries. And so anyway, this really comes back down to what can DEQ do going forward, notwithstanding what anyone particularly at $D E Q$ said in the past.

And $I$ think $D E Q$ just relies on the fact that we just don't have that authority to issue a mobile license. We've never issued a mobile license to Ms. Mitchell. If you look in the record, every license we've issued to her has been for that Missoula Avenue facility location.

And that's what we've been working with with Ms. Mitchell over the past several years, since we sent that letter, was to just bring her operations in line with what $D E Q$ can do under the Montana Solid Waste Management Act.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: So I think it goes back to the question asked by Board Member Altemus about whether this was a one-off situation or are other businesses operating in the state.

I know that you said that the mobile part of it isn't what's at issue, yet in the documents it specifically talks about not being able to permit a mobile solid waste management system because it would violate statutory
provisions, although this kind of business is operating in the state of Montana.

So based on all the discussions and the questions that have been asked, $I$ think what I'm trying to find out is if DEQ -- it's not clear to me what originally was licensed and what really changed as far as having an understanding that there was a mobile component to this.

There's a disconnect, and $I$ don't know that $I$ 'm doing a great job of explaining or trying to understand what seems to be a disconnect. I mean $I$ totally understand the Department's solid waste recycling facility components. Like I mean that makes sense. Everything is fine there. It was just with this mobile part, knowing that this was an e-collection business and recycling.

I'm just kind of -- there seems to be a disconnect. I don't know if you can help me understand or not.

MR. WHITAKER: Sure. Yes. Ms. Aguirre, members of the Board, yes. I understand where you're coming from now a little better.

So I just want to make the distinction here between the sort of the event of going out in the community and collecting e-waste, or any type of waste from someone, and the actual facility. Right?

And so what we're licensing here is the actual facility. Obviously I mean even every solid waste, every landfill in the county, they've got trucks that go out to each house and pick up the waste, but then they bring it back to the landfill, and we license and regulate the landfill itself.

I think it's no different here. Ms.
Mitchell, or any other business wanting to do sort of e-waste collection is welcome to go out and do that, go out to a bank or another business and collect whatever e-waste they have.

But then when they take it back to a specific facility, and then store that for a period of time and process that waste further at that facility, it's that facility that we're regulating.

And so here Ms. Mitchell in 2017 I think when she first got her license, the place she was taking it back to was at Missoula Avenue, and so we licensed that facility at Missoula Avenue.

At some point in time she left Missoula Avenue, and then has been doing the processing --
in her words -- out of this horse trailer or her truck. But then we still need to license that facility somewhere.

In simplest terms, the truck parks somewhere at night. Here the record evidence shows that at least some of the waste was being stored in a garage down in Ravalli County, and that's what we need to license here.

And so where DEQ is stuck from issuing just a mobile license to Ms. Mitchell is that if she's going to park the truck on Monday night in Missoula County, and then Tuesday night in Ravalli County, and then so on and so forth, we need to be able to license a specific facility location. And then both $D E Q$ and the relevant local government under the solid waste act has to have knowledge of where that is. We can't just say, "You've got a mobile license. You're free to operate wherever you want to in the state of Montana." Does that help, Ms. Aguirre, explain that --

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Yes, that does. Thank you, Mr. Whitaker.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Bruner.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. Mr. Whitaker, you appear to be on the
hot seat. A couple more questions for you.
In reading the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, the order addresses 17.50.508 for the authority that you need to have the physical location, airports, ownership of the property, etc. Am $I$ correct in assuming those are the rule requirements that are being -- that are the issue here?

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Bruner, members of the Board. Yes, that's correct.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: My read of the statute was those are promulgated under 75-10-201, that in subsection (3) says, "The application must contain the name and business address of the applicant, the location of the proposed solid waste system," etc. Is that the statutory authority under which that rule is promulgated? MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Bruner, members of the Board. Yes, I believe so. I think it would be under that one, and then as well 17.10.204 is the Department's rulemaking authority as well. BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Sure, and 204 gives you the powers and duties of the Department. Right. Okay. I'm with you there. It seems to me that 17.50 .508 is -- and

I understand that's the purpose of rulemaking is to flesh out the statutes -- but it contains a lot of requirements that could arguably be beyond the scope of 75-10-201. Would you agree with that or disagree with that, and if so, why?

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Bruner, members of the Board. I would disagree with that. I think again, if $I$ point back to 75-10-204, if you look at 75-10-204 sub (4), then this is again setting out what the Department's rulemaking, what we shall, you know, adopt rules governing solid waste management systems, and we talk about the suitability of the site from a public health standpoint when hydrology, geology, and climatology are considered. I think the combination of those two is where that authority comes from.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Sure. And I think we covered this, but following up. This mobile recycling facility operation that's at issue, there doesn't appear to have been any finding that it would impact hydrogeology, geology, or climatology, correct?

MR. WHITAKER: Are you saying a finding by the -- Sorry. Mr. Bruner, members of the Board
-- a finding by the DEQ?
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Let's go a little broader than that. Is there any evidence in the record that it would impact any of those three factors?

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Bruner, members of the Board. I don't know if that analysis was ever done. Again, $I$ think the circumstances here you look at -- we received an application for a recycling collection facility for fiscal year 2022 to be located at 2206 Missoula Avenue in Missoula County.

We responded to that with a letter saying, "You're not operating there. Please provide information about --" you know, "please provide an updated facility address."

And Ms. Mitchell -- we just haven't gotten beyond that point. We've had many discussions with Ms. Mitchell. Since then she's mentioned this mobile facility, but she never -you know, the application before DEQ at the time it sent the letter in July of 2021 was for a facility at a location that she's just simply not operating at.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Follow-up
question, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Whitaker, under 75-10-206, it reads, "A person may apply to the Board for a variance." Question No. 1: Is that the Board of Environmental Review in that --

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Bruner, members of the Board, yes.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Okay. And has there been any discussion of whether a variance from 17.50 .508 would be appropriate in this situation? I'll tell you, I didn't see any, but --

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Bruner, members of the Board. I don't think there would be anything in the record to that effect, but that was -- we had several meetings with Ms. Mitchell trying to resolve this issue before we kind of moved into the procedures of the contested case, and that was brought up at one point $I$ recall, but it's been a little while now.

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Whitaker. That's all I have.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any further questions from the Board?
(No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Before we proceed with a motion and discussion, why don't we take a ten minute break. Reconvene at 10:27a.m.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR SIMPSON: It looks like Board Member Reiten is the only remaining member who hasn't rejoined. Jon, are you there?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let's reconvene. Sandy, will you repeat the roll call, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, sir. Chair
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, sir.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. In the matter of Oreo Refining, it's time for the Board to make a decision on this. Do we have a motion? MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson, there was a raised hand by Shelly Mitchell before the break.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I missed that. Ms. Mitchell, before we proceed, did you have something to say?

MS. MITCHELL: Yes. It was a response to the question to Mr. Whitaker about -- what was the word that Mr. Bruner had mentioned? I want to say deviance, but it's not deviance.

CHAIR SIMPSON: The variance?
MS. MITCHELL: Yes. I remember during the conversations with Mr. Whitaker, and with Rick Thompson, $I$ had asked for that, and $I$ was told that it didn't apply to this case, that they can't
change State law.
So $I$ was wanting to go for that for the time to be able to find -- in their terms -- a permanent place. That's why $I$ needed the six months to be able to make income, to be able to see if anyone would host my business, because the DEQ -- nobody wants them in their lives because they're not accountable, and they're not transparent. And so everyone $I$ talked to said no. They wanted me, but they could not risk having the DEQ in their lives.

But I did ask for that to happen, an exception to rule, and $I$ was denied. That's it.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Lee, you had brought up the issue of the variance. Is that contained in statute, or rule, or both?

BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Chair Simpson, it is contained in statute, and you'll find it at 75-10-206. I think it would be before us if one was requested and $D E Q$ denied it.

Now I understand that we have a person appearing pro se in this case, and that sometimes makes these procedural hurdles a bit obtuse and difficult. I get that. I'm concerned.

It certainly is there. I think at least on first read it appears that it might apply, but I'm not sure it's before us.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Any further comments, questions, before we proceed with a motion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion?
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Bruner has his hand up, sir.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Bruner.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: Sorry. I'm still
learning the protocols of the Board.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Sorry. I'm still
learning to look for the hand.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: I'm going to preface my motion with a comment that $I$ think this is a good business. I hope that there's a path that it can operate. It provides a good service.

And $I$ reached my conclusion based in large part on Mr. Whitaker's representation that there's certainly a path forward for this applicant to continue to pursue a license, perhaps under a variance, perhaps under some other thing.

With that said -- which is probably
completely inappropriate -- I move that we adopt
the proposed findings, conclusions, and order of the Hearings Examiner in this case.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded that the Board accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law, prepared by the Hearing Examiner, the proposed -- I should say the proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law. Discussion? Oh, excuse me. I'm getting ahead of the game here. We have a first and second. All in favor say aye.

Let me back up. I'm getting ahead of myself here.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Yes. We need comment first.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm getting ahead of myself. I'm sorry. Let's proceed with discussion. It's been moved and seconded.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, this
is Ms. Altemus. I guess $I$ will vote in favor, but I would really encourage the DEQ and Ms. Mitchell to continue to work on this. I do think there's a path forward with a variance. I would love for that to get worked out, and if it doesn't get worked out, for her to bring a variance to the

Board.
But unfortunately $I$ think for me, I'm going to have to vote in favor of this motion, but I certainly am sympathetic to her plight, and wish that she will continue, because I do think she offers a great business, and $I$ think it's important that she be able to -- small business is tough, period, but when you've got environmental issues involved, it just makes it that much tougher. So that would be my comment.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Further discussion?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, this is Jon Reiten, and the rest of the Board. I guess I reluctantly would have to go along with it, too. It's unfortunate that it doesn't appear that $D E Q$ is able to keep these conversations going between small businesses sometimes. That's unfortunate. I just know that's the way it goes sometimes. Thank you.

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

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Bruner.
BOARD MEMBER BRUNER: I'm also learning
to run the technology. There. Down now.
Sometimes I think we should meet in person. Us
old guys and technology, not good.
CHAIR SIMPSON: I second that motion as an old guy myself. Further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I agree with the motion because $I$ don't believe that we have any other choice under the statute. On the other hand, I certainly sympathize with the position of the petitioner here, because it seems like it's one of those bureaucratic situations where you can't get there from here. And perhaps the variance provision provides a path. I don't know.

I think we have two choices, or maybe we have two choices, and that's what I'd like to discuss. One is just to proceed with a vote, and accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and request that the parties continue working toward a solution here, perhaps through the variance provision.

My question is whether there is an alternate path, and that is to remand this back to the Hearing Examiner with the issue of the potential for a variance addressed. Is that a logical and legal path that we might consider? I put that to our attorney, Ms. Oomens.

MS. OOMENS: Because a variance was not discussed with the Hearing Examiner previously, $I$ don't think you can just hand it back to her and ask to her to consider one. They would have to go through the process with DEQ, and then appeal it to the Board.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I'm in agreement with that. I think we have to focus on what is before us.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm sorry, Terisa, I heard what you said, but it didn't sink in. If you could maybe explain that a little bit more thoroughly.

I mean my understanding has been if there are facts that were not considered by the Hearing Examiner in producing the findings of fact and conclusions of law, that it could be remanded.

Are you telling me that the whole process would have to start over again?

MS. OOMENS: What the Hearing Examiner considered was not a variance, it was the license itself, and so you can't remand to the Hearing Examiner to consider a whole new issue, which would be the variance.

Now, if Ms. Mitchell worked with DEQ and
asked for a variance, and DEQ said no, she could then appeal that to the Board, but you can't put a whole new issue -- the variance -- in front of the Hearing Examiner now without having gone through the process with DEQ first.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Now I've got it.
Thank you.
MS. OOMENS: You're welcome.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, all in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. As a follow up, $I$ would certainly encourage, as the point was made here earlier during our discussion, for Ms. Mitchell and the Department to find some solution to this.

I'm certainly sympathetic to the needs of small business, and in particular somebody's livelihood is at stake here, so that's something that $I$ think needs to be considered in any further actions. But $I$ would encourage exploration of the
variance option. I guess our next item is -MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Mr. Chairman, Board Member Reiten has hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. Mr. Reiten. I'm sorry.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Chairman Simpson, Board Members. The thing that kind of concerns me about this - and I'm not sure what we can do at this point -- but it's almost --

According to Ms. Mitchell's testimony, it seems like the option of a variance meaning wasn't fully explained, and who she would go to to get the variance, so maybe we can make sure that DEQ -- or we can suggest that DEQ clearly opens that up to small businesses like hers, is that there is an option of getting a variance and going to the Board. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Jon. I certainly agree with that. Any further thoughts on the Oreo case and a variance or other course of action that might be considered by the petitioner before we move on?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Let's proceed.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:44 a.m.)
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