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CHAIR SIMPSON: It's 9:00. At this point other than myself $I$ only see Board Member Smith.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board member Aguirre is joining, and $I$ had promoted Board Member Rankosky, but it tells me she's declined, but I've allowed her to talk. I'm not sure what's going on with the communication, but she's allowed to talk.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Lee said he probably wouldn't make it at all, and Julia may be late, so I believe we have everyone who is going to be joining us. Sandy, would you take roll, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, sir. Chairman Simpson.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Rankosky.
BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Here, but no video for some reason.

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. Would you please proceed with identifying those others on the call, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I will. I'm Sandy
Moisey-Scherer, I'm the Board secretary; Laurie Crutcher, Board transcriptionist; Moira Davin, DEQ; Terisa Oomens, Agency Legal Services; Angie Colamaria, DEQ; Nick Whitaker, DEQ; Vicki Marquis, Crowley Fleck; Bill Mercer, Holland and Hart;

Aaron Pettis, DEQ. And Andy, is that Andy Janes? Andy, could you identify please?
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Catherine
Armstrong, DEQ; Elena Hagen, Agency Legal
Services; Mae Vader, DEQ; Rachel Clark, DEQ; Ray Stout, Kootenai Valley Record.
(Loryn Johnson, DEQ; Rachel Clark, DEQ;
Andy Mefford, PCA Montana; Terry Martin-Denning;

Jason Mohr, Montana Legislative Services also present via Zoom)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Sandy. The first item on our agenda of course is review and approve the minutes. Are there any comments or corrections to the minutes from the June 9 th meeting?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion? BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I make a motion that we approve the minutes from the June 9th, 2023 meeting.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I second that motion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded to approve the minutes from the June 9th meeting. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank
you. Briefing items. Terisa.
MS. OOMENS: Yes, I'm here.
CHAIR SIMPSON: I presume that there
have been no -- there's no new activity on these
cases that are in court -- MEIC, regarding Western Energy Company, also Signal Peak. Anything new on those?

MS. OOMENS: So the Signal Peak one, they've extended the deadlines a little bit. They're still working on finalizing those, but because the Board filed a Notice of Non-Participation in that case, what the deadiines are doesn't really affect us.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I see. Okay. On Item (c), this is the Montana DEQ versus BER, Teck, and the Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County; also Montana Environmental Information Center, et. al versus BER, Teck Coal, Limited, and the Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County regarding the selenium rule.

There has been, since this update was printed, there has been a joint motion by all parties to stay the scheduling order pending the resolution of questions currently before the Court. That stay was granted yesterday. So that is the only change there.

Non-enforcement cases. First of all,
are there any questions regarding that case from the members of the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Since our last meeting, of course, everyone has been notified, and it's noted in the agenda here, that the Board has retained outside Counsel, Dana Hupp of Worden Thane, to represent the Board.

There is, one of the matters pending before the Court is consolidation of these cases, so we're assuming that probably will be granted, and so these cases for the time being are being considered together on our agenda.

Non-enforcement cases. Terisa, are there any updates on any of these?

MS. OOMENS: The only update that I have that is not one of the action items is in the Sidney Sugars case. The parties have asked for a stay, and that was recent, so $I$ don't think it made it into the agenda. It asks for a stay until January.

Sidney Sugars is still working its way through figuring out if someone is going to buy the company, or how that's going to work. And so they just asked for a stay for a little bit more time to figure that out.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I see. Okay. Thank
you. Item (c), Rippling Woods Homeowners Association, et al., I see a decision is pending by the Hearing Examiner. Are we anticipating that this case will be ripe for decision by our next meeting?

MS. OOMENS: Yes. That's the goal.
I've talked to the Hearing Examiner, and she said she anticipates having it on the December agenda. Oh, sorry. That's not the next meeting. Maybe the next meeting, definitely by December.

CHAIR SIMPSON: This case has multiple petitioners, does it not?

MS. OOMENS: Correct. That's why it's taking so long to work through the whole process.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, $I$ noticed in my review of the cases and their status recently that there's been a lot of time gone into this, and $I$ presume that a lot of that has to do with the multiple appellants.

MS. OOMENS: Correct. That's my understanding.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Anything further on any of these non-enforcement cases?

MS. OOMENS: Not that I'm aware of.
CHAIR SIMPSON: I have nothing either on
my notes. Any comments from the other Board members, or questions on any of these non-enforcement cases?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let's move on then to cases not assigned to a Hearing Examiner. Teck Coal, Limited, Board of County Commissioners, etc. That's nothing -- That of course is being contested by DEQ, et. al -- and MEIC et. al. Excuse me. So nothing. We've already discussed that.

Action items. Item III, Appeal and Request for Hearing by Westmoreland Rosebud, LLC, regarding the issuance of MPDES Permit No. MT-0032042 in Colstrip.

This was the case where the parties have entered into a settlement agreement, and are proceeding with identifying or defining the water quality and ephemeral drainages at the Rosebud Mine. Mr. Mercer, can you bring us up to date, or is there anything that you'd like to add to what's in the agenda?

MR. MERCER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you. And you'll note that Ms. Bowers provided an update to the Board that notes that

DEQ will finalize the quality assurance project plan by the end of this month.

Westmoreland has provided comments, and so obviously we will be reviewing what DEQ completes by the end of the month, but $I$ think at this point that's what's happened pursuant to the stipulation, and until the quality assurance plan is completed, we won't have -- there's nothing else that $I$ would add at this point.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I don't recall that the settlement agreement included a schedule; is that correct?

MR. MERCER: It did set forth the plan that needed to be done, what we needed to do in conjunction with DEQ pursuant to the stipulation, but you're right, there weren't specific timelines in terms of exactly what would happen when. But $I$ think we have made good progress based upon the stipulation at this point.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. I guess that's one thing that had crossed my mind, is whether or not there should be a schedule or a projected timeline. And $I$ guess I'd be inclined to hold off on any discussion along that line until we see the QAPP at the next meeting.

MR. MERCER: Well, from our perspective, Mr. Chairman, $I$ think that's prudent.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any other comments from the Board on this matter?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Moving on,
Item (b). I believe we were going to get a status update on this.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Angie Colamaria has raised her hand.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, Ms. Colamaria.
MS. COLAMARIA: Kirsten Bowers from DEQ is the lead Counsel on this and is not here today, but $I$ can provide an update if that would be helpful.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mercer's hand is up as well. Are you involved in this case also?

MR. MERCER: Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
We are, but I'll wait to hear Ms. Colamaria's report, and if I've got anything to add, I'll jump in then if that's acceptable to you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: That's great. Thank you. Would you please proceed, Ms. Colamaria.

MS. COLAMARIA: Sure. The parties in
this case are working on a permit renewal under the terms of our settlement agreement. In May DEQ requested additional information regarding some outfall conditions from Westmoreland to assist us in drafting the permit -- the renewal of the permit. Sorry -- under the terms of settlement agreement.

Westmoreland responded in June of this year. We're currently reviewing that response. We may have additional requests or questions as is normal. It may be necessary to update the settlement agreement, and propose a revised time frame to complete the permit renewal.

I think that's about it substantively, but Bill would add whatever I missed.

MR. MERCER: That really is pretty complete, Mr. Chairman. I think $I$ would only add that the Hearing Examiner did convene us, and we, Ms. Bowers and $I$ provided the update that you just heard from Ms. Colamaria.

And $I$ think the only thing $I$ would add is that we've had an initial conversation about proposing additional time frame, additional calendar pursuant to a stipulation, but we haven't yet settled upon what those dates might look like.

But $I$ think we may well be coming to you with that additional proposal at the next meeting.

The only thing $I$ guess $I$ would add, too, is although this matter is now pending at DEQ, it's certainly possible that there would be another permit appeal based upon what the final terms are. We don't want to prejudge that at this point.

But I think we had submitted the responsive comments. We're going to wait for the issuance of the permit. And depending on the timing of that, it may or may not be necessary to provide additional stipulation terms on timing to the Board. But we'll have more clarity on that by the time your next meeting occurs.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. I guess $I$ would observe that this case has been going on since 2015, eight years. I would encourage you to come to some resolution as to how this case is going to proceed going forward. I mean it seems like if we end up with a new appeal, that would seem to start the clock all over again.

I've been more than a little concerned about some of these cases that have been on our docket for years. A normal contested case, going
back and reviewing some of the schedules, should be 15 to 18 months, assuming no intervenors or other matters.

Of course we encourage settlement discussions, and hope a lot of these cases can be settled before they come to the Board, but I'm just asking the parties to try and keep this moving forward so that it can be -- reach a conclusion one way or another in the foreseable future. Any other comments from the Board?
(No response)
MR. MERCER: Mr. Chairman, this is Bill Mercer. Can $I$ state one additional thing on that? CHAIR SIMPSON: Certainly.

MR. MERCER: Looking back at part of the delay here, $I$ think this is -- and $I$ know you've already had this in another matter this morning -but $I$ think some of the delay here was occasioned by the fact that there was a pending District Court case, that it made sense to put this particular matter on hold while that case worked its way through the judicial process.

And so $I$ know when you look at that timeline, it seems like it is a lengthy one, but certainly some of that was the result of saying it
really made sense to wait to see what was going to happen as part of a completely separate permit challenge that was going to be relevant to the resolution of this.

So I think that in part explains some of the delay, but at this point, $I$ think we've submitted what -- we responded to the questions that $D E Q$ posed, and $I$ think that we understand the Board's interest in getting this resolved, so that either the permit is final or there's an appeal pursuant to what $D E Q$ includes in the newly issued permit.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is that the Rosebud case?

MR. MERCER: No. Oh, you mean that one I'm saying --

CHAIR SIMPSON: The one we're waiting on.

MR. MERCER: Well, at this point, no. At this point we're not waiting on a decision. But some of that delay, when you noted that the appeal was docketed back in 2016 , I think there was a period of three years or thereabouts where we were waiting for a Court decision, but that has now been resolved, so that is no longer a basis
for - -
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. I recall which case you're talking about now. I'm sorry. I was a little confused there for a minute. Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry, Mr. Mercer.

MR. MERCER: That really completes what I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you very much. We'll anticipate a status report at the next meeting. Any other comments from the Board?

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, I just want to echo your comments on the timeliness of working through these matters, and keeping them moving, because that is a shared concern $I$ think by several of the Board members that these cases are not moving along very quickly. And maybe that's not the exact right word, "quickly," but many of them have been around for a long time.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Board Member Aguirre. That's a subject we'll circle back to later on in the meeting in more general terms, as opposed to this specific case. Anything else?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Let's proceed to

Item (c), request for hearing by Harry Richards, Lincoln County. We are being asked to decide -Well, it's up to us to decide whether to adopt the Hearing Examiner's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and summary judgment order, which was included in our packet, and $I$ presume everyone has read.

I have had no request for any oral argument, but $I$ will ask if Mr. Richards is on the call, or is anyone representing Mr. Richards would like to address this.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson, Nick Whitaker of $D E Q$ is asking to speak.

CHAIR SIMPSON: That was my next question. Mr. Whitaker.

MR. WHITAKER: Good morning, Chair Simpson, members of the Board. Yes, Nick Whitaker, attorney for $D E Q$ on this matter.

Actually earlier this week, DEQ had requested that this matter be removed from the action items for today's meeting, and extended out until the October meeting in order to allow Mr. Richards the opportunity to file exceptions to the Hearing Examiner's proposed order as is required in statute.

On Wednesday, the Hearing Examiner issued an order setting out exceptions deadline, and noting that this matter would be taken up at the Board's -- or sent to the Board for consideration at the October meeting. And so I guess $D E Q$ just requests that we not take up this matter today in order to allow the exceptions process to play out.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Ms. Oomens, does this extension until the next meeting require a vote from the Board?

MS. OOMENS: No. No, Chair, it does not.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. Well, in that case, we'll hold off on this item until the next meeting.

Item (d), in the Matter of the Denial of Opencut Permit 3115 for FirstMark Materials. This, according to our agenda, stipulated settlement agreement, motion -- excuse me --
"April $28 t h$, the parties filed a stipulated settlement agreement and a motion for dismissal with prejudice, and on May 1 , the Hearing Examiner issued an order dismissing the appeal. The Board will now decide whether to
adopt the Hearing Examiner's order."
I don't recall seeing that in our package. Is that something we should have received?

MS. OOMENS: It should have been in your packet.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Did I miss something?
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I missed it, too, so if we're erring, we're making the same error for some reason.

CHAIR SIMPSON: The only item that was covered in the packet $I$ believe was the Richards case.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: For your information on this, it's not much, but it's on Page 141 of the $P D F$, or in the red numbers Page 140. It's right after the Richards case. There's it looks like three or four pages on this, but there's not really any information there other than the motion for dismissal.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Page 140? Oh, there it is, two lines.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Thanks, Joe. I missed that as well.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Should there have been a
copy of the settlement agreement here, or is there one?

MS. OOMENS: I know there was a settlement agreement that the parties entered into. I can check and see if it's in our files. The parties may have just requested a joint dismissal without sending the settlement agreement to the Hearing Examiner.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I guess that's what I was looking for was a copy of the settlement agreement.

MS. OOMENS: It looks like Ms. Marquis may be able to answer some of our questions.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Marquis, you've got your hand up. Maybe you can clarify here.

MS. MARQUIS: Good morning, Chair Simpson, members of the Board. My name is Vicki Marquis. I represent Croell. We were one of the petitioners in the FirstMark matter.

Yes, there is a settlement stipulation, and it was filed with the Board and with the Hearing Examiner. And it was a pretty simple stipulation, but we were able to reach an agreement with DEQ on this matter, and so it should be dismissed based on the agreement we
reached.
The agreement, the stipulated settlement agreement was dated April $28 t h, 2023$, and I believe it was sent to -- I'm just looking at the certificate of service -- it was sent to the BER secretary, Liz Leman, Lee McKenna, and then all the attorneys of record on the matter.

I'd be happy to describe the settlement agreement to you, or if you would like to see a copy, $I$ think it can be probably be found in a couple different places, and emailed out perhaps.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Would you describe it to us, please.

MS. MARQUIS: Yes. Certainly. The settlement agreement, it begins with simply a narrative text describing sort of the procedure of this and the timing of when it was appealed; and the allegations filed by FirstMark and Croell; and then DEQ's position notes that those are their positions, but then also notes that FirstMark, Croell, and the Department hereby agree as follows, and I'll just read -- we've misnumbered them. I apologize.

There are three points we agreed on. The first is, "FirstMark and Croell will jointly
move for an order dismissing the appeal with prejudice."

No. 2, "Croell's application is for the same operation at the same location, and reliant upon the same technical support information as the Oscar's site permit application submitted by FirstMark on April $19 t h$ and 20th, $2019 . "$

And No. 3, which unfortunately is misnumbered as No. 4, but it reads, "The Department will process Croell's application in accordance with all applicable statutory and regulatory deadlines."

Dated 28 th of April 2023, signed by attorneys for Croell, MC Property Holdings as agent for FirstMark, and the Montana Department of Environmental Quality.

So essentially what happened was we agreed that Croell would submit their application for the permit for the same pit, at the same site that was pending under the FirstMark application.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. I believe I recall this, but just for clarity, could you summarize the initial point of disagreement that was the subject of the petition.

MS. MARQUIS: Sure. There was a permit
application pending under FirstMark, this is for a gravel pit operation, and it had been pending for some time. There had been some back and forth and a public hearing.

And on November 22nd, 2022, DEQ issued a denial letter for the opencut mine permit. It's permit No. 3115. And FirstMark alleged that that denial was improper, and appealed that denial letter to the Board, asking that the Board declare the denial letter null and void, and then remand it back to the Department to rescind the denial letter, and process the application in accordance with the Opencut Mining Act.

But the parties have agreed to leave their positions as is, and just move forward with a new application that Croell submitted, and DEQ agreed to process that under the deadlines provided in rule and in law, and that process is moving forward as we speak.

So that's sort of crux of the settlement. And $I$ don't know if Lee McKenna is on the phone, but $I$ do want to note. I've tried to fairly characterize it as it was laid out in the settlement stipulation, but DEQ might have additional or different views. But from our view,
that's sort of the crux of it.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. That was my next question. Anybody from the Department have anything to add? Ms. Colamaria.

MS. COLAMARIA: Thank you, Chair. This is Angie Colamaria. I don't have anything substantively to add to Ms. Marquis's summary. It was correct.

Our main concern with the application as it previously existed was the actual applicants have switched, and we don't have flexibility in the opencut laws to process it, as it's not the applicant that's going to be running the operation.

So the settlement agreement just kind of resolves that issue. They agreed to submit a new application, as Ms. Marquis said. They've submitted a new application, and we're moving forward with that.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Ms. Oomens, is there any reason why the Board should not proceed with the issue at hand, that is, approving or not approving the settlement agreement?

MS. OOMENS: Unless one of the Board
members would like to review the settlement agreement in writing, $I$ believe you can proceed to a vote.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I would like to make a motion that the settlement agreement and adoption of the Hearing Examiner's order dismissing appeal is approved. And if I've stated that incorrectly, please correct me.

MS. OOMENS: No, I think that was correct.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded to approve. Any further discussion from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, all in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you.

I see we have two new contested cases.
A request for hearing by Dairy Subdivision,

Missoula County, having to do with a mixing zone issue; and a request for hearing on the order of revocation of a certified operator license in Hysham. Is there a motion?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we send these to a Hearing Examiner.

CHAIR SIMPSON: That would be Agency
Legal Services?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Yes.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second that. The one thing I'll say is we've got very minimal information provided on both of these. Maybe it's just me being an engineer, and especially the first case filed by PCI, it makes sense to me.

Both of these seem like pretty simple cases. Maybe it warrants a discussion on whether we -- $I$ know we've had this discussion a lot -but whether we review it as a Board. I think probably a Hearing Examiner is the right decision here, but both of these seem like pretty simple cases to me.

CHAIR SIMPSON: The motion has been made and seconded. Discussion.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I agree with Board Member Smith on the characterization of these cases as being fairly straight forward, it appears. And $I$ was wondering as well if maybe these should be cases that the Board hears instead of going to a Hearing Examiner. And just respectfully, $I$ think that $I$ will vote no, because I believe it would be a more effective way for the Board to hear these cases.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I guess I would suggest that given that these cases appear to be -- and I have to emphasize the word "appear" because sometimes appearances can be deceiving -- but I was going to suggest that these might be cases that would be appropriate for suggesting the informal proceedings process as opposed to bringing them to the Board.

And the reason $I$ say that is for the Board to take on the matter of the initial scheduling, meetings scheduling, and all of the hearing responsibilities, and so on, is something that would take up quite a bit of time. And that's been done in the past. Yes. Ms. Aguirre.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Would you explain the informal process then?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Oh, boy. I spent so much time on it $I$ should be able to recite it in my sleep, but it's been a little while now.

Basically it's an informal conference that bypasses the hearing process, and sends the decision directly to the Hearing Examiner, but both parties have to waive the process, that is, the contested case process is set in statute, but there is a provision in the statute for an informal process.

And a year or so ago the Board essentially adopted the informal process, but that's really kind of a gross overview of how it works. It's meant to accelerate the process for relatively -- it's only of any utility for a straight forward case such as these appear to be.

But it's a matter of if this case is assigned to a Hearing Examiner, then the Hearing Examiner would give the parties an opportunity to use the informal process, which essentially consists of an informal conference by the parties to state their positions, and from that point on for the Hearing Examiner to propose a proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the Board to resolve the issue.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I have one remaining question, Chairman. If the Board approves the motion as it stands, to go to a Hearing Examiner, can the Board add a suggestion that that be considered, or is that completely up to the Hearing Examiner?

In other words, can we -- is it prudent or appropriate to amend Chairman Reiten's motion to suggest that they explore that informal process?

And Chairman Reiten, $I$ don't want to change your motion. I'm just trying to figure out, because $I$ do like that opportunity for these cases.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, initially when the Board went through the process of providing some definition to the informal process, the Board had ordered that for each case the Hearing Examiner offer that option to the parties, but for more complex cases, it was --

To make a long story short, there were no cases in which the parties opted for the informal process. And $I$ think the realization is that most of the time -- again, depending on the nature of the case -- but for some of the more
complex cases that come before the Board, it really doesn't make sense.

In these it may make sense and it may not, depending on the specifics. But yes, the Board could direct the Hearing Examiner working these cases to explain that informal process and make it available to the parties. And yes, I believe it would be appropriate to amend the motion to make that clarification.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I would gladly amend that motion to do that.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Board Member Reiten. Second to that amendment?

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded that these cases be assigned to ALS, and that the Hearing Examiner or Examiners be directed to make available to the parties the informal procedures that were established by the Board. Further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Next item, 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 other than contested cases. Is there any public comment?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, we'll move to on Item 6, the Board Chair update.

We had initially intended to -- I should say considered making this meeting an in-person meeting, and on consultation with Ms. Oomens on what our agenda was going to look like, decided not to do an in-person meeting, just because it didn't make sense to me to have everyone travel to Helena for a meeting that probably wouldn't take more than an hour or so.

So I guess I suggest we take a look at the October meeting. I've been anticipating that the Rippling Woods case would be coming before us, but it sounds that like that's iffy at this point as well.

I guess what $I$ would suggest is that we follow the same line of thought, and that is that depending on how the agenda turns out, considering

October for an in-person meeting, but we'll make that decision a couple of weeks before if the Board is in agreement with that.
(Nods heads)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I see heads nodding, so I think we are okay there. I don't think we need a motion for that.

Also in discussions with the Department on budget matters, $I$ 'd gone back -- and $I$ think $I$ mentioned $I$ was going to do this at a previous meeting -- went back and did an analysis of the various cases that are in progress right now, in terms of the hours that have been billed on them, and projected hours going forward.

And one of the things that was apparent from that analysis -- and Board Member Aguirre, this $I$ think addresses the question, or goes to the question you brought up earlier about the time that some of these cases have been taking.

On those cases that have had a lot of -gone on for some period of time, and extensions, although $I$ think it is incumbent on the Board to try to keep things moving as well as we can, there's not a lot of time that goes into them. It was a fraction of an hour here and a fraction of
an hour there, depending on what comes before the Hearing Examiner.

But for those cases that are kind of in some manner extended, it doesn't seem to be a major expense because there are very few hours expended. Just as a matter of general interest, it appears that most of these cases, if they follow the standard course, that is, without interventions and so on, 80 to 100 hours of legal time is about what we're looking at.

So it gives kind of a rule of thumb, just in terms of legal cost, what each of these, what each case means in terms of budget considerations for the Department. That translates to probably $\$ 8,000$ or $\$ 10,000$ per case, but they can vary widely depending on the progress of the case, or $I$ should say the trajectory of the case, and also whether or not it's settled. Of course, if there's a settlement, then it takes a lot less legal time.

That's just a matter of general information $I$ wanted to pass along to you. If you have any interest in more of the specifics, $I$ can provide a spreadsheet, a copy of the spreadsheet if you'd like. But it's just general background
information, but $I$ wanted to mention that before we adjourn.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Any comments or
questions on that? Board Member Aguirre.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Thank you for that information. I think that's valuable. I also wonder if that doesn't lend itself at some point here in the near future to more discussion about how those cases are worked in terms of the length of time that, say, 80 to 100 hours is spread out over, if there's any opportunity potentially to look at how to --

I want to pick the right word. "Expedite" isn't necessarily the right word. "Efficiently" maybe isn't the right word. But kind of a combination of that kind of thinking. I mean $I$ know that Board matters are one part of people's efforts, but maybe there's some opportunities, is what I'm wondering.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, sometimes it seems that there are extensions approved that do nothing, little more than prolong the process, and generally joint requests for extensions by the parties seem to be routinely approved.

So I think that raises a good point, and perhaps what we ought to do is plan an agenda item for our next meeting considering any guidance that the Board might provide to Hearing Examiners on justification for extensions.

It's kind of a fine line because petitioners are entitled to due process, but on the other hand, extensions, time extensions should have some basis.

And so I guess $I$ would ask our Counsel Ms. Oomens to provide some guidance to the Board on how we might try to tighten up the criteria for awarding extensions, time extensions going forward.

MS. OOMENS: Yes, $I$ think that would be a great agenda item for the next meeting to get the Board's input as far as how they would like the Hearing Examiners to -- not necessarily conduct the hearing process, but what they would like the Hearing Examiner to consider when extensions specifically are requested.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Well, let's plan on an agenda item for the next meeting. And Terisa, let's get together here sometime in the next few weeks to kind of outline what that might
look like.
MS. OOMENS: Okay.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Colamaria.
MS. COLAMARIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will there be an opportunity for the parties that regularly appear before the Board to have a chance to comment on that discussion?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, certainly. This is -- we're not talking about a rule. I think we're talking about a general policy. But yes, I think it would be appropriate to have Counsel for both the Department and petitioners to comment on that issue.

MS. COLAMARIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I think it's important to clarify what you just said, Chairman Simpson. We're not setting a policy. We're talking about sort of -- I guess in my world it would be termed "continual improvement."

CHAIR SIMPSON: Guidance.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Guidance.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Guidance, policy. I'm not even sure what the correct terminology is. But we're certainly not talking about a Board rule that would require a formal process, just some
discussion by the Board, and some policy guidance as to what justification would be appropriate for extensions of time, rather than just automatic extensions.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: It's a conversation which has never happened during my time on the Board, and I think that it would be valuable.

MS. COLAMARIA: I think it's a great idea. I'm just thinking those of us who are submitting those requests for extensions might be able to give you some insight into the justification, so it would help your conversation. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: That's awesome.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any more discussion on that topic?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, yes. I think some generic examples of something like that might be an interesting part of that process for us to talk about, or just see some -- how it's been done in the past. So that's all.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.
Anything further?
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I'd just like to acknowledge $I$ think that that's a good suggestion
by Chairman Reiten.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Anything further?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion to adjourn.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much, everyone, and we'll convene again in October.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Do we need to vote on that?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, we do. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:02 a.m. )

*     *         *             *                 * 

STATE OF MONTANA )
: SS.
COUNTY OF LEWIS \& CLARK )

I, LAURIE CRUTCHER, RPR, Court Reporter, Notary Public in and for the County of Lewis \& Clark, State of Montana, do hereby certify:

That the proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein named; that the proceedings were reported by me in shorthand and transcribed using computer-aided transcription, and that the foregoing -37- pages contain a true record of the proceedings to the best of my ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 18 th day of August, 2023 .

```
/s/ Laurie Crutcher
```

$\qquad$

```
LAURIE CRUTCHER, RPR
Court Reporter - Notary Public
My commission expires
March 9, 2024.
```



| 27:5 | Cha | 28:11 | 5:2, 6:22 | 7:13, 7:20, | $5: 5,5: 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 4,2: 13, \\ & 2: 19,2: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 10,33: 3, \\ & 35: 4,35: 16, \end{aligned}$ | complete [2] 11:13, 11:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 12,23: 8, \\ & 24: 8,24: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21: 12,22: \\ \text { deceiving - } \end{array}$ |
|  | 3:8, 4:3, | 36:17, 37:1 | completed - | 35:23 | 6:13 |
| calendar - | 4:9, 4:15, | challenge - | 9:8 | correc | December [ |
| 11:24 | 4:19, 4:21, |  | completely [2] | 4:6 | 7:8, 7:10 |
| carries [3] | 4:24, 5:10, | chance - 35:6 | 14:2, 28:5 | cost - 32:12 | decide [3] |
| 4:21, 24:22, | 6:2, 6:25, | change [2] | completes [2] | Counsel [4] | 16:2, 16:3, |
|  | 7:11, 7:15, | 5:22, 28:12 | 9:5, 15:6 | 6:5,10:1 | 17:25 |
| case [30] 5:8, | 7:22, 7:25, | charact | omplex [2] | 34:10, 35 | dec |
| 5:24, 6:16, | 8:5, 9:10, | - $26: 2$ | 28:20, 29:1 | County [9] | 30 |
| 7:4, 7:11, | 9:20, 10:3, | characterize - | computer-aided | 5:12, 5:13, | decision [7] |
| 8:16, 10:18, | 10:6, 10:11, | 22:23 | - 38:11 | 5:15, 5:16, | 7:2, 7:4, |
| 11:1, 12:17, | 10:16, | check - 19:5 | concern [2] | 8:7, 16:2, | 14:20, |
| 12:20, | 10:23, | circle - 15:21 | 15:15, 23:9 | 25:1, 38:4 | 14:24 |
| 12:25, | 12:16, | clarification - | concerned - | 38 | 25:21, 27: |
| 13:20, | 13:14, | 29:9 | 12:23 | couple [2] | 31:2 |
| 13:21, | 14:13, | clarify [2] | conclud | 20:11, 31:2 | declare - 22:9 |
| 14:14, 15:3, | 14:17, 15:2, | 19:15, 35:16 | 37:21 | course [6] | declined - 2:9 |
| 15:23, | 15:8, 15:20, | clarity [2] | conclu | 4:4, 6:3, | defini |
| 17:15, | 15:25, | 12:14, 21:22 | 13:9 | 8:8, 13:4, | 8:18 |
| 18:13, | 16:12, | Clark [4] | concl | 32:8, 32:1 | definitely - |
| 18:17, | 16:14, | 3:22, 3:24, | [2] 16:4, | court [8] | 7:10 |
| 25:16, 27:8, | 16:16, 17:9, | 38:4, 38:7 | 27:24 | 1:22, 5:1, | definit |
| 27:16, | 17:12, | clock-12:22 | conditi | 5:21, 6:8, | 28:17 |
| 27:17, | 17:14, 18:7, | Coal [2] 5:14, | 11:4 | 13:20, | delay [4] |
| 28:18, | 18:11, | 8:7 | conduc | 14:24, $38: 5$, | 13:16, |
| 28:25, | 18:21, | Colamaria | 34:19 | 38:21 | 13:18, 14:6, |
| 30:20, | 18:25, 19:9, | [14] 3:15, | conference [2] | covered | 14:21 |
| 32:13, | 19:14, | 10:10, | 27:4, 27:21 | 18:12 | denial [6] |
| 32:15, | 19:16, | 10:11, | confused | criteria | 17:17, 22:6, |
| 32:17, 32:18 | 20:12, | 10:12, | 15:4 | 34:12 | 22:8, 22:8, |
| cases [33] | 21:21, 23:2, | 10:24, | conjunction - | Croell [7] | 22:10, 22:1 |
| 5:1, 5:23, | 23:5, 23:20, | 10:25, | 9:15 | 19:18, | Department |
| 6:8, 6:10, | 24:13, | 11:20, 23:4, | consider | 20:18, | [8] 20:21, |
| 6:12, 7:16, | 24:17, | 23:5, 23:6, | 34:20 | 20:21, | 21:10, |
| 7:23, 8:3, | 24:20, | 35:3, 35:4, | consideration | 20:25, | 21:15, |
| 8:6, 12:24, | 24:22, 25:8, | 35:14, 36:9 | -17:5 | 21:14, | 22:11, 23:3, |
| 13:5, 15:16, | 25:11, | Colamaria's - | considerations | 21:18, 22:16 | 31:8, 32:14, |
| 24:24, | 25:24, | 10:20 | - 32:14 | Croell's [2] | 35:12 |
| 25:18, | 26:10, 27:1, | Colstrip - | considered [3] | 21:3, 21:10 | depending [6] |
| 25:23, 26:3, | 28:15, | 8:15 | 6:11, 28:5, | crossed - 9:2 | 12:11, |
| 26:5, 26:9, | 29:12, | combination - | 30:11 | Crowley | 28:24, 29:4, |
| 26:11, | 29:15, | 33:17 | considering | 3:16 | 30:25, 32:1, |
| 26:14, | 29:22, | comes - 32:1 | [2] 30:25, | Crutcher [5] | 32:16 |
| 28:14, | 29:24, $30: 1$, | coming [2] | 34:3 | 1:21, 3:13, | DEQ [27] |
| 28:20, | 30:8, $30: 9$, | 12:1, 30:20 | consists | 38:5, 38:18, | 3:14, 3:15, |
| 28:22, 29:1, | 31:5, 33:4, | comment [5] | 27:21 | 38:20 | 3:15, 3:17, |
| 29:6, 29:16, | 33:21, | 30:2, 30:3, | consolid | crux [2] | 3:21, 3:22, |
| 30:6, 31:12, | 34:22, 35:3, | 30:6, 35:7, | -6:8 | 22:20, 23:1 | 3:22, 3:24, |
| 31:19, | 35:8, $35: 14$, | 35:12 | consultation | currently [2] | 3:24, 5:11, |
| 31:20, 32:3, | 35:20, | comments [9] | 30:12 | 5:20, 11:9 | 8:9, 9:1, |
| 32:7, 33:10 | 35:22, | 4:5, 8:1, | contain |  | 9:4, 9:15, |
| Catherine - | 36:15, | 9:3, 10:3 | 38:12 | D | 10:12, 11:2, |
| 3:20 | 36:22, 37:2, | 12:10, | contested [5] |  | 12:4, 14:8, |
| Center - 5:14 certainly [6] | 37:5, 37:9, | 13:10, | 8:9, 12:25, | Dairy - 24:25 | 14:11, |
| certainly [6] | 37:15, | 15:10, | 24:24, 27:8, | Dana - 6:5 | 16:13, |
| 12:5, 13:14, | 37:18, 37:20 | 15:12, 33:4 | 30:5 | date - 8:20 | 16:18, |
| 13:25, | Chairman [20] | commission - | continual | dated [2] | 16:19, 17:6, |
| $20: 14,35: 8$, $35: 24$ | 1:13, 2:17, | 38:22 | 35:19 | 20:3, 21:13 | 19:24, 22:5, |
| $35: 24$ certificate - | 8:23, 10:2, | Commissioners | convene [2] | dates-11:25 | 22:16, 22:24 |
| certificate - $20: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 9,10: 19, \\ & 11: 17, \end{aligned}$ | [3] 5:12, | 11:18, 37:11 conversation | DAVID - 1:13 | DEQ's - 20:19 <br> describe [2] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 5 \\ & \text { certified } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 17, \\ & 13: 12,15: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:15, 8:7 } \\ & \text { communication } \end{aligned}$ | conversation <br> [3] 11:22, | Davin - 3:13 deadline - | describe [2] $20: 8,20: 12$ |
| 25:3 | 15:11, 25:5, | -2:11 | 36:6, 36:13 | 17:2 | describing - |
| certify - 38:7 | 28:2, 28:8, | company [2] | correct [7] | deadlines [4] | 20:16 |


| dir | 34:7 | 5:5, 16:21, | 23:19 | heard - 11:20 | 9:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| directed | Environmental | 32 | 27:16 | hearing [38] | included [2] |
| 29:17 | [3] 1:1, 5:13, | exten | 31:14, 34:14 | 7:3, 7:7, | 9:11, 16:6 |
| directly - 27:6 | 21:16 | 17:10 | fraction [2] | 8:6, 8:13, | includes |
| disagreement | epheme | extension | 31:25, 31:25 | 11:18, 16:1, | 14:11 |
| - 21:23 | 8:19 | [12] 31:21 | frame [2] | 16:4, 16:24, | incorrectly |
| discussed | erring - 18:9 | 33:22, | 11:13, 11:23 | 17:1, 17:24, | 24:8 |
| 8:10 | error - 18 | $33: 24,34: 5$ | future [2] | 18:1, 19:8, | incumb |
| discuss | especially | 34:8, 34:8, | 13:10, 33:9 | 19:22, 22:4, | 31:22 |
| [10] 9:24 | 25:15 | 34:13, |  | 24:6, $24: 17$, | informal [12] |
| 24:14, | essentially [3] | 34:13, | G | 24:25, 25:2, | 26:16, |
| 25:18, | 21:17, | 34:21, 3 |  | 25:6, 25:21, | 26:25, 27:4, |
| 25:19, | 27:12, 27: | 36:4, $36: 11$ | general [6] | 26:6, 26:21, | 27:10, |
| 25:25, | established |  | 15:22, 30:2 | 27:5, 27:6, | 27:12, |
| 29:20, 33: | 29:19 | F | 32:6, $32: 21$, | 27:18, | 27:20, |
| 35:7, $36: 1$ | et [4] 5: |  | 32:25, 35:10 | 27:18, | 27:21, |
| 36:15 | 7:2, 8:9, 8:9 | fairly [2] | generally - | 27:23, 28:4, | 28:17, |
| discussions | etc - 8:7 | 22:23, 26 | 33:24 | 28:6, 28:18, | 28:23, |
| [2] 13:5, 31:8 | everyone [6] | favor [4] | generic | 29:5, 29:17, | 29:18 |
| dismissal [3] | 2:15, 6:3, | 4:17, 24 : | 36:18 | 30:8, $32: 2$, | information |
| 17:23, | 16:6, 30:15, | 29:22, 37:16 | given - 26:11 | 34:4, 34:18, | [9] 5:13 |
| 18:20, 19:7 | 37:3, 37:11 | figure [2] | gives - $32: 11$ | 34:19, 34:20 | 11:3, 18:15, |
| dismissed - | exact-15:17 | 6:24, 28:12 | gladly - 29:11 | hears - 26:5 | 18:19, 21:5, |
| 19:25 | exactly - 9:17 | figuring - | goal - 7:6 | Helena | 25:14 |
| dismissing [3] | Examiner [22] | 6:21 | goes [2] | 30:16 | 32:22, 33:1, |
| 17:24, 21:1, | 7:3, 7:7, | file - 1 | 31:17, 31:24 | helpful - | 33:7 |
| 24:7 | 8:6, 11:18, | filed [5] 5:7, | $\text { gone [3] } 7: 17,$ | 10:15 | initial [3] |
| District - | 17:1, 17:24, | 17:21, | $31: 9,31: 21$ | hereby [2] | 11:22, |
| $13:$ | 19:8, 19:22, | 19:21, | granted [2] | 20:21, 38:7 | 21:23, 26:19 |
| docket - | 25:7, 25:21, | 20:18, | 5:21, 6:9 | herein - 38:9 | initially [2] |
| 12:25 | 26:6, 27:6, | files - 19:5 | gravel - 22:2 | hereunto | 28:15, 30:10 |
| docketed | 27:18, | final [2] 12:6, | gross - 27:13 | 38:15 | input - 34:17 |
| 14:22 | 27:19, | 14:10 | guess [11] | hold [3] 9:23, | insight - |
| drafting | 27:23, 28:4, | finalize - 9:1 | 9:20, 9:23, | 13:21, 17:15 | 36:12 |
| 11:5 | 28:6, 28:18, | finalizing | $12 \cdot 3,12 \cdot 1$ | Holdings - | instead - 26:5 |
| drainages | 29:5, 29:17, | 5:6 | 17:6 | 21:14 | intended - |
| 8:19 | 32:2, 34:20 | findings [2] | 26:10, | Holland - 3:16 | 30:10 |
| due - $34: 7$ | Examiner's [4] | 16:4, 27:24 | 30:18, | Homeowners - | interest [3] |
|  | 16:4, 16:24, | fine - 34:6 | 30:23, | 7:1 | 14:9, 32:6, |
| E | 18:1, $24: 6$ | FirstMark [10] | 34:10, 35:18 | hope - 13:5 | 32:23 |
|  | Examiners [3] |  | guidance [6] | hour [3] | interesting |
| earlier [2] | 29:17, 34:4, | 19:19, | 34:3, 34:11, | 30:17, | 36:19 |
| 16:19, 31:18 | 34:18 | 20:18, | 35:20, | 31:25, 32:1 | interven |
| echo - 15:12 | exampl | 20:20, | 35:21, | hours [5] | 13:2 |
| effective | 36:18 | 20:25, | 35:22, 36 | 31:13, | interventions |
| 26:8 | exceptions [3] | 21:15, |  | 31:14, 32:5, | - $32: 9$ |
| Efficiently | 16:23, 17:2, | 21.20 | H | 32:9, 33:11 | involved |
| 33:16 | 17:7 | 22:7 |  | Hupp-6:5 | 10:17 |
| efforts - | excus | Fleck | H | Hysham - 25:4 | isn't [2] |
| 33:19 | 8:10, 17:20 | flexibility | happen [2] |  | 33:15, 33:16 |
| eight - 12:18 | existed | 23.11 | 9:17, 14:2 | I | issuance [2] |
| either [2] | 23:10 | follow [2] | happened [3] |  | 8:14, 12:11 |
| 7:25, 14:10 | Expedite | 30:24, 32:8 | 9:6, $21: 17$, | idea - 36:10 | issue [5] |
| Elena - 3:21 | 33:15 | follows - | 36:6 | identify - 3:18 | 23:16, |
| emailed - | expended | 20:2 | happy - 20:8 | identifying [2] | 23:22, 25:2, |
| 20:11 | 32:6 | foregoing | Harry - 16:1 | 3:9, 8:18 | 27:25, 35:13 |
| emphasi | expense | 38:12 | Hart - 3:16 | iffy - 30:21 | issued [4] |
| 26:12 | 32:5 | foreseeable | haven't - | III - 8:12 | 14:11, 17:2, |
| encourage [2] | expires | 13:9 | 11:24 | improper - | 17:24, 22:5 |
| 12:19, 13:4 | 38:22 | formal - 35:25 | having [2] | 22:8 | item [15] 4:4, |
| Energy - 5:2 | explain [2] <br> 26:24 29:6 | forth [2] | 7:8, $25: 1$ | improvement - | 5:10, 7:1, $8: 12 \cdot 10: 7$ |
| engineer - | $26: 24,29: 6$ <br> explains - | $9: 13,22: 3$ forward [9] | heads [2] | 35:19 in-person [3] | $8: 12,10: 7,$ |
| $25: 15$ entered [2] | explains | forward [9] | 31:4, 31:5 | in-person [3] | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 1,17: 15 \text {, } \\ & 17: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| entered [2] $8: 17,19: 4$ | 14:5 <br> explore - 28:9 | 12:20, 13:8, | hear [2] | 30:11, | $17: 17 \text {, }$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 17,19: 4 \\ & \text { entitled - } \end{aligned}$ | explore - 28:9 extended [3] | 22:15, | 10:20, $26: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 14,31: 1 \\ & \text { inclined - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 11,30: 2, \\ & 30: 2,30: 9, \end{aligned}$ |


| $34: 2$, $34: 16,34: 23$ | 20:6, 22:21 legal [6] | $13: 17$, $13: 21$, | 28:1, $29: 10$, 29:12, | $1: 2,3: 25$, $4: 1$, $5: 11$, | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 12,7: 23, \\ & 8: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| items [4] | 3:14, 3:21, | 16:18, | 29:14, | 5:13, 21:15, | Non-Participatio |
| 4:22, 6:15, | 25:9, $32: 9$, | 16:20, 17:3, | 31:16, 33:3, | 38:2, 38:7 | - 5:8 |
| 8:12, $16: 21$ | 32:12, 32:20 | 17:7, 17:17, | 33:5, 33:6, | month [2] | none [2] |
| itself - 33:8 | Legislative - | 19:19, | 35:15, | 9:2, 9:5 | 24:17, 30:8 |
|  | 4: | 19:24, 20:7 | 35:21, $36: 5$, | months - | normal [2] |
| J | Leman-20 | 26:19, | 36:14, | morning [3] | 11:11, 12:25 |
|  | lend - 33:8 | 27:17, 30:4 | 36:17, | 13:17, | no |
| Janes - 3:17 | length - 33:11 | 32:6, 32:21 | 36:24, 37:7 | 16:16, 19:16 | 38 |
| January | lengthy - | matters [5] | 37:8, 37:13 | motion [23] | Notary [3] |
| 6:19 | 13:24 | 6:7, 13:3, | members [8] | 4:9, 4:10, | 1:22, 38:6 |
| Jason - 4:1 | less-32:20 | 15:13, 31:9, | 1:14, 5:25, | 4:14, 4:15, | 38:21 |
| EN - 1:15 | let's [4] 8:5, | 33:18 | 8:2, 15:15, | 4:21, 5:18, | note [2] 8:24 |
| Joe - 18:23 | 15:25, | maybe [8] | 16:17, | 17:20, | 22:22 |
| Johnson | 34:22, 34:24 | 7:9, 15:17 | 19:17, | 17:22, | noted [2] |
| 3:24 | letter [4] | 19:15, | 30:3 | 18:20, 24 | 14:21 |
| joining [2] | 22:6, $22: 9$ | 25:14, | mention | 24:12, | notes [4] 8:1, |
| 2:8, 2:16 | 22:10, 22:12 | 25:18, 26:4 | 33:1 | 24:13, | 8:25, 20:19, |
| joint [3] 5:18 | Lewis [2] | 33:16, 33:19 | mentioned | 24:22, $25: 4$ | 20:20 |
| 19:6, 33:24 | 38:4, 38:6 | MC-21:14 | 31:10 | 25:24, 28:3 | nothing [5] |
| jointly - | license - 25:3 | McKenna [2] | Mercer [14] | 28:8, 28:12, | 7:25, 8:8, |
| 20:25 | Limited [2] | 20:6, 22:21 | 3:16, 8:20, | 29:9, 29:11, | 8:10, 9:8, |
| JON-1:14 | 5:14, 8:7 | means - 32:13 | 8:23, 9:13, | 30:1, 31:7, | 33:23 |
| JOSEPH - 1:14 | Lincoln [3] | meant - 27:14 | 10:1, 10:19 | 37:5 | Notice - 5:7 |
| judgment - | 5:12, 5:15, | meeting [29] | 11:16, | move [5] 8:5, | noticed - 7:15 |
| 16:5 | 16 | 1:5, 4:7 |  | 21:1, 22:15 | notified - 6:3 |
| judicial | lines - 18:22 | 4:12, $4: 1$ | 13 | 25:6, | noting - 17:3 |
| 13:22 | Liz-20:6 | 6:2, 7:5, | 13:15, | moved [3] | November - |
| Julia - 2:14 | LLC - 8:13 | 7:9, 7:10 | 14:15, | 29:15, 37:7, | 22:5 |
| jump - 10:21 | location - | 9:25, 12:2 | 14:19, 15:5 | 37:9 | null - 22:10 |
| June [4] 4:6, | 21:4 | 12:15, | 15:6 | moving | numbers |
| 4:11, 4:16, | longer - 14:25 |  | Mercer's | 10:6, 13:8 | 18:16 |
| 11:8 | looking [4] | 15:22, | 10:17 |  |  |
| jurisdiction | 13:15, | 16:21, | mind - 9:2 | 15:16, | 0 |
| 30:4 | 19:10, 2 | 16:22, 1 | mine [2] 8:20, | 22:19, |  |
| justification | 32:10 looks [2] | 17:10, | 22:6 | 23:18, 31:23 | observe |
| [3] 34:5, | looks [2] | 17:16, | minimal | MPDES - 8:14 | 12:17 |
| 36:2, 36:13 | 18:18, 19:12 | 30:11, | 25:13 | MT-0032042 | obviously |
|  | Loryn-3:24 |  | Mining |  | 9 : |
| K |  |  |  |  | occasioned |
|  | M | 30:16, | minute - 1 | 7:11, $7: 19$ | 13:18 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { keeping - } \\ 15: 14 \end{gathered}$ |  | $30: 19,31:$ $31: 11$, $34:$ | minutes [4 $4: 5,4: 6$ | myself - 2:5 | occurs - 12:15 <br> October [5] |
| irsten | mai | 34:16, | 4: | N | 16:22, 17:5, |
| 10:12 | major - 32:5 | 34:23, 37:10 | numbered |  | 30:19, 31:1, |
| Kootenai - | makes - 25:16 | meetings | [2] 20:22, | named - 38 | 37:12 |
| 3:23 | making [2] | 26:20 | 21:9 | narrative - | offer - 28:19 |
|  | 18:9, 30:11 | Mefford - $3: 25$ | miss - 18:7 | 6 | Oomens [20] |
| L | manner - 32: | MEIC [2] 5:1, | missed [3] | nature - | 3:14, 4:23, |
|  | March - $38: 23$ Marquis [8] |  | 15, 18:8 | 28:25 | 5:4, $6: 14$, |
| laid - 22:23 later - 15:22 | $3: 15,19: 12$ | $2: 5,2$ | Mis | necessarily $\text { [2] } 33: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & : 6,7: 13, \\ & : 20,7: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| Laurie [5] | 19:14, | 2 | 25:1 | 34:18 | 17:9, 17:12, |
| 1:21, 3:12 | 19:16, | 2:22, $2: 24$ | mixing | necessary [2] | 18:5, 19:3, |
| 38:5, 38:18 | 19:18, | 3:1, $3: 3$, | Mohr-4:1 <br> Moira - 3:1 | 11:11, 12:12 | 19:12, |
| 38:20 | 20:14, 23.17 | $3: 4,3: 5$, | Moira - 3:13 | needed [2] | 23:21, |
| lauriecr | q21:25, 23:17 | 4:10, 4:13, | Moisey-scherer | 9:14, 9:14 | 23:25, 24:9, |
| $-1: 23$ | Marquis's - | 15:11, ${ }^{\text {5 }}$, 18.8 | [12] 2:7, | newly - 14:11 | 30:12, |
| law [3] 16:5, | 23:7 | 15:20, 18:8, | 2:17, 2:20, | Nick [3] 3:1 | 34:11, |
| 22:18, 27:24 | Martin-denning | 18:14, | 2:22, 3:1, | 16:12, 16:1 | 34:15, 35:2 |
| laws - $23: 12$ | - $3: 25$ | 18:23, 24:4, | 3:4, 3:6, | nodding | opencut [4] |
| lead - 10:13 | Materials - | 24:11, 25:5, | $3: 11,3: 12$, | 31:5 | 17:18, 22:6 |
| leave - 22:14 | 17:18 | 25:10, | 3:20, 10:9, | Nods - 31:4 | 22:13, $23: 12$ |
| Lee [3] 2:13, | matter [17] | 25:12, 26:1, | 16:12 | non-enforce | operation [3] |
| Lee [3] 2.13, | 10:4, 12:4, | 26:2, $26: 24$, | Montana [8] | [4] 5:23, | 21:4, 22:2, |


| 23:14 | PCI - | 20:19 | , | - | $18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| operator | PDF - 18:16 | positions [3] | 32:1 | reach | representing |
| 5:3 | Peak [2] 5:2, | 20:20, | projec | 9 | 16.10 |
| opportunities | 5:4 | 22:15, 27:22 | projected [2] | reached | request [5] |
| - 33:20 | pending [8] | possible | 9:22, 31:14 | 20: | 8:13, 16:1 |
| opportunity | 5:19, 6:7, | 12:5 | prolong | reads - $21: 9$ | 16:8, $24: 25$ |
| [5] 16:23, | 7:2, 12:4 | potentia | 33:23 | realization | 25:2 |
| 27:19, | 13:19, | 33:13 | promoted | 28:23 | requested [4] |
| 28:13, | 21:20, 22 | prejudge | 2:8 | really [7] 5:9, | 11:3, 16:20, |
| 33:12, 35:5 | 22:2 | 12:7 | Property | 11:16, 14:1, | 19:6, 34:21 |
| opposed [6] | people's | prejudice [2] | 21:14 | 15:6, 18:19, | requests [4] |
| 4:19, 15:23 | 33:19 | 17:23, 21:2 | proposa | 27:13, 29:2 | 11:10, 17:6, |
| 24:20, | per-32 | PRE | 12:2 | reason [4] | 33:24, 36:11 |
| 26:16, | perhaps [2] | 1:21 | propose [2] | 2:25, 18:10, | require [2] |
| 29:24, 37:18 | 20:11, 34:2 | present | 11:12, 27:23 | 23:21, 26:18 | 17:10, 35:25 |
| opted - 28:22 | period [2] | presume [3] | proposed [2] | received | required |
| option - 28:19 | 14:23, 31: | 4:24, 7:18, | 16:24, 27:23 | 8 | 16:24 |
| oral - 16:8 | permit [16] |  | proposing - | recent | rescind |
| order [11] | 8:14, 11:1, | previou | 11:23 | recently | 22:11 |
| 5:19, 16:5, | 11:5, 11:6, | 31:10 | provide [5] | 7:16 | resolution [3] |
| 16:22, | 11:13, 12:6 | previously | 10:14, | recite - 27:2 | 5:20, 12:19, |
| 16:24, 17:2, | 12:11, 14:2 | 23:10 | 12:13, | record [3] | 14:4 |
| 17:7, 17:24, | 14:10, | printed - 5:18 | 32:24, 34:4, | 3:23, 20:7, | resolve |
| 18:1, 21:1 | 14:12, | probably [6] | 34:11 | 38:13 | 27:25 |
| 24:6, 25:2 | 17:18, 2 | 2:13, 6:9, | provided [5] | red | resolved [2] |
| ordered - | 21:19, | 20:10, | 8:25, 9:3, | regarding [5] | 14:9, 14:25 |
| 28:18 | 21:25, 22:6 | 25:21, | 11:19, | $5: 1,5: 16$ | resolves - |
| Oscar's - | 22:7 | 30:16, 32:15 | 22:18, 25:14 | 5:24, 8:14, | 23:16 |
| others - 3:9 | per | pr | pr | 11 | respectfully |
| otherwise |  | 20:16 | P | regularl | 26:7 |
| 30:5 | petition | procedures | provision | 35:6 | responded [2] |
| ought - | 21:24 | 29:19 | 27:9 | regulatory | 11:8, 14:7 |
| outfall - 11:4 | petitioners [4] | proceed [6] | prudent [2] | 21:12 | response [20] |
| outline - | 7:12, 19:19, | 3:9, 10:24, | 10:2, 28:7 | Reiten [13] | 3:19, 4:8, |
| 34:25 | 34:7, 35:12 | 12:20, | public [8] | 1:14, 3:2, | 4:18, 4:20, |
| outside - 6 | Pettis - 3:17 | 15:25, | 1:22, 22:4, | 3:3, 4:13 | 6:1, 8:4, |
| overview | pick - 33:14 | 23:22, 24:2 | 30:2, 30:3 | 25:5, 25:10, | 10:5, 11:9 |
| 27:13 | pit [2] $21: 19$ | proceeding | 30:3, 30:6 | 28:11, | 13:11, |
|  | 2 | 8:18 | 38:6, 38:21 |  | 15:24, |
| P | places | proceedings | pursuant [4] | 29:13 | 24:16, |
|  | plan [5] 9:2 | [7] 1:8, 2:1, | 9:6, 9:15 | 36:17, 37:1, | 24:19, |
| packa | $9: 7,9: 13,$ | 26:16, | 11:24, 14:11 | $37: 8,37: 13$ | 24:21, |
| $18: 3$ | $34: 2,34: 22$ | 37:21, 38:8, |  | Reiten's - | 29:21, |
| packet [3] | play - 17:8 | 38:10, 38:13 | Q | 28:8 | 29:23, |
| 16:6, 18:6, | please [7] | process [27] |  | relatively - | 29:25, 30:7, |
| 18:12 | 2:16, 3:9, | 7:14, 13:22, |  | 27:15 | 37:4, $37: 17$, |
| pages [2] | 3:10, 3:18, | 17:8, 21:10, | quality [4] | relev | 37:19 |
| 18:18, 38:12 | 10:24, | 22:12, | 1 | 4:3 | responsibilities |
| particular - | 20:13, 2 | 22:17, | 9:7, $21: 16$ | reliant - 21:4 | - 26:21 |
| 13:21 | point [13] | 22:18, | quickly [2] | remaining | responsive |
| parties [18] | 2:5, 9:6, | 23:12, | 15:17, 15:18 | 28:2 | 12:10 |
| 5:19, 6:16, | 9:9, 9:19, | 26:16, | quite - 26:22 | remand - | result - 13:25 |
| 8:16, 10:25, | 12:8, 14:6 | 26:25, | quorum - 3:6 | 22:10 | retained - 6:5 |
| 13:7, 17:21, | 14:19, | 27:7, $27: 8$ |  | removed | review [5] |
| 19:4, 19:6, | 14:20, | 27:10, | R | 16:20 | 1:1, |
| 22:14, 27:7 | 21:23, | 27:12, |  | renewal [3] | 7:16, 24:1, |
| 27:19, | 27:22, | 27:14, | Rachel [2] | 11:1, 11:5, | 25:20 |
| 27:21, | 30:21, 33 | 27:20, | 3:22, 3:24 | 11:13 | reviewing [3] |
| 28:19, | 34:1 | 28:10, | raised - 10:10 | report [2] | 9:4, 11:9, |
| 28:22, 29:7, | points - 20:24 | 28:16, | raises - $34: 1$ | 10:21, 15:9 | 13:1 |
| 29:18, | policy [4] | 28:17, | Rankosky [5] | reported - | revised |
| 33:25, 35:5 | 35:10, | 28:23, 29:6, | 1:15, 2:9, | 38:10 | 11:12 |
| pass - $32: 22$ | 35:17, 36.1 | $33: 23,34: 7,$ | 2:23, 2:24 | Reporter [3] | revocation |
| past [2] $26: 23,36: 21$ | $\begin{array}{r} 35: 22, ~ 36: 1 \\ \text { posed - } 14: 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 19, \\ & 35: 25,36: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $29: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 22,38: 5, \\ & 38: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 3 \\ & \text { Richards [6] } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 26: 23,36: 21 \\ & \text { PCA }-3: 25 \end{aligned}$ | posed - 14:8 position - | $\begin{gathered} 35: 25,36: 19 \\ \text { progress [3] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | rather - 36:3 | 38:21 <br> represent [2] | Richards [6] $16: 1,16: 9 \text {, }$ |


| 16:10, | 2, | 17:14, 18:7, | 33:12 | 16:5, 23:7 | 9:21, 11:21, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:23, | 4:1, $25: 9$ | 18:11, | spreadsheet | support - 21:5 | 12:3, 13:13, |
| 18:12, 18:17 | setting [2] | 18:21, | [2] 32:24, | switched | 25:13 |
| ripe - 7:4 | 17:2, 35:17 | 18:25, 19:9, | 32:24 | 23 | hinking [2] |
| Rippling [2] | settled [3] | 19:14, | SS - 38:3 |  | 33:17, $36: 10$ |
| 7:1, 30:20 | 11:25, 13: | 19:17, | STACY - 1 | T | thumb-32:11 |
| roll - 2:16 | 32:18 | 20:12, |  |  | tighten |
| Rosebud [3] | settlement | 21:21, 23:2, | 32:8 | taken [2] | 34:12 |
| 8:13, 8:19, | [23] 8:17, | 23:20, | stands - 28:3 | 17:3, $38: 8$ | timeline [2] |
| 14:13 | 9:11, 11:2 | 24:13, | start - 12:22 | takes - 32 : | 9:23, 13:24 |
| routinely | 11:6, 11:12 | 24:17, | state [5] 1:2, | taking [2] | timelines |
| 33:25 | 13:4, 17:20, | 24:20, | 13:13, | 7:14, 31:19 | 9:16 |
| RPR [3] 1:21, | 17:22, 19:1, | 24:22, $25: 8$, | 27:22, 38:2, | technical - | timeliness |
| 38:5,38:20 | 19:4, 19:7, | 25:11, | 38:7 | 21:5 | 15:13 |
| rule [5] 5:16, | 19:10, | 25:24, | stated - 24:7 | Teck [3] | timing [3] |
| 22:18, | 19:20, 2 | 26:10, 27:1, | status [3] | 5:14, 8:6 | 12:12, |
| 32:11, 35:9, | 20:8, $20: 15$ | 28:15, | 7:16, 10:7 | tells - 2:9 | 12:13, 20 |
| 35:24 | 22:21, | 29:12, | 15 | Terisa [4] | today [2] |
| running | 22:24, | 29:15, | statute [3] | 3:14, 4:22 | 10:13, 17:7 |
| 23:13 | 23:15, | 29:22, | 16:25, 27:8, | 6:12, 34:24 | today's - |
|  | 23:23, 2 | 29:24, 30:1 | 27: |  | 16:21 |
| S | 24:5, 32:19 | 30:8, 31:5 | statutory | 35:19 | topic - 36 |
|  |  | 33:3, |  | terminology - | trajec |
| Sandy [3] |  | 33:21, | stay [5] 5:19, | 5:23 | 32 |
| 2:16, 3:11 | shared - | 34:22, $35: 3$ | 5:21, 6:17, | terms [10] | transcr |
| 4:3 | 15:14 | 35:8, $35: 17$ | 6:18, 6:23 | 9:17, 11:2, | 38:11 |
| saying [2] | she's [2] | 35:20, | stipulated [3] | 11:6, 12:7, | TRANS |
| 13:25, 14:16 | 2:11 | 35:22, | 17:19, | 12:13, | 1:8 |
| schedule [2] | short | 36:15, | 17:22, | 15:22, | transcri |
| 9:11, 9:22 | shorthand | 36:22, 37:2 | stipulation [8] | 31:13, | 38:11 |
| schedules | 38:10 | 37:5, 37:9, | 9:7, 9:15, | 32:12, | transcriptionist |
| 13:1 | Sidney [2] | 37:15, | 9:19, 11:24, | 32:13, 33:10 | - 3 |
| scheduling [3] | 6:16, 6:20 | 37:18, 37:20 | 12:13, | Terry - 3:25 | translates |
| 5:19, 26:20, | Signal [2] | site [2] 21:6, | 19:20, | text-20:16 | 32:15 |
| 26:20 | 5:2, 5:4 | 21:19 | 19:23, 22:24 | Thane - 6:6 | travel - 30:15 |
| seal - 38 | signed - 21:13 | sleep - | Stout - 3:23 | Thank [25] | ied - 22:22 |
| seconded [5] | simple | Smith [9] | straight [2] | 3:8, 4:3, | true - $38: 12$ |
| 4:16, 24:14, | 19:22, | 1:14, 2:6 | 26:3, 27:16 | 4:21, 6:25, | turns - 30:25 |
| 25:25, | 25:17, 25:22 | 3:4, $3: 5$, | Subdivision - | 8:23, 8:24, |  |
| 29:16, 37:10 | simply - 20:15 | 18:14, | 24:25 | 10:6, 10:16, | U |
| secretary [2] | Simpson [87] | 24:11, | subject [2] | 10:23, |  |
| 3:12, 20:6 | 1:13, 2:4, | 25:12, 2 | 15:21, 21:24 | 12:16, 15:8, | understand |
| seeing - 18:2 | 2:13, $2: 18$ | 37: | submit [2] | 15:20, | 14 |
| seem [5] | 2:19, 3:8, | someo | 21:18, 23:16 | 17:14, | understanding |
| 12:22, | 4:3, $4: 9$, | 6:21 | submitted [5] | 23:5, 23:20 | -7:21 |
| 25:17, | 4:15, 4:19, | sometime - | 12:9, 14:7, | 24:22, | unfortunately |
| 25:22, 32:4, | 4:21, $4: 24$ | $34: 24$ sorry [4] | 21:6, $22: 16$, | 29:12, 33:6, | - 21:8 |
| 33:25 | 5:10, $6: 2$ | sorry [4] | 23:18 | 35:4, $35: 14$, | Unless - 23:25 |
| seems [3] | 6:25, 7:11, | 11:6, 15 | submitting | 36:22, 37:2, | update [8] |
| 12:21, | 7:15, 7:22, | 15:5 | 36:11 | 37:10, 37:20 | 5:17, 6:14, |
| 13:24, 33:21 | 7:25, 8:5 | sort [4] | substantive | Thanks [2] | 8:25, 10:8, |
| selenium - $5: 16$ | $9: 10, ~ 9: 20$, $10: 3,10: 6$, | 20:16, | [2] 11:14, | 10:19, 18:23 | 10:14, |
| 5:16 | 10:3, 10:6 | 22:20, 2 | 23:7 | there's [10] | 11:11, |
| send - 25:6 | 10:9, 10:11, | 35:18 | Sugars [2] | 4:25, 7:17, | 11:19, 30:9 |
| sending - 19:7 | 10:16, | sounds | 6:16, 6:20 | 9:8, 14:10, | updates - |
| sends - 27:5 | 10:23, | 30:21 | suggest [5] | 18:17, | $6: 13$ |
| sense [6] | 12:16, | speak[2] | 26:10, | 18:19, | upon [4] |
| 13:20, 14:1, | 13:14, | 16:13, 22:19 | 26:14, 28:9, | 31:24, | 9:18, 11:25 |
| 25:16, 29:2, | 14:13, | specific [2] | 30:18, 30:23 | 32:19, | 12:6, $21: 5$ |
| 29:3, 30:15 | 14:17, 15:2, | 9:16, 15:23 | suggesting - | 33:12, 33:19 | using - 38:11 |
| sent [3] 17:4, | 15:8, 15:11, | specifically - | 26:15 | thereabouts | utility - $27: 15$ |
| 20:4, 20:5 | 15:20, | 34:21 | suggestion [2] | 14:23 |  |
| separate - | 15:25, | specifics [2] | 28:4, 36:25 | They're - 5:6 | V |
| 14:2 | 16:12, | 29:4, 32:23 | summarize | they've [2] |  |
| $\text { service - } 20: 5$ <br> Services [4] | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 14, \\ & 16: 17,17: 9, \end{aligned}$ | spent - 27:1 spread - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:23 } \\ & \text { summary [2] } \end{aligned}$ | $5: 5,23: 17$ <br> thing [5] | Vader - 3:22 |


|  | 9:6 <br> whatever 11:15 <br> WHEREOF 38:15 <br> WHEREUPON 2:1 <br> whether [6] <br> 9:21, 16:3, <br> 17:25, <br> 25:18, <br> 25:20, 32:18 <br> Whitaker [5] <br> 3:15, 16:13, <br> 16:15, <br> 16:16, 16:18 <br> whole - 7:14 <br> widely - $32: 16$ <br> within - $30: 4$ <br> WITNESS - <br> 38:15 <br> won't - 9:8 <br> wonder - 33:8 <br> wondering [2] <br> 26:4, 33:20 <br> Woods [2] <br> 7:1, $30: 20$ <br> Worden - 6:5 <br> works - 27:14 <br> wouldn't [2] <br> 2:14, 30:16 <br> writing - $24: 2$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

