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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:
(Board Member Rankosky not present)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Good morning, everyone.
Let's bring the meeting to order. Sandy, would you take the roll, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Here. MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Here. MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Rankosky.
(No response)
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 with five.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Sandy. Could
we also please for the record commit who else is on the call.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I have Laurie Crutcher, our Court Reporter; I have Deputy Director James Fehr; I have Board Counsel Terisa Oomens; DEQ attorney Kurt Moser; Nick Whitaker, DEQ; Vicki Marquis, Crowley Fleck; Bill Mercer, Holland and Hart; Aaron Pettis, DEQ; Barbara Chilcott, attorney; Elena Hagen, Agency Legal Services; Elizabeth Torske, DEQ; Emily Lodman, DEQ; Gabrielle Ostermayer; Jessica Wilkerson, DEQ; Kaitlyn Whitfield, Agency Legal Services; Ryen Godwin; and Sara Christophersen, DEQ.
(Also present via Zoom: Catherine Armstrong, DEQ; Angie Colamaria, DEQ; Loryn Johnson, DEQ; Sonja Nowakowski, DEQ; Ray Stout, Kootenai Valley Record; Matthew Adams)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is review and approve the minutes from previous meeting August 11th. Any comments or corrections to the minutes from the Board members?
(No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, is there a motion?

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I make a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that.
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Next is briefing items. I don't really have any further comment on these. Let's go through them page by page from the agenda.

On the first page we start out with cases in court. This is MEIC and the Sierra Club versus DEQ having to do with Western Energy. That I presume is still pending?

MS. OOMENS: That is correct.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is that correct? Page
2. The second item has to do with Signal Peak. That one is still, is in court and in process.

Third, DEQ versus Board of Environmental

Review, Teck Coal, the Board of County Commissioners -- and MEIC, Clark Fork Coalition, Idaho Conservation League, etc., versus the Board of Environmental Review, Teck Coal, Limited, and Board of County Commissioners, Lincoln County.

There's not been a lot happening on this case pending action by the Judge on a couple of matters that are highlighted in the last two paragraphs. Any questions or comments there from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Moving on to nonenforcement cases, anything on $2(a)$ ?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Still pending by the Supreme Court. Anything further on Page 4 ?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Page 5.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: The Alpine case is one that has been going on for quite some time. I see we have joint status report due in November.

And this next one, Rippling Woods Homeowners Association, et al., regarding approval of opencut mining 2949 Moudy Pit site. The
decision is pending by the Hearing Examiner, and is expected before the 2023, December 2023 Board meeting.

This $I$ presume, at least according to this scheduling, is something we'll be seeing in December. It is the first of many -- it will be first of several, I should say, opencut issues, permit issues to come before the Board. And given the number of plaintiffs in this case, I presume that this will take some extensive discussion and consideration by the Board at our next meeting. Anything further on Page 6?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Page 7.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Page 8.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Page 9.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Page 10.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Eleven.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: And twelve.
(No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Terisa, if there's anything new on any of these, please speak up. One comment $I$ would make is that it would be a lot easier for review if updates would be provided to the Board at each meeting would be indicated in bold type or in some fashion, so that we can pick up more quickly on what the most recent developments have been, rather than going through the whole thing.

Some of these have been going on for a very long time, and the amount of print here is getting to be quite voluminous.

MS. OOMENS: Just a quick follow up question then. I'm happy to change how the agenda is set out as far as what's included, so if you guys just want what has happened since the last meeting to be included on the agenda, I'm happy to do that. Would that be more helpful?

CHAIR SIMPSON: No. I guess from my standpoint, it would be just be helpful to highlight the new developments.

MS. OOMENS: So leave everything --
CHAIR SIMPSON: The history is
important, but if we could just highlight the recent developments in these various cases, I
think it would be a little easier for us to track. Do any other Board members have any comment on that?

MS. OOMENS: So you want me to leave the whole paragraph, but like you said, maybe just bold what has happened since the last meeting; is that correct?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, if we could do that, please.

MS. OOMENS: Yes, $I$ can do that.
CHAIR SIMPSON: I appreciate it. Any other further comments on any of these, Terisa?

MS. OOMENS: No. I will say in the Sidney Sugars case, they do have a status report that is due $I$ believe November $1 s t$, and $I$ 'm not sure that made it into the agenda, but they are still stayed. So they're just trying to figure out what's going on with the company. But everything else looks up to date.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Further comments or questions from the Board on any of these briefing items?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Hearing none, we'll move on to the action items under Roman

Numeral III. The first has to do with Westmoreland Rosebud Mining and the settlement agreement that was approved by the Board earlier this year. The update is summarized in the agenda.

Representatives from $D E Q$ and from Western Energy, would you care to summarize briefly where we are on this, please, and what our next milestone will be.

MR. MOSER: Mr. Chairman, can you hear me? This is Kurt Moser from DEQ.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. Thank you.
MR. MOSER: I am sitting in for Kirsten Bowers today. I am not sure if Counsel for Westmoreland is on the line. Is that your understanding?

CHAIR SIMPSON: I believe Mr. Mercer is here.

MR. MERCER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I'm on the line.

MR. MOSER: Good morning, everyone. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. I think the update that was provided is fairly brief, and explains where we are in the process. We're working through it in accordance with the
stipulation.
We're in the process of evaluating existing data, and on or by October $30 t h$, we'll make a written determination whether EC and SAR concentrations in the receiving waters exceed the applicable water quality criteria, and if that's the case, the update goes into further detail about that.

And basically we're trying to determine whether or not we need to develop nonanthropogenic standards, and we would be developing a sampling analysis plan, and we have some time limits set on those, 45 days from our determination that additional data would be required. And then the company would be obtaining some additional data in accordance with that sampling and analysis plan.

So it seems that we are on track. I
know, Mr. Mercer, if you'd like to go ahead and add, feel free.

MR. MERCER: No. That summarizes it.
And in the update, the last paragraph on Page 15 really does contain everything that's happened since the Board's last meeting.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Well, thank you very much. I'm pleased to see that we're making
progress on this, and looking forward to hearing what the existing data base looks like, and whether you'll be moving forward with any further sampling.

After as many years in operation as has been the case at Rosebud, hopefully there's a pretty good data base to work from, to start from.

Any other comments from the Board on this?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: In the matter of
Westmoreland Resources, Inc.'s appeal of final MPDES Permit MTOO21229, the Absaloka Mine in Hardin.

We were to receive a -- we had a brief report in August on this, and follow up today. Should I start with Mr. Mercer or someone from DEQ, available to give us the updated status report on this case. This is another one that's been going on for quite some time. Eight years to be exact.

MR. MOSER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, this is Kurt Moser again sitting in for Kirsten Bowers on this one as well.

I guess just in a brief sense -- and
please, Mr. Mercer, add along after I am done here -- but as of right now, in October of this year Westmoreland submitted additional information. We're working through a permit renewal process right now. I think we're currently working on it, towards an agreement on certain time frames for that, for the renewal of the MPDES permit. And right now DEQ is evaluating the data that was recently submitted by Westmoreland.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I think what I would add to Mr. Moser's summary there is that -- Chairman, you are correct. We provided the oral briefing in August, and we had at that time noted that $D E Q$ had posed additional questions with respect to this matter, and we responded on, $I$ believe it was the 30 th of June.

And at this point, $I$ think that submission is still pending with $D E Q$, and that we really at this point, $I$ think, we're dependent upon DEQ acting upon what we submitted. So I agree with Mr. Moser that the process is ongoing, but at this point we think we have provided the information that the agency sought, and we're looking forward to working with them on any questions that they have.

But $I$ would say the status on this is really unchanged from the time we briefed the Board at the time of the last meeting.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Moser.
Comments from the Board on this?
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman, my question is: Is there a time frame from DEQ as far as the review of the information that's been submitted in the process that you're going through right now with the permit renewal?

MR. MOSER: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Board. This is Kurt Moser again for DEQ. I would say that other than working with Westmoreland on this, and reviewing the information, if there are -- I think we, DEQ, $I$ guess we'll have to work internally and come up with some reasonable time frame that we could do that for renewing the permit, but we are currently reviewing information that we did receive from them.

And $I$ guess we have had some issues with some internal staffing issues with our permits related to coal permitting, so we are working through that as well. But $I$ guess we don't necessarily have a firm timeline at this point.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, can we request some sort of timeline? I know there's challenges. I hear that and acknowledge that. It seems like there should be some sort of timeline placed on the review. I mean there would be otherwise, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Moser.

MR. MOSER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. I think we do have -- I guess it would be possible to work with Westmoreland on that. I mean if there are some, you know, I guess -between the two parties could work towards something in that area, trying to identify what reasonable time frames could be. I don't know if Mr. Mercer has any further comment on that or not. MR. MERCER: Well, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Board. Thank you, Mr. Moser. I did talk to Ms. Bowers about this very topic a couple of weeks ago, because my sense is that we feel like we've supplied what the Department -- we responded to questions the Department wanted to hear from, but $I$ think it's difficult to come up with a time frame for the Board, at least as of now.

And $I$ can commit to continue
communication with Ms. Bowers to see if in advance of your next meeting we can sketch a time frame, but my conclusion from talking to her was that we weren't in a position to present that sort of thing to the Board presently because of sort of the challenges, the staffing challenges that the Department is facing.

So I think she and $I$ would both like to be able to propose a time frame to the Board, but at least as of now, we didn't think that we were in a position to do that. So $I$ guess what $I$ could commit to, Mr. Chairman, is continued communication with the Department through Ms. Bowers to see if in December we could propose a time table to the Board, but we just didn't think we had the wherewithal to do that for your October meeting.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Mercer, Mr. Moser. My understanding of this case is that it has to do with an MPDES permit renewal; is that correct?

MR. MERCER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Dating back to 2015.
Normal permit term on an MPDES permit $I$ believe is five years, and this has been going on for eight.

I don't know. It just seems to me that we ought -- there ought to be some way to resolve this case, rather than just have it drag on, which it's done for quite a long time now.

Ms. Oomens, I see there was an order setting status conference held on July 24 th. Are there any other deadlines in the Hearing Examiner's schedule on this?

MS. OOMENS: There are not, other than that they were going to bring deadiines to the Board. I'm happy to set another status conference, but my opinion would be that the parties coming in front of the Board to give the Board deadlines is probably more efficient, to answer your questions. But I'm happy to set a status conference just as a Hearing Examiner if you would prefer that $I$ do it that way.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, $I$ would leave that to your discretion, and certainly as Hearing Examiner -- I guess where I'm going with this is I would like to either find the basis for a settlement here, or if there are issues in dispute, to bring it before the Board, rather than just kicking the can down the road. So we'll look forward to the update in December, and see what's
happening. Any further comments from the Board? (No response)

MR. MERCER: Mr. Chairman, can I just weigh in on this before you move to the next section?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Certainly, Mr. Mercer.
MR. MERCER: So Mr. Chairman, I think we had a little bit of a back and forth about this at the August meeting.

But you can see from the narrative that at least part of the delay that was occasioned here was waiting for resolution of a District Court case by the Montana Supreme Court.

And so what Westmoreland has submitted is a new application, so it's for issuance of a renewal permit, but we believe that we have submitted the application, and we believe we've responded to the Department's questions.

And so at this point what the parties are looking for is a determination by the agency, which may or may not result in another appeal. Obviously if Westmoreland doesn't take issue with the terms of the permit, then $I$ don't believe the Board would see this matter again.

But it is on your agenda as a result of
that history, but what we're looking for is the issuance of a permit, which may or may not require any further action by the Board. So we'll certainly commit to trying to get to the end of the process as quickly as possible, but $I$ think a lot of that delay was the result of judicial decisions that were going to drive what was going to happen with respect to what DEQ would do with the renewal application.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, understood. When was that case decided by the Supreme Court?

MR. MERCER: I don't have that in front of me, Mr. Chairman. We can --

CHAIR SIMPSON: The Western Energy case.
MR. MERCER: I don't know the date of that. We could certainly provide that to you at the time of the next hearing.

CHAIR SIMPSON: My point is it's been some time ago, four or five years at least, I believe.

MR. MERCER: There was a District Court order, which then led to an appeal to the Supreme Court. And so I don't have the dates of those two in front of me, but $I$ think that really had a lot to do with the delay.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I understand that. I'm not familiar with the details really in either case, but $I$ know there was a parallel issue there. I think we've probably spent enough time on this unless there's further comment from the Board.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Board Member Aguirre had her hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Board Member Aguirre. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I was just going to thank Mr. Moser and Mr. Mercer for providing insight on the communication that's going on between them. That was really all my questioning, the point of my questioning, is just kind of how is this moving along, because there are definitely timelines in issuing especially now what is a new permit application. So $I$ just wanted to thank you for providing more insight in the fact that you guys are communicating.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Agreed. Thank you very
much. Anything further?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let's move on to Item (c). This is the request for hearing by Harry Richards, Lincoln County.

My understanding of this is that we had
this on our agenda for the last meeting. It was deferred until this meeting to give Mr. Richards an opportunity to file exceptions, which my understanding is he did not do. I guess $I$ would ask for a recap from the Department. First of all, I'd ask: Is Mr. Richards or anyone representing Mr. Richards on the call?
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, he is not on the call.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Could the Department recap for us where we are on this. We have a summary judgment decision before us, but I would like to have a summary from the Department, just to be sure we all have an understanding of what the issues are.

MR. WHITAKER: Good morning, Chair Simpson, members of the Board. This is Nick Whitaker, I'm the attorney for the Department representing $D E Q$ on this matter.

Yes. So just to recap this case, this stems from an administrative order issued by the Department in March of 2022 for a hazardous waste violation by Mr. Richards up in Lincoln County. Mr. Richards filed a letter requesting a hearing
related to the order.
But when he initially filed, there was a few letters he filed early on in the case, but he hasn't really participated in the case since I guess last October was his last filing in this matter.

DEQ filed a summary judgment motion earlier this year. Mr. Richards did not respond to that motion, and the Hearing Examiner granted DEQ's motion in July of this year.

As you know, Chair Simpson, the Board had set this matter for oral argument at the August hearing, but $D E Q$ had filed a motion just requesting to reset it to this hearing today, or this meeting today, so that the statutory exceptions process could be set out.

And that process played out over the last two months. Neither party filed any exception to the Hearing Examiner's summary judgment order, and so DEQ is just requesting that the Board today just adopt the Hearing Examiner's summary judgment order as the final agency action of the Board.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any questions for Mr.
Whitaker from the Board?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Aguirre has her hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Board Member Aguirre.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to move to make a motion that we grant DEQ's motion for summary judgment, and enter a final order affirming DEQ's issuance of the March 7 th, 2022 order.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second.
This is Julia Altemus.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to -- I'll take this language from our agenda -- adopt the Hearing Examiner's proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and summary judgment order. Is that a correct statement, Stacy?

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Yes. I took my words out of the conclusion of the -- so yes.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Understood. I just
wanted to clarify for the record. Discussion? A motion has been made and seconded.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I guess this seems fairly straight forward to me. I do have a couple
of questions just for information.
At one point in the record there was a reference made to an examination or question of whether any water courses had been affected by this action. My question is: Did I miss it, or was that -- I'm assuming that determination was made. Were there any water courses affected by this oil, waste oil?

MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, members of the Board, no. I believe that DEQ's initial violation letter to Mr. Richards mentioned a nearby water course of some sort, but the order issued to Mr. Richards was just under the Montana Hazardous Waste Act, and did not involve any water quality violations.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Assuming that the Board approves the motion, or votes to adopt the motion, what's the next -- what happens next?

MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, members of the Board. DEQ hasn't made any determination on if it would take any further action against Mr. Richards. I'm assuming we would attempt to obtain compliance with the order, as we've been trying to do prior to the order, but then DEQ would just have to decide internally if Mr. Richards does not
comply with the order, if it would take any additional action against him. And at that point it would just be a District Court case in the judicial context.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. The order is to mitigate?

MR. WHITAKER: Yes.
CHAIR SIMPSON: By removing the affected soil?

MR. WHITAKER: That's correct.
CHAIR SIMPSON: If I remember correctly, this case goes back to '19, so it's four years old, or it's been four years since the action resulting in the violation notice occurred.

So I guess my question is, after this amount of time, whether that has any impact or affect on the Department's orders, and the potential impacts of going in and disturbing the soil to remove it at this date, whether that has a potential negative impact or not.

MR. WHITAKER: Chair Simpson, members of the Board, yes. DEQ has been up to visit the site since the unlawful disposal occurred a couple different times. I'm just trying to see when the last inspection occurred, but it may have been a
year or two ago.
But yes, I think that's something our enforcement program $I$ guess would take into account in looking at any cleanup here. Certainly we're requesting Mr. Richards to have a qualified person do this cleanup, and they would ideally submit a plan to $D E Q$, and we'd review it and make sure the cleanup is done in a way that's obviously going to mitigate the environmental harm that's been done out there.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Whitaker. Any further comments or discussion from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, a motion has been made and seconded to adopt the Hearing Examiner's proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and summary judgment order in the Harry Richards case. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries.
(Board Member Rankosky present via Zoom)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Next item, Item (d), in the matter of the hearing request for exploration
license 00680 , Butte Highlands site, five year bond determination.

And I believe, according to our agenda here, that the Hearing Examiner issued an order granting a stay July 31 st of this year. On September 21 st, the parties filed a joint stipulation and motion to dismiss, which the Hearing Examiner issued an order dismissing the appeal with prejudice on September $27 t h$, and the Board is being asked to adopt the order dismissing appeal with prejudice. Once again, could we have a brief summary of the issue here.

MS. MARQUIS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Vicki Marquis. I represent the Highlands Joint Venture. I'm not sure if you wanted an update from the parties or from the Hearing Examiner, so let me know if you want me to wave off and wait until someone else has updated you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Terisa, you're the Hearing Examiner on this, are you not?

MS. OOMENS: I am. I think it's more appropriate to talk to the parties, but if you would like me to go over it, $I$ definitely can.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, in that case,
let's turn the floor over to you, Ms. Marquis, and I presume somebody from the Department will speak. MS. MARQUIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. We were happy that we were able to get this resolved as timely as we could. We appreciate working with DEQ attorney Jessica Wilkerson on this.

It seemed like it was one discrete issue, but it really would have a big impact on reclamation down the road, and the ability for our client to get the highest value if they wanted to sell the property later, and we were able to resolve that through working through a reclamation schedule with DEQ, and coming to an agreement about future requests for the ability to retain some infrastructure on the property.

So if you want, it's a settlement, so it didn't get to -- they didn't get the affirmative action that they wanted, but like all settlements, it was a compromise, and this one was reasonable and timely, and so we appreciate that. I'm happy to answer whatever questions you might have. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Ms. Marquis. Comments from the Department on this?

MS. WILKERSON: Thank You, Chairman, and the rest of the Board. This is Jessica Wilkerson, and $I$ 'm an attorney with $D E Q$ working on this case. Yes, and $I$ concur with what Vicki said as far as the outcome of the settlement. The Department has appreciated being able to work with the attorneys on the other side, and come to an agreement about this, and we feel assured that the bond is sufficient, and that we can move forward with reclamation, and there's no more action needed by the Board at this time.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Any
questions from the Board for either Ms. Marquis or Ms. Wilkerson?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, is there a motion?

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I can make it, if you'd like, Mr. Chairman. I'll make a motion to adopt the order dismissing the appeal with prejudice.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and
seconded to adopt the order dismissing the appeal
with prejudice with regard to the Butte Highlands case. Any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I guess I would compliment the parties on working to achieve a settlement here quickly and efficiently.

MS. WILKERSON: Thank you, Chairman and the Board.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

Moving on to Board discussion items. At
the last meeting we had a brief discussion regarding granting of stays, and this had to do with the observation that it seems like a number of our cases seem to drag on for long periods of time. Certainly from the Board's standpoint, I think we need to recognize due process. So I have asked Ms. Oomens to give us a briefing on this as to what our options might be. Ms. Oomens.

MS. OOMENS: Before I start, Board
Member Altemus, did you have a question you wanted me to answer initially?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: No. Actually I thought we had skipped over something, but I'm realizing that it was the tail end of the first conversation. So I'm going to lower my hand. Make sure we got to the cases not assigned to the Hearing Examiner, but $I$ think we did go through those. Thank you.

MS. OOMENS: So as is evident -- go ahead.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm sorry. I guess we have no cases not yet assigned to a Hearing Examiner. That's kind of unusual. Hooray.

MS. OOMENS: It is.
CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm sorry. ExCuse me for interrupting, Terisa.

MS. OOMENS: So as is evidenced by this meeting and the previous one, the Board obviously has a concern with getting these Hearing Examiner cases through the process as quickly as possible.

I will also just as an initial note -- I forgot to bring it up when we were talking about the Hearing Examiner cases earlier -- at the last
meeting we had mentioned the informal MAPA procedure that parties could waive their right to the formal MAPA procedure, and take informal instead.

In one of the cases in front of me, the parties did discuss this, but $I$ wanted to bring this to the attention of the whole Board, that when licenses for professions are involved, informal MAPA procedure is not allowed under statute. And so $I$ just wanted that to kind of be in the back of everyone's mind, that while informal MAPA procedure is definitely something we still tell the parties to consider, unfortunately it's not an option for when licenses are revoked or suspended.

But just as far as stays go, Hearing Examiners are obviously authorized to regulate the course of hearings, and while the Montana Rules of Civil Procedure don't govern cases for MAPA, they still serve as guidance, and so we look to the Montana Rules of Civil Procedure for when stays are granted, and those are usually granted for good cause.

Good cause does not have a great definition. It's just defined as a legally
sufficient reason. It's a pretty flexible standard. Whether it's present will be dependent on the totality of the facts and circumstances in every case. So it's pretty hard to have an overarching good cause standard, but it has also been defined as a substantial reason, one that affords a legal excuse.

> So it's pretty discretionary to the

Hearing Examiners and the Board as to whether good cause is met in each case, but one thing $I$ will note is that the main concern of the Hearing Examiner and the Board is to ensure that all parties are afforded the opportunity to respond, and present evidence and arguments involving all issues in the case, so especially when both parties come to the Hearing Examiner requesting a stay, it's hard to argue that all parties are not being afforded the opportunity to respond and address concerns when they're both agreeing to a stay.

$$
\text { As far as cases, } I \text { did review all of the }
$$ BER cases that are currently active. It looks like a total of 66 stays have been granted over the course of all of those cases. Only two of those have been opposed. So out of 64 stays, both

parties are agreeing to, again, kind of going back what $I$ was saying before. When both parties agree it's hard to say that one party is being punished by the stay.

There's been several different reasonings for why the stays are requested. The most common one is to accommodate the schedules of the attorneys, especially the DEQ attorneys, when they have multiple BER cases at one time, sometimes it's those deadlines run into each other, and so that's I think been the most common reason for granting stays.

But the second is settlement
negotiations. And so just as evidenced by the Butte Highlands today, offering parties that opportunity for settlement is really saving the Board time in the long run.

And $I$ will just note also that as far as a Hearing Examiner goes, when the case is stayed, us Hearing Examiners are not putting in any work or effort into that case. It's just kind of sitting there for us.

So while the Board is definitely correct in its desire to get the cases through the process as quickly as possible, while they're stayed the

Board is not spending any money to keep on top of the cases.

So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions, but $I$ do also think that the discussion with especially $D E Q$ and other parties that frequent the BER process would be good to get their input as well.

CHAIR SIMPSON: First of all, I've lost my screen here. I have no idea how to get it back without leaving the meeting. So if $I$ get lost, hopefully I'll be able to sign in again. I think I clicked the wrong thing on my screen somewhere.

Anyway, any comments from the Board? Further discussion on this matter?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Comments, questions for Terisa?

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I think that it sounds like that there's partially some perception, based on what you explained, Terisa, it sounds like some of it might be a perception concern, that, you know, like one of the cases has been on the books for eight years, and that somehow the stay or that process then keeps that going forward.

But what $I$ think $I$ heard you say is that it's more of a joint decision more often, the stay, than it is the parties not agreeing to the stay; is that correct?

MS. OOMENS: That's correct. So 64 out of the 66 stays that $I$ looked at, both parties agreed to the stay.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: I think we, at least myself as a Board member, is trying to just figure out how to have more outcomes like the Highlands JV outcome, versus eight years of a case being around. I think that was kind of a driving question for me as a Board member.

I don't know what we can do. If the parties are in agreement about stays, then $I$ don't know what we can do about that. I mean the cases are coming before us. I don't know, I'm just kind of $I$ guess talking out loud about what even my own perception was of the length of the cases in terms of the years that they've been around.

MS. OOMENS: I will say as a Hearing Examiner, $I$ definitely look at how many times they've requested a stay for the same step in the process. If we're in, let's say, the discovery phase, and they've already requested one or two
stays, requesting another, or third, or fourth, it just seems you'd better have a good reason for requesting that many stays.

So frequently it's just one, maybe two stays per step in the process, and so I guess the reality of current litigation, not only in front of BER, but just the court litigation process in general, is a long process.

And so $I$ think the Hearing Examiners and the parties realize that the Board has an interest in moving these cases along. I even had a party bring that up in a recent hearing in front of me. So they're aware that this is an interest of the Board, and $I$ think once everybody is under the same understanding, hopefully that can get the parties to resolve things quicker.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Thanks for the additional discussion, Terisa.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Terisa. I am back on finally. I guess I don't know that there's anything to be done other than to do what we've already done, and that's express our concern about cases dragging on with repeated extensions.

And it would just be something that
should be -- just to make the point that we'd like the Hearing Examiners to be aware of the Board's concern here, and to be critical when looking at extensions. Does that seem reasonable?

MS. OOMENS: If that was directed at me, yes.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Terisa.
MS. OOMENS: Yes, absolutely.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. I'm asking the question of both you and the Board, but $I$ believe that's where we are on this. Any other thoughts?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chairman Simpson, this is Julia Altemus. I guess I would ask the question. If we didn't grant those 60 some odd stays, what would the outcome have been for those cases? I mean giving them a little bit more time may be beneficial, but $I$ don't have a reference point because we grant the stays. So Terisa, do you have a sense of what would have happened to those cases if the Board had not granted them?

MS. OOMENS: Well, it's hard to tell because the reasoning for all of the stays is different. But like $I$ said, the biggest reason for the parties requesting stays is for accommodating their schedules.

And so in my opinion, without granting those stays, you end up with pleadings that are not adequately drafted, which in a lot of senses can extend the process because the parties don't address every argument they have up front, and so then you have to address them as they go. And so sometimes it can extend the process.

The second reason that they request stays is settlement, and so without requesting those stays, you get into the Hearing Examiners deciding summary judgment or discovery disputes, just for the parties to come to you and say, "Just kidding. Here's our agreement."

So like I said, I understand, especially as a practicing attorney as well, $I$ understand a request for a stay every now and then, but when you request two, three, four stays in one portion of the process, it just doesn't make any sense to me. So it really depends on why they request the stay, what the consequences would be if it's not granted.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thanks, Terisa. It just seems like even though it's a necessary maybe evil, it is just something that probably is better in the long run, $I$ guess is my point.

MS. OOMENS: Yes, I would agree with that.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: And hopefully if you're keeping an eye on it, hopefully you're not -- we are all apprised when someone is asking for a stay for the third time for the same thing.

MS. OOMENS: Correct. Yes.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you. CHAIR SIMPSON: Further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Are we ready to move along to the next topic?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Item 2 under Board discussion items, 2025 Legislature. Just a little background on this.

A couple years ago, I guess it was the fall of 2021, my first year on the Board, I had had some discussions with Steve about frustration with the lack of clarity in the statutes regarding the authorities and responsibilities of the Board. Those are scattered through a number of different statutes, are sometimes inconsistent, and they're -- I think in my own line of thinking, $I$ think we could improve some on the statutory definition of what those responsibilities and authorities are. Since that time, of course we're now involved in a lawsuit with DEQ over just such a point as to the Board's authority. Maybe I'm being naive, but I'm hopeful that that will be resolved before the next Legislature convenes.

But I have been approached by Board members on several occasions asking that very question as to what is our -- what is the extent of our responsibility and authority.

My own feeling is that, as I've said, I do believe that there should be a better definition in the statutes, without expanding on it, at least as $I$ see it, expanding on what the responsibilities of the Board ought to be.

So what I'm asking for is consideration by the Board as to whether we want to go down that road. I guess I've had brief discussion with Board Member Altemus about this, Julia, being our legislative expert.

So I'd open it up for discussion. Right now $I$ don't have anything specific in mind as far as what language might look like, but $I$ would propose that we begin working on this, so that if it appears we have something workable, we can have
it ready well before the next Legislature.
I've been down this road before on other statutory changes, and I've found it's not something you do overnight. It's not a wise thing to do, to drop something in the hopper at the last minute. It needs to be well thought out, and involving the various, and including the various parties that would be affected. And of course DEQ is obviously an interested party, and I'm sure there are others. So with that, I'll throw it open to discussion, comments from the Board.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, this
is Board Member Altemus again. I don't have anything specific that $I$ would throw out here that needs to be changed, but $I$ will from like a higher level look at it. I mean there is definitely -If you look at the enabling legislation for the Board, it's pretty innocuous. It's not very clear to me. In two places it's not very clear.

But then if you look at other statutes where the Board is mentioned, or where laws have come into play, and the Board is mentioned, there's a lot of code clutter when it comes to references to the Board of Environmental Review. So if nothing else, it would be nice to have a
deep dive into where all this is at in code, and is there a way to put it in one specific place, or are some of those references outdated.

I think a look at it would be appropriate, before you even maybe think that there might be something you want to change. That's my perspective anyway. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Julia. I've gone through and prepared a summary of what $I$ could find in the codes having to do with Board authority. I think it could probably stand some dusting off.

But this is something that, as I said, I had prepared and discussed with Steve back a couple years ago, but we decided at that time that there really wasn't enough time to pull something together that could be presented as a bill, which is why $I$ bring it up now. We've got more than a year before the next Legislature, and $I$ would hope that by this time next year, if we're going to go through with proposing a bill, that by this time next year we would be pretty much ready to go. BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: This is Board Member Aguirre. We need to make sure that in the summary that we're looking at, and what we're
looking at now, incorporates all the changes that got made from this last legislative season, because there was an announcement by Montana DEQ to incorporate those changes with regard to the Board into the rules. So we need to make sure we have the most up-to-date perspective or summary of the rules.

But $I$ would agree that looking at it is probably an important aspect of our work as a Board, and so that we can be more clear on what the role is.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, the 2021
Legislature of course transferred rulemaking authority from the Board to the Department, and I'm not sure that's an entirely bad thing. I could see advantages to it from the Board's standpoint. But $I$ think that those changes have increased -- for lack of a better word -confusion and uncertainty as to just what the Board's role is.

I am reading through the statutes, it's no question that we as a quasi-judicial board, one of our primary functions, or the primary function I suppose, is contested cases, which is what we've been focusing on almost entirely, but I believe
our authority extends beyond that.
It's unclear. Let's just say a lot of the language is not all that clear as to the intent, and that's where $I$ think there's definitely some smoothing out to be done. I'm kind of dancing around the subject here. I'm not ready to, without studying things a little further, to propose what changes we might want to consider, but $I$ really do think that regardless of which way this litigation with the Department goes, there's a need for some cleanup here, and some specificity in the statutes.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Chairman Simpson, I would say I'm definitely in favor of looking at this further. Since I've been on the Board, I think we've been in a bit of flux, just because of the changes that happened right before we came on the Board with the changes in rulemaking authority, and how that works. And $I$ think just taking a deep dive into what our real purpose is, and then trying to define that better in statute could benefit everybody for sure.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Board Member Smith. Any other comments?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, this
is Jon Reiten. And the rest of the board. I agree. I think it's a good -- this is an opportune time to take a look at the summaries that you've put together, and any of that information would really be helpful, just get us up to speed. So I think it's a good idea.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. I'm going to propose a motion to direct the Chair to begin developing this idea, with assistance from various Board members, to summarize what we have in the statutes right now, and to present ideas for clarification. And of course, first of all, is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that. CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to direct the Chair to move ahead with developing the information for a possible bill in the next Legislature. I don't see any reason for the Board to -- in fact, $I$ think it would be a mistake for the Board in do it in a vacuum. I think it needs to be a public process. And I'm sure there will be others with an interest in Board authority and Board procedures. So further discussion?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, that's
just what $I$ was going to say. I just want to make sure that we're really transparent. This has got to be in the public eye, it's got to be public. We can't be making decisions. So I'm glad you're aware of that, and that we need to make sure that we need to keep that in the forefront of our mind as to how we do this and be transparent about it. So that was my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Further discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, say aye. (Response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Anyone opposed?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

General public comment. Under this item members of the public may comment on any public matter within the jurisdiction of the Board that is not otherwise on the agenda. Do we have any public comment?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, we'll move on. Board Chair update. I don't really have
much. I think we've covered all of the matters that $I$ had in mind.

I would note that we have lost Board Member Bruner. I think you're all aware of that. Lee was appointed to be the Workers Compensation Judge, Workman's Comp Judge. I believe that's correct. Is that right, Sandy?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, sir, it is.
CHAIR SIMPSON: That's the way I
remember it. I don't have the notes right in front of me. But anyway, so we're short one board member right now, and awaiting the appointment of the attorney member. Other than that, $I$ have nothing further that hasn't already been discussed. Any other comments or questions before we adjourn?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let me back up just a minute. We had intended for the second meeting in a row to potentially have this meeting as an in-person meeting, and given the length of the agenda it was pretty obvious that it really didn't make a lot of sense to have everybody travel to Helena for a meeting that so far has taken about an hour and fifteen minutes.

Our December meeting is likely to be another story, assuming that the Moudy Pit comes before us. The reason $I$ say that is that $I$ believe that this will be the first appeal of an opencut permit decision to come before the Board since significant changes were made in the statute. Is that a correct statement, Terisa? MS. OOMENS: That is correct.

CHAIR SIMPSON: So it may very well be that it would be appropriate to have an in-person meeting in December. Recognizing that weather could be an issue, $I$ guess we'll leave it open for the time being, but it is just something to keep in mind.

And $I$ plan to take a look at the opencut law as it stands right now as preparation for that meeting, and $I$ think it would be wise for all of us to do so if you have the opportunity. So on that note, is there a motion to adjourn?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much everybody. All in favor.
(Response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
See you next time.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:16 a.m. )

*     *         *             *                 * 

CE RT I FICA TE 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 -49- 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 31 st day of October, 2023.
Lawn Entry

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

| 0 | 7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { adequately - } \\ & 38: 3 \\ & \text { adjourn [3] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 18,35: 8, \\ & 36: 17, \\ & 42: 23,42: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { approve [2] } \\ & 3: 21,4: 4 \\ & \text { approved - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { base [2] 11:2, } \\ & 11: 7 \\ & \text { basically - } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00680-26:1 | 7-6:14 | 47:16, | ahead [3] | 9:3 | 10:9 |
|  | 7th-22:8 | 48:19, 48:23 | $10: 18$ | approves | begin [2] |
| 1 |  | administrative $\text { - } 20: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 12,45: 16 \\ & \text { al-5:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 17 \\ & \text { argue - } 32: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $40: 24,45: 8$ beneficial - |
| 10-6:20 | 8 | adopt [7] | allowed - 31:9 | argument [2] | 37:17 |
| 10:16-49:6 | 8-6:16 | 21:21, | Alpine - 5:20 | 21:12, 38:5 | benefit |
| 11th - 3:22 |  | $22:$ | already [3] | arguments | 44:22 |
| 15-10:21 | 9 | 23:17 | 35:25, | 32:14 | BER [4] |
| 19-24:12 | 9 | 25:15 | 36:22, 47:14 | Armstrong | 32:22, 3 |
| 1st - 8:15 | 9 | 26:10 | Altemus [17] | 3:15 | 34:6, 36 |
|  |  | 28:20, | 1:15, 2:13 | asking | best - |
| 2 | 9:00-1:11 | advanc 15:1 | $2: 14,22: 10$ $22: 11,30: 2$ | $37: 9,39: 5$, $40: 8,40: 16$ | better [5] $36: 2,38: 25$ |
| 2[2] 4:23, |  | advant | 30:4, 37:12 | aspect - 43:9 | 40:12, |
| 29:14 | A | 43:16 | 37:13, | assigned [2] | 43:18, $44: 21$ |
| 2(a-5:13 | a.m [2] 1:11, | affect - 2 | 38:22, 39:3, | 30:8, 30:14 | beyond - 44:1 |
| 20 [2] 1:6, | 49:6 | 23:4, 23:7, |  | $45: 9$ | $37: 23$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1: 10 \\ & 2015-15 \end{aligned}$ | Aaron - 3:8 | 24:8, $41: 8{ }^{\prime}$ | 41:13, | Association | bill [4] 3:7, |
| 2021 [2] |  | affirmative | 45:25, 48:20 | 5:24 | 42:17, |
| 39:18, $43: 12$ | 27:15, 50:14 | 27:18 | amount [2] | assuming [4] | 42:21, |
| 2022 [2] | able [5] 15:9, | affirming | 7:11, $24: 16$ | 23:6, 23:16, | bit [3] 17:8, |
| 20:23, 22:8 | 27:5, 27:12, | affixed - |  |  |  |
| 2023 [6] 1:6, | 28:6, 34:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { affixed } \\ & 50: 16 \end{aligned}$ | Angie - 3:16 | assured - 28:8 attempt - | board [143] $1: 1,1: 5,$ |
| 1:10, 1:10, | Absaloka - | afforded [2] | Angieuncement | $\begin{aligned} & \text { attempt } \\ & 23: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $1: 14,2: 4$ |
| $6: 2,6: 2,$ | 11:13 | 32:13, 32:18 | - $43: 3$ | attentio | 2:11, 2:12, |
| 2024-50:23 | absolutely 37:8 | affords - 32:7 | anyway [3] | 3 | 2:14, 2:15, |
| 2025-39:15 | accommodat | against [2] | 34:13, 42:7, | attorney [7] | 2:18, 2:20, |
| 21st-26:6 | - $33: 7$ | $\begin{gathered} 23: 21,24: \\ \text { agency } 551 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47: 11 \\ \text { appeal [8] } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 6,3: 9, \\ & 20: 19,27: 6, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 24th - 16:6 | accommodating | agency $3: 9,312$, | appeal [8] $11: 12,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 19,27: 6, \\ & 28: 3,38: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 5,3: 24, \\ & 4: 3,4: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{th}-26: 9$ $2949-5: 25$ | - 37:25 | $3: 9,3: 12$, $12: 23$, | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 12, \\ & 17: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $28: 3,38: 15,$ $47: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 3,4: 5, \\ & 4: 25,5: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 2949-5:25 | accordan | 17:20, $21: 22$ | 18:22, $26: 9$ | attorneys [3] | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 20,5: 1 \\ & 5: 3,5: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | [2] | agenda [12] | 26:11, | 28:6, 33:8, | 5:10, 6:2, |
| 2] $10: 3$ | 1 | 3:21, 4:16, | 28:20, | 33:8 | 6:8, $6: 11$, |
| 0th [2] 10:3, | according $6: 4,26: 3$ | 7:14, 7:17, | 28:25, 48:4 | August [5] | 7:5, 8:2, |
| 12:16 | account - 25:4 | 8:16, 9:5, | appears | 3:22, 11:16, | 8:21, 9:3, |
| 31st[2] 26:5, | achieve - 29:5 | 22:14, 26:3' | applicable | $21: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 22,11: 8, \\ & 11: 23,13: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:16 | acknowledge - | 46:21, 47:22 | $10: 6$ | authorities [2] | 13:5, 13:6, |
|  | 14:4 | agree [5] | application [4] | 39:21, 40:1 | 13:12, 14:1, |
| 4 | Act - 23:14 | 12:21, 33:2, | 17:15, | authority [7] | 14:9, 14:17, |
| 4-5:16 | acting - 12:20 action [10] | 39:1, 43:8, | 17:17, 18:9 | 40:4, 40:10, | 14:23, 15:5, |
| 45-5:10:13 | 5:7, 8:25, | 45:2 |  | 2:11, | 5:15 |
| 49-50:12 | 18:3, 21:22, | 19:19, 35:7 | 47:5 | 44:19, 45:23 | 16 |
|  | 23:5, 23:21, | agreeing [3] | appointment | authorized - | $16: 14,$ |
| 5 | 24:2, $24: 13$ | 32:19, $33: 1$ | 47:12 | 31:17 | 16:23, 17 |
|  | 27:19, 28:10 | 35 | appreciate [3] | available | 17:24, 18:3, |
| 5-5:18 | active - 32:22 | agreement [6] | 8:11, 27:6, | : 18 | 19:5, 19:7, |
|  | Adams - $3: 18$ <br> add [3] | 9:3, 12:6, | 27:21 | awaiting | 19:8, 19:9, |
| 6 | add [3] | 27:14, 28 | appreciated | 47:12 | 20:18, |
|  |  | 35:15, 38:13 | 28:6 | aye [4] | 21:11, |
| $6-6: 12$ $60-37: 14$ | additional [6] | Aguirre [19] | apprised | 25:18, | 21:21, |
| $60-37: 14$ $64[2] 32: 25$, | $10: 14,$ | 1:15, 2:10, | 39:5 | 29:11, $46: 12$ | 21:23, |
| $64[2] ~ 32: 25, ~$ $35: 5$ | $10: 15,12: 3$ | $2: 11,4: 3$ | approached |  | 21:25, 22:1, |
| $35: 5$ $66[2] ~ 32: 23$, | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 15,12: 3, \\ & 12: 14,24: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $13: 6, \quad 14: 1,$ | 40:7 | B | 22:3, 22:4, |
| $66[2] ~ 32: 23, ~$ $35: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 14, ~ 24: 2, \\ & 36: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 19:7, 19:8, | approp |  | 22:10, |
| 35:6 |  | 19:9, 22:2, | [3] 26:23 | background - | 22:18, |
|  |  | 22:3, 22:4, | 42:5, 48:10 | 39:16 | 23:10, |
|  | 32:19, $38: 5$, | 22:18, | approval - | bad - 43:15 | 23:17, |
|  |  | 28:18, | 5:24 | Barbara - $3: 8$ | 23:20, |


| 22, | : 6 | 35:19, | 29:9, 29:11, | 4] | e |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25:12, | bond [2] | 36:11, | 29:13, | 25:4, 25:6, | 20 |
| 25:23, | 26:2, 28:8 | 36:23, | 29:15, | 25:8, 44:11 | computer-aide |
| 26:10, | books - 34:23 | 37:16, | 30:13, | clear [4] | 50:11 |
| 26:14, 27:4, | Bowers [5] | 37:20, 43:24 | 30:17, 34:8, | 41:18, | concentrations |
| 28:2, 28:11, | 9:14, 11:24, | Catherine - | 34:16, | 41:19, | 0:5 |
| 28:13, | 14:18, 15:1, | 3:15 | 36:19, 37:7, | 43:10, 44:3 | concern [5] |
| 28:18, | 15:14 | cause [4] | 37:9, 39:9, | clicked | 30:21, |
| 28:23, 29:8, | brief [6] 9:23, | 31:23, | 39:11, | 34:12 | 32:11, |
| 29:17, $30: 1$, | 11:15, | 31:24, 32:5, | 39:14, | client - 27:11 | 34:22, |
| 30:4, 30:20, | 11:25, | 32:10 | 41:12, 42:8, | clutter | 36:23, 37:3 |
| 31:7, 32:9, | 26:12, | certain - 12:6 | 43:12, | 41:23 | co |
| 32:12, | 29:18, 40:18 | certainly [6] | 44:23, 45:7, | coal [3] 5:1, | 32:19 |
| 33:17, | briefed - 13:2 | 16:19, 17:6, | 45:8, 45:15, | 5:4,13:23 | concluded |
| 33:23, $34: 1$, | briefing [4] | 18:4, 18:16, | 45:16, | Coalition - 5:2 | 49:5 |
| 34:13, | 4:14, 8:21, | 25:4, 29:22 | 45:25, 46:9, | code [2] | conclusion [2] |
| 34:18, $35: 8$, | 12:13, 29:24 | certify - 50:7 | 46:12, | 41:23, 42:1 | 15:3, 22:19 |
| 35:9, 35:13, | briefly - 9:8 | Chair [108] | 46:14, | codes - 42:10 | conclusions |
| 36:10, | bring [7] 2:6, | 2:5, 2:9, | 46:16, | Colamaria | [2] 22:15, |
| 36:14, | 16:10, | 2:10, 2:25, | 46:24, | 3:16 | 25:16 |
| 36:17, | 16:23, | 3:20, 4:1, | 46:25, 47:9, | comes [2] | concur - 28:4 |
| 37:10, | 30:24, 31:6, | 4:6, 4:9, | 47:18, 48:9, | 41:23, 48:2 | conference [3] |
| 37:12, | 36:12, 42:18 | 4:11, 4:13, | 48:22, 49:1, | coming [3] | 16:6, 16:12, |
| 37:20, | Bruner - 47:4 | 4:22, 5:12, | 49:3 | 16:13, | 16:16 |
| 38:22, 39:3, | Butte [3] | 5:15, 5:18, | Chairman [29] | 27:14, 35:17 | confusion |
| 39:8, 39:14, | 26:1, 29:1, | 5:20, 6:14, | 1:13, 2:8, | comment [9] | 43:19 |
| 39:18, | 33:15 | 6:16, 6:18, | 9:10, 9:19, | 4:15, 7:3, | consequences |
| 39:21, 40:7, |  | 6:20, 6:22, | 9:22, 11:22, | 8:2, 14:15, | - 38 |
| 40:15, | C | 6:24, 7:1, | 12:10, | 19:5, 46:8, | Conservatio |
| 40:17, |  | 7:19, 7:23, | 12:12, 13:6, | 46:18, | 5:3 |
| 40:19, | can't - 46:4 | 8:8, 8:11, | 13:11, 14:2, | 46:19, 46:22 | consider [2] |
| 41:11, | care - 9:7 | 8:20, 8:24, | 14:8, 14:16, | comments | 31:13, 44:9 |
| 41:12, | carries [4] | 9:12, 9:17, | 15:12, | [14] 3:23, | consideration |
| 41:13, | 4:13, 25:22, | 10:24, | 15:22, 17:3, | 5:9, 8:12, | [2] 6:11, |
| 41:18, | 29:15, 46:16 | 11:11, 13:4, | 17:7, 18:13, | 8:20, 11:8, | 40:16 |
| 41:21, | case [28] 5:7, | 15:18, | 19:6, 20:9, | 13:5, 17:1, | contain [2] |
| 41:22, | 5:20, 6:9, | 15:23, | 22:4, 26:13, | 25:12, | 10:22, 50:12 |
| 41:24, | 8:14, 10:7, | 16:18, 17:6, | 27:3, $28: 1$ | 27:25, | contested |
| 42:10, | 11:6, 11:19, | 18:10, | 28:19, 29:7, | 34:13, | 43:24 |
| 42:23, | 15:19, 16:3, | 18:14, | 37:12, | 34:16, | context - 24:4 |
| 42:23, 43:5, | 17:13, | 18:18, 19:1, | 44:13, 44:25 | 41:11, | contin |
| 43:10, | 18:11, | 19:8, 19:19, | challenges [3] | 44:24, 47:15 | 14:25 |
| 43:14, | 18:14, 19:3, | 19:22, | 14:3, 15:6, | commission | continued |
| 43:22, | 20:21, 21:3, | 20:11, | 15:6 | 50:22 | 15:12 |
| 44:13, | 21:4, 24:3, | 20:17, | change [2] | Commissioners | convenes |
| 44:15, | 24:12, | 21:11, | 7:14, 42:6 | [2] 5:2, 5:5 | 40:6 |
| 44:18, | 25:18, | 21:24, 22:3, | changed - | commit [4] | conversation |
| 44:23, | 26:25, 28:3, | 22:9, 22:12, | 41:15 | 3:1, 14:25, | 30:7 |
| 44:25, 45:1, | 29:2, 32:4, | 22:20, | changes [8] | 15:12, 18:4 | correct [14] |
| 45:10, | 32:10, | 22:24, 23:9, | 41:3, 43:1, | common [2] | 4:21, 4:22, |
| 45:14, | 32:15, | 23:16, | 43:4, 43:17, | 33:7, 33:11 | 8:7, 12:12, |
| 45:19, | 33:19, | 23:19, 24:5, | 44:8, $44: 17$, | communicating | 15:21, |
| 45:20, | 33:21, 35:11 | 24:8, 24:11, | 44:18, 48:6 | - 19:18 | 22:16, |
| 45:23, | cases [24] | 24:21, | Chilcott - 3:9 | communication | 24:10, |
| 45:23, | 4:18, $5: 13$ | 25:11, | Christophersen | [3] 15:1 | 33:23, 35:4, |
| 45:25, | 7:25, 29:21, | 25:14, | - 3:13 | 15:13, 19:11 | 35:5, 39:7, |
| 46:20, $46: 3$ | $30: 8,30: 14$, | 25:20, | circumstances | Comp - 47:6 | 47:7, 48:7, |
| 46:25, 47:3, | 30:22, 31.5 | 25:22, | - 32:3 Civil [2] | company [2] | 48:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 11,48: 5 \\ & 48: 20,48: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $30: 25,31: 5$, $31: 19$, | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 24, \\ & 26: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Civil[2] } \\ & 31: 19,31: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 8:18, 10:15 Compensation | correction $3: 23$ |
| Board's [6] | 32:21, | 26:25, | clarification - | - 47:5 | correctly |
| 10:23, | 32:22, | 27:24, | 45:12 | compliance - | 24:11 |
| 29:22, 37:2, | 32:24, $33: 9$, | 28:12, | clarify - 22:21 | 23:23 | Counsel [2] |
| 40:4, 43:16, | 33:24, 34:2, | 28:16, | clarity - 39:20 | compliment | 3:5, 9:14 |
| 43:20 | 34:22, | 28:22, | Clark [3] 5:2, | 29:5 | County [7] |
| bold [2] 7:6, | 35:16, | 28:24, 29:4, | 50:4, 50:7 | comply - 24:1 | 5:1, 5:5, |


| 5:5, | 6:1, 20:13, | 41:8, 43:3 | 17:12, | etc - 5: | 36:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19:24, | 35:2, 48:5 | DEQ's [4] | 18:21, 24:3 | evaluating [2] | extend [2 |
| 20:24, 50:4, | decisions [2] | 21:10, 22:6, | disturbing | 10:2, 12:8 | 38:4, 38:7 |
| 50:6 | 18:7, 46:4 | 22:7, 23:10 | 24:18 | everybody [4] | extends |
| couple [6] | deep [2] 42:1, | desire - 33:24 | dive [2] 42:1, | 36:14, | 44:1 |
| 5:7, 14:19 | 44:20 | detail - 10:7 | 44:20 | 44:22, | extensions [2] |
| 22:25, | deferred | details - 19:2 | drafted - 38:3 | 47:23, 48:24 | 36:24, 37:4 |
| 24:23, | 20:2 | determination | drag [2] 16:3, | everyone [2] | extensive |
| 39:17, 42:15 | define - 44:21 | [6] 10:4, | 29:21 | 2:5, 9:21 | $6:$ |
| course [7] | defined [2] | 10:13, | dragging | everyone's | extent - 40 |
| 23:12, | 31:25, 32: | 17:20, |  | 31:11 | eye [2] 39:4, |
| 31:18, | definitely [8] | 23:20, 26: | drive - | everything [3] | 46:3 |
| 32:24, 40:2, | 19:14, | determine - | driving | 7:22, 8:19, |  |
| 41:8, 43:13, | 26:24, | 10:9 | 35:12 | 10:22 | F |
| 45:12 | 31:12, | develop | drop-41:5 | evid |  |
| courses [2] | 33:23, | 10:10 | due [3] 5:22, | 32:14 | facing - 15:7 |
| 23:4, 23:7 | 35:22, | developing [3] | 8:15, 29:23 | evidenced [2] | facts - 32:3 |
| court [14] | 41:16, 44:5, | 10:11, 45:9, | dusting - | 30:19, 33:14 | fairly [2] |
| 1:23, 3:4, | 44:14 | 45:17 | 42:12 | evident - | 9:23, $22: 25$ |
| 4:18, 4:24, | definition [3] | developments |  | 30:11 | fall - $39: 18$ |
| 5:16, 17:13, | 31:25, | [3] 7:8, 7:21, | E | evil-38:24 | familiar |
| 17:13, | 39:25, 40:13 | 7:25 |  | exact - 11:21 | 19 |
| 18:11, | delay [3] | difficult | earlier [3] | examinatio | fashion - 7:6 |
| 18:21, | 17:11, 18:6, | 14:22 | 9:3, $21: 8$, | 23:3 | favor [6] 4:9, |
| 18:23, 24:3 | 18:25 | direct [2] | 30:25 | Examiner [16] | 25:18, |
| 36:7, 50:5, | Department | 45:8, 45:16 | easier [2] | 6:1, 16:16, | 29:11, |
| 50:21 | [14] 14:20, | directed | 7:4, 8:1 | 16:20, $21: 9$ | 44:14, |
| covered | 14:21, 15:7, | 3 | EC - 10:4 | 26:4, 26:8, | 46:12, $48: 24$ |
| 47 | 15:13, 20:5, | Director - 3:5 | efficient | 26:17, | feel [3] |
| criteria - 10:6 | 20:12, | discovery [2] | 16 | 26:21, $30: 9$, | 10:19 |
| critical - 37:3 | 20:14, | 35:24, 38:11 | efficiently | 30:15, | 14:20, 28:8 |
| Crowley - 3:7 | 20:19, | discrete | 29:6 | 30:21, | feeling - |
| Crutcher [4] | 20:23, 27:2, | 27 | effort - 33:21 | 30:25, | 40:11 |
| 1:22, 3:4 | 27:25, 28:5, | discretion | eight [4] | 32:12, | Fehr - 3:5 |
| 50:5, 50:20 | 43:14, 44:10 | 16:19 | 11:20, | 32:16, | fifteen |
| current - 36:6 | Department's | discretionary - | 15:25, | 33:19, 35:22 | 47:25 |
| currently [3] | [2] 17:18, | $32: 8$ | 34:23, 35:11 | Examiner's [5] | figure [2] |
| 12:5, 13:18, | 24:17 | discuss - 31:6 | either [3] | 16:8, $21: 19$, | 8:17, 35:10 |
| 32:22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { dependent [2] } \\ 12: 19,32: 2 \end{gathered}$ | discussed [2] $42: 14,47: 15$ | $16: 21,19:$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 21, \\ & 22: 14,25: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { file - } 20: 3$ |
| D | depends | discus | El | Examiners [6] | 20 |
|  | 38:19 | [18] 4:7, | Eleven-6: | 31:17, 32:9, | 21:3, 21:7, |
| data [6] 10:3, | Deputy - 3:4 | 6:10, 22:21, | Elizabeth | 33:20, 36:9, | 21:13, |
| 10:14, | DEQ [40] 3:6, | 25:12, 29:2, | 3:10 | 37:2, 38:10 | 21:18, 26:6 |
| $10: 15,11: 2,$ | 3:7, 3:8, | 29:9, $29: 17$, | $\text { Emily - } 3: 10$ | exceed - 10:5 |  |
| $\text { 11:7, } 12: 8$ | 3:10, 3:11, | 29:18, 34:4, | enabling - | exception - | final [3] |
| date [3] 8:19, | 3:11, 3:13, | 34:14, | 41:17 | 21:19 | 11:12, |
| 18:15, 24:19 | 3:15, 3:16, | 36:18, $39: 9$ | Energy [3] | exceptions [2] | 21:22, 22:7 |
| dates - 18:23 | 3:16, 3:17, | 39:15, | 4:19, 9:7, | 20:3, 21:16 | finally - 36:20 |
| Dating - | 4:19, 4:25, | 40:18, | 18:14 | excuse [2] | findings [2] |
| 15:23 | 9:6, 9:11, | 40:21, | enforcement | 30:17, 32:7 | 22:15, 25:16 |
| DAVID - 1:13 | 11:18, 12:8, | 41:11, | 25:3 | existing [2] | firm - 13:25 |
| deadlines [4] | 12:14, | 45:24, 46:10 | ensure | 10:3, 11:2 | five [4] 2:24, |
| 16:7, 16:10, | 12:18, | discussions | 32:12 | expanding [2] | 15:25, |
| 16:14, 33:10 | 12:20, 13:7, | 39:19 | enter - 22:6 | 40:13, 40:14 | 18:19, 26:1 |
| December [6] | 13:12, | dismiss - 26:7 | entirely [2] | expected - 6:2 | Fleck - 3:7 |
| 6:2, 6:6, | 13:15, 18:8, | dismissing [4] | 43:15, 43:25 | expert - 40:20 | flexible - 32:1 |
| 15:14, | 20:20, 21:7, | 26:8, $26: 10$ | environmental | expires - | floor - 27:1 |
| 16:25, 48:1, | 21:13, | 28:20, 28:25 | [5] 1:1, 4:25, | 50:22 | flux - 44:16 |
| 48:11 | 21:20, | disposal - | 5:4, 25:9, | explained | focusing - |
| decide - 23:25 | 23:20, | 24:23 | 41:24 | 34:20 | 43:25 |
| decided [2] | 23:24, | dispute - | especially [5] | explains | follow [2] |
| 18:11, 42:15 | 24:22, 25:7, | 23 | 19:15, | 9:24 | 7:13, 11:16 |
| deciding - | 27:6, 27:14, | disputes | 32:15, 33:8, | exploration | forefront - |
| 38:11 | 28:3, 33:8, | 38:11 | 34:5, 38:14 | 25:25 | 46:6 |
| decision [4] | 34:5, 40:3, | District [3] | et - 5:24 | express | foregoing |


| 50:12 | 7:19, 11:25, | 22:14, | 14:13 | 31:8, 40:3 | $46: 20$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| forgot - 30:24 | 13:16, | 25:14, | III - 9:1 | involving [2] | JV - $35: 11$ |
| Fork - 5:2 | 13:21, | 25:15, | impact [3] | 32:14, 41:7 |  |
| formal - 31:3 | 13:24, 14:9, | 25:25, 26:4, | 24:16, | issuance [3] | K |
| forth - 17:8 | 14:11, | 26:8, $26: 17$, | 24:20, 27:9 | 17:15, 18:2, | K |
| forward [7] | 15:11, | 26:21, | impacts - | 22:7 | Kaitly ${ }^{\text {- }}$ 3:12 |
| 11:1, 11:3, | 16:20, 20:4, | 28:16, $30: 9$, | 24:18 | issue [5] | keeping - 39:4 |
| 12:24, | 21:5, $22: 24$, | 30:14, | improve - | 17:22, 19:3, | keeps - 34:24 |
| 16:25, | 24:15, 25:3, | 30:21, | 39:25 | 26:12, 27:9, | kicking - |
| 22:25, 28:9, | 29:4, 30:13, | 30:25, | in-person [2] | 48:12 | 16:24 |
| 34:25 | 35:18, $36: 5$, | 31:16, 32:9, | 47:21, 48:10 | issued [4] | kidding |
| fourth - 36:1 | 36:20, | 32:11, | Inc.'s - 11:12 | 20:22, | 38:13 |
| frame [5] | 37:13, | 32:16, | included [2] | 23:13, 26:4, | Kirsten [2] |
| 13:7, 13:17, | 38:25, | 33:19, | 7:15, 7:17 | 26:8 | 9:13, 11:24 |
| 14:23, 15:2, | 39:17, | 33:20, | including - | issues [7] | Kootenai - |
| 15:9 | 40:18, 48:12 | 35:21, 36:9, | 41:7 | 6:7, 6:8, | 3:17 |
| frames [2] | guidance - | 36:12, 37:2, | inconsistent | $13: 21$, | Kurt [4] 3:6, |
| 12:6, 14:14 | 31:20 | 38:10, 46:24 | 39:23 | 13:22, | 9:11, 11:23, |
| free - 10:19 | guys [2] 7:16, | hearings - | incorporate - | 16:22, | 13:12 |
| frequent - $34: 6$ | 19:18 | 31:18 | 43:4 | 20:16, 32:15 |  |
| 34:6 |  | held - 16:6 | incorporates | issuing - | L |
| 36:4 | H | 47 | increased | item [7] 3:21, | lack [2] |
| front [8] | Hagen - $3: 9$ | helpful [3] | 43:18 | 4:23, 19:22, | 39:20, 4 |
| 16:13, | happen - 18:8 | 7:18, 7:20, | indicated | 25:24, | language [3] |
| 18:12, | happened [5] | 45:5 | 7:6 | 25:24, | 22:13, |
| 18:24, 31:5, | 7:16, 8:6, | Here's - 38:13 | informal [4] | 39:14, 46:18 | 40:23, 44:3 |
| 36:6, 36:12, | 10:22, | hereby - 50:7 | 31:1, 31:3, | items [5] | later - 27:12 |
| 38:5, 47:11 | 37:19, 44:17 | herein - 50:9 | 31:9, 31:12 | 4:14, 8:22, | Laurie [4] |
| frustration - | happening [2] | hereunto - | information | $8: 25,29: 17,$ | 1:22, 3:3, |
| 39:19 function | 5:6, 17:1 | 50:15 | [8] 12:3, | $39: 15$ | 50:5, 50:20 |
| 43:23 | 23:18 | highest - | 13:15, | J | $-1: 24$ |
| functions | happy [7] | 27:11 | 13:19, 23:1, |  | law [3] 22:15, |
| 43:23 | 7:14, 7:1 | Highlands [5] | 45:5, 45:17 | James - $3: 5$ | 25:17, 48:16' |
| future - 27:15 | 16:11, | 26:1, 26:15, | infrastructure | JENNIFER - | laws - $41: 21$ |
|  | 16:15, 27:4, | 29:1, 33:15, | - 27:16 | 1:16 | lawsuit - 40:3 |
| G | 27:21, 34:3 | 35:11 | initial [2] | Jessica [3] | League - 5:3 |
| abriell | Hardin - | highlight [2] $7: 21.7: 24$ | $23: 10,30: 23$ | 3:11, 27:6, | least [7] 6:4, |
| 3:11 | harm - 25:9 | highlighted | 21:2, 30 :3 | Johnson | 14:23, |
| general [2] | Harry [2] | 5:8 | innocuous | 3:16 | 17:11, |
| 36:8, 46:18 | 19:23, 25:17 | history [2] | 41:18 | joint [4] 5:22, | 18:19, 35:9, |
| given [2] 6:8, | Hart - 3:8 | 7:23, 18:1. | input - 34:7 | 26:6, 26:15, | 40:14 |
| 47:21 | hasn't [3] | Holland - 3:8 | insight [2] | 35:2 | leave [4] |
| giving - 37:16 | 21:4, 23:20, | Homeowners | 19:11, 19:17 | Jon [2] 1:14, | 7:22, 8:4, |
| glad - 46:4 | 47:14 | 24 | inspection | 45:1 | 16:18, 48:12 |
| Godwin - 3:13 | having [2] | Hooray | 24:25 | JOSEPH - 1:14 | leaving - |
| goes [4] 10:7, | 4:19, 42:10 | 30:15 | instead - $31: 4$ | Judge [3] 5:7, | 34:10 |
| 24:12, | hazardous [2] | hope - 42:19 | intended - | 47:6, 47:6 | led - 18:22 |
| 33:19, 44:11 | 20:23, 23:14 | hopeful-40:5 | 47:19 | judgment [8] | Lee - 47:5 |
| gone - 42:9 | hear [3] 9:10, | hopefully [5] | intent - 44:4 | 20:13, 21:7, | legal [3] 3:9, |
| govern - | 14:3, 14:22 | 11:6, 34:11, | interest [3] | 21:20, | 3:12, 32:7 |
| 31:19 | heard - $35: 1$ | $36: 15,39: 3$, $39: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 10, \\ & 36: 13,45: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 21:22, $22: 6$, | legally - |
| grant [3] | hearing [40] | 39:4 | 36:13, 45:22 | 22:16, | 31:25 |
| $22: 6,37: 14$, $37: 18$ | 4:1, 6:1 | hopper-41:5 | interested | 25:17, 38:11 | legislation |
| 37:18 | 8:24, 11:1, | hour-47:25 | 41:9 | judicial [2] | 41:17 |
| granted [6] | 16:7, 16:16, |  | internal | 18:6, 24:4 | legislative [2] |
| 21:9, $31: 22$, | 16:19, | I | 13:22 | Julia [5] 1:15, | 40:20, 43:2 |
| 31:22, | 18:17, |  | internally [2] | 22:11, | Legislature |
| $32: 23$, $37: 20,38: 21$ | 19:23, | Idaho - 5:3 | 13:16, 23:25 | 37:13, | [6] 39:15, |
| 37:20, 38:21 | 20:25, 21:9, | idea [3] 34:9, | interrupting | 40:19, 42:8 | 40:6, 41:1, |
| granting [4] | 21:13, | 45:6, 45:9 | 30:18 | July [3] 16:6, | 42:19, |
| $26: 5,29: 19$, $33: 12,38: 1$ | 21:14, | ideally - 25:6 | involve | 21:10, $26: 5$ | 43:13, $45: 18$ |
| $33: 12,38: 1$ guess [24] | 21:19, | ideas - 45:11 | 23:14 | June - 12:16 | length [2] |
| guess [24] | 21:21, | identify | involved [2] | jurisdiction - |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & 35: 19, \\ & 47: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5: 8,47: 1 \\ \text { Matthew }- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 11,14: 8, \\ & 14: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 21,20: 17, \\ & 26: 13 \end{aligned}$ | needed - $28: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 3,12: 2, \\ & 15: 16,21: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| let's [6] 2:6, | 3:18 | 20:18, 23:9, | Moser [16] | needs [3] | 50:17 |
| 4:15, 19:22, | maybe [5] | 23:19, | 3:6, 9:10, | 41:6, 41:15, | odd - 37:14 |
| 27:1, 35:24, | 8:5, 36:4, | 24:21, | 9:11, 9:13, | 45:21 | offering |
| 44:2 | 38:24, 40:4, | 26:14, 27:4, | 9:21, 11:22, | negative | 33:15 |
| letter [2] | 42:5 | 40:8, $45: 10$, | 11:23, | 24:20 | oil [2] 23:8, |
| 20:25, 23:11 | meeting [29] | 46:19 | 12:21, 13:4, | negotiations | 23:8 |
| letters - 21:3 | 1:5, 2:6, | mentioned [4] | 13:11, | 33:14 | ongoing |
| level - 41:16 | 3:22, 4:4, | 23:11, 31:1, | 13:12, 14:7, | Neither | 12:21 |
| Lewis [2] | 6:3, 6:11, | 41:21, 41:22 | 14:8, 14:17, | 21:18 | Oomens [24] |
| 50:4, 50:6 | 7:5, 7:17, | Mercer [19] | 15:19, 19:10 | nice - 41:25 | 3:6, 4:21, |
| license - 26:1 | 8:6, 10:23, | 3:7, 9:17, | Moser's | Nick [2] 3:6, | 7:13, 7:22, |
| licenses [2] | 13:3, 15:2, | 9:19, 10:18, | 12:11 | 20:18 | 8:4, 8:10, |
| 31:8, 31:14 | 15:17, 17:9, | 10:20, | motion [22] | nonanthr | C:13, 16:5, |
| likely - 48:1 | 20:1, 20:2, | 11:17, 12:1, | 4:2, 4:3, | - 10:10 | 16:9, 26:22, |
| Limited - 5:4 | 21:15, | 12:10, | 4:6, 4:13, | none [5] 4:1, | 29:24, |
| limits - 10:12 | 29:18, | 14:15, | 21:7, 21:9, | 8:24, $25: 14$, | 29:25, $30: 1$, |
| Lincoln [3] | 30:20, 31:1, | 14:16, | 21:10, | 28:16, 46:24 | 30:11, |
| 5:5, 19:24, | 34:10, | 15:18, | 21:13, $22: 5$, | nonenforcement | 30:16, |
| 20:24 | 47:19, | 15:22, 17:3, | 22:6, 22:22, | - 5:13 | 30:19, 35:5, |
| litigation [3] | 47:20, | 17:6, 17:7, | 23:17, | Normal - | 35:21, 37:5, |
| 36:6, 36:7, | 47:21, | 18:12, | 23:18, | 15:24 | 37:8, 37:21, |
| 44:10 | 47:24, 48:1, | 18:15, | 25:14, | notarial | 39:1, 39:7, |
| Lodman - 3:10 | 48:11, | 18:21, 19:10 | 25:22, 26:7, | 50:16 | 48:8 |
| looking [10] | 48:17, 48:23 | met - 32:10 | 28:17, | Notary [3] | open [3] |
| 11:1, 12:24, | MEIC [2] | milestone - | 28:19, | 1:23, 50:6 | 40:21, |
| 17:20, 18:1, | 4:18, 5:2 | 9:9 | 29:15, 45:8, | 50:21 | 41:11, 48:12 |
| 25:4, 37:3, | member [50] | mind [5] | 46:16, 48:19 | note [5] | opencut [4] |
| 42:25, 43:1, | 2:4, 2:11, | 31:11, | Moudy [2] | 30:23, | 5:25, 6:7, |
| 43:8, $44: 14$ | 2:12, 2:14, | 40:22, 46:6 | 5:25, 48:2 | 32:11, | 48:5, 48:15 |
| looks [3] | 2:15, 2:18, | 47:2, 48:14 | move [8] | 33:18, 47:3, | operation - |
| 8:19, 11:2, | 2:20, 2:21, | Mine - 11:13 | 8:25, 17 | 48:19 | 11:5 |
| 32:22 | 2:22, 4:3, | mining [2] | 19:22, 22:5, | noted - 12:14 | opinion [2] |
| Loryn-3:16 | 4:5, 13:6, | 5:25, 9:2 | 28:9, $39: 11$, | notes - 47:10 | 16:12, 38:1 |
| lost [3] 34:8, | 14:1, 19:7, | minute [2] | 45:16, 46:24 | nothing [2] | opportune |
| 34:10, 47:3 | 19:8, 19:9, | 41:6, 47:19 | moved [5] | 41:25, 47:14 | 45:3 |
| loud - $35: 18$ | 22:1, 22:3, | minutes [4] | 22:12, | notice - 24:14 | opportunity |
| lower - 30:7 | 22:4, 22:10, | 3:22, 3:23, | 28:24, | November [2] | [5] 20:3, |
|  | 22:18, | 4:4, 47:25 | 45:15, | 5:22, 8:15 | 32:13, |
| M | 25:23, | miss - 23:5 | 48:20, 48:22 | Nowakowski - | 32:18, |
|  | 28:18, | mista | moving [5] | 3:17 | 33:16, 48:18 |
| main - $32: 11$ | 28:23, $30: 2$, | 45:20 | 5:12, 11:3 | Numeral - 9:1 | opposed [6] |
| making [2] | 30:4, 34:18, | mistaken | 19:14, |  | 4:11, $25: 20$, |
| 10:25, 46:4 | 35:8, $35: 9$, | 14:7 | 29:17, 36:11 | 0 | 29:13, |
| MAPA [5] | 35:13, | mitigate [2] | MPDES [4] |  | 32:25, |
| 31:1, 31:3, | 36:17, | 24:6, 25:9 | 11:13, 12:7, | observation | 46:14, 49:1 |
| 31:9, 31:12, | 37:12, | MOISEY-SC | R15:20, 15:24 | 29:20 | option-31:14 |
| 31:19 | 38:22, 39:3, | [12] 2:8, | MT0021229 | obtain - 23:22 | options |
| March [3] | 39:8, 40:19, | 2:10, 2:12, | 11:13 | obtaining | 29:25 |
| 20:23, 22:8, | 41:12, | 2:15, 2:18, | multiple - | 10:15 | oral [2] |
| 50:23 | 41:13, | 2:21, 2:23, | 33:9 | obvious | 12:13, 21:12 |
| Marquis [7] | 42:23, | 3:3, 19:6 | myself - 35:9 | 47:22 | order [21] |
| 3:7, $26: 13$, | 42:24, | 20:9, 22:1, |  | obviously [5] | 2:6, 16:5, |
| 26:15, 27:1, | 44:13, | 47:8 | N | 17:22, $25: 8$, | 18:22, |
| 27:3, 27:24, | 44:23, | money - 34:1 |  | 30:20, | 20:22, 21:1, |
| 28:13 | 44:25, | Montana [8] | naive - 40:5 | 31:17, 41:9 | 21:20, |
| matter [9] | 45:14, | 1:2, 17:13, | named - 50:9 | occasioned - | 21:22, 22:7, |
| 11:11, | 45:25, 47:4, | 23:13, | narrative - | 17:11 | 22:8, 22:16, |
| 12:15, | 47:12, | 31:18, | 17:10 | occasions | 23:12, |
| 17:24, | 47:13, | 31:21, 43:3, | nearby - | 40:8 | 23:23, |
| 20:20, 21:6, | 48:20, 48:21 | 50:2, 50:7 | 23:12 | occurred [3] | 23:24, 24:1, |
| 21:12, | members [17] | months | necessarily - | 24:14, | 24:5, $25: 17$, |
| 25:25, | 1:14, 3:24, | 21:18 | 13:25 | 24:23, 24:25 | 26:4, 26:8, |
| 34:14, 46:20 | 8:2, 9:22, | morning [5] | necessary - | October [7] | 26:10, |
| matters [2] | 11:22, | 2:5, 9:19, | 38:23 | 1:6, 1:10, | 28:20, 28:25 |


| orders - 24:17 | permit [14] | 38:15 | 4, 44:8, | 22, 44:7 | , |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ostermayer - | 6:8, 11:13, | prefer-16:17 | 45:8 | real-44:20 | 1:14, 2:19, |
| 3:11 | 12:4, 12:7, | prejudice [4] | proposed [2] | reality - 36: | 2:20, 4:5, |
| others [2] | 13:10, | 26:9, $26: 11$, | 22:14, 25:16 | realize | 44:25, 45:1, |
| 41:10, 45:22 | 13:18, | 28:21, 29:1 | proposing - | 36:10 | 45:14 |
| otherwise [2] | 15:20, | preparation | 42:21 | realizing | related [2] |
| 14:6, 46:21 | 15:24, | 48:16 | provide | 30:6 | 13:23, $21:$ |
| ought [3] | 15:24, | prepared [3] | 18:16 | really [17] | remove |
| 16:1, 16:2, | 17:16, | 1:22, 42:9, | provided [4] | 4:14, 10:22, | 24:19 |
| 40:15 | 17:23, 1 | 42:14 | 7:5, 9:23, | 12:19, 13:2, | removing |
| outcome [3] | 19:16, 48:5 | present [7] | 12:12, 12:2 | 18:24, 19:2, | 24:8 |
| 28:5, 35:11, | permits | 2:4, 3:15, | providing [2] | 19:12, $21: 4$, | renewal [6] |
| 37:15 | 13:22 | 15:4, 25:23 | 19:10, 19:17 | 27:9, $33: 16$, | 12:4, 12:7, |
| outcomes | permitti | 32:2, 32:14, | public [10] | 38:19, | 13:10, |
| 35:10 | 13:23 | 45:11 | 1:23, 45:21 | 42:16, 44 | 15:20, |
| outdated | perspe | presented | 46:3, 46:3, | 45:5, 46: | 17:16, 18 |
| 42:3 | [2] 42:7, 43 | 42:17 | 46:18 | 46:25, 47: | renewing |
| overarch | Pettis - $3: 8$ | pre |  | reason [8] | 13:18 |
| 3:5 | phase - 35:2 |  | 46:19, | 32:1, $32: 6$ | repeated |
| overnight | pick - 7:7 | presume [4] | 46:22, 50:6, | 33:12, 36:2, | 36:23 |
| 41:4 | Pit [2] 5:25 | 4:20, 6:4, | 50:21 | 37:23, 38:8, | report [4] |
|  |  |  | pull - 42:16 | 45:18, 48: | 5:22, 8:1 |
| P | place | previous [2] | P | reasonable [4] | 11:16, 11:1 |
|  | places - 41:19 | 3:22, 30:20 | 33 | 13:17, | reported - |
| pages - 50:12 | plaintiffs - | primary [2] | purpose | 14:14, | 50:10 |
| paragraph [2] | 6:9 | 43:23, 43:23 | 44:20 | 27:20, 37:4 | Reporter [4] |
| 8:5, 10:21 | plan [4] | print - 7:11 | putting | reasoning | 1:23, 3:4, |
| paragraphs | 10:12, | prior - 23:24 | 33:20 | 37:22 | 50:5, 50:21 |
| 5:9 | 10:16, 25:7, | probably [5] |  | reasonings | represent - |
| parallel - 19:3 | 48:15 | 16:14, 19:4, | Q | 33:6 | 26:15 |
| partially | play - 41:22 | 38:24 |  | recap [3] | Representatives |
| 34:19 | played | 42:11 | qualified | 20:5, 20:12 | - 9:6 |
| participated - | 21:17 | procedure [6] | 25: | 20:21 | representing |
| 21:4 | pleadings | 31:2, 31:3, | quality | receive [2] | [2] 20:7, |
| parties [26] | 38:2 | 31:9, 31:12, | 10:6, 23:15 | 11:15, 13:19 | 20:20 |
| 14:12, | please [6] | 31:19, 31:21 | quasi-judicial | receiving | request [7] |
| 16:13, | 2:7, 3:1, | procedures - | - $43: 22$ | 10:5 | 14:2, 19:23, |
| 17:19, 26:6, | 7:2, 8 | 45:23 | questioning | recent [3] | 25:25, 38:8, |
| 26:17, | 9:8, 12:1 | proceedings | [2] 19:12, | 7:8, 7:25, | 38:16, |
| 26:23, 2 | pleased | [6] 1:8, 2:1, | 19:13 | 36:12 | 38:17, 38:19 |
| 31:2, 31:6, | 10:25 | 49:5, $50: 8$, | quick - 7:13 | recently - | requested [3] |
| 31:13, | point [13 | 50:10, 50:13 | quicker - | 12:9 | 33:6, 35:23, |
| 32:13, | 12:17, | process [22] | 36:16 | rec | 35:25 |
| 32:16, | 12:19, | 4:24, 9:24, | quickly [5] | [3] 27:10, | requesting [9] |
| 32:17, 33 | 12:22, | 10:2, 12:4, | 7:7, 18:5, | 27:13, 28:10 | 20:25, |
| 33:2, $33: 15$ | 13:25, | 12:21, 13:9, | 29:6, 30:2 | recognize - | 21:14, |
| 34:5, 35:3, | 17:19, | 18:5, 21:16, | 33:25 | 29:23 | 21:20, 25:5, |
| 35:6, 35:15, | 18:18, | 21:17, | quite [4] | Recognizing | 32:16, 36:1, |
| 36:10, | 19:13, $23:$ | 29:23, | 5:21, 7: | 48:11 | 36:3, 37:24, |
| 36:16, | 24:2, $37: 1$, | 30:22, | 11:20, 16:4 | record [5] | 38:9 |
| 37:24, 38:4, | 37:18, | 33:24, 34:6, | quorum - 2:23 | 3:1, 3:18 | requests |
| 38:12, 41:8 | 38:25, 40:4 | 34:24, |  | 22:21, 23:2, | 27:15 |
| party [4] | portion | 35:24, 36 | R | 50:13 | require - 18: |
| 21:18, 33:3, | 38:17 | 36:7, $36: 8$ |  | reference [2] | required |
| 36:11, 41:9 | posed - 12:14 | 38:4, 38:7, | Rankosky [4] | 23:3, 37:17 | 10:14 |
| Peak - 4:23 | position [2] | 38:18, 45:21 | $1: 16,2: 4,$ | references [2] | reset - 21:14 resolution - |
| pending [5] | $15: 4,15: 11$ | professions - $31: 8$ | 2:16, 25:23 | $41: 24,42: 3$ regard [2] | resolution 17:12 |
| 4:20, $5: 7$, | possible [5] | 31:8 | rather [3] | regard [2] $29: 1,43: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 12 \\ & \text { resolve [31 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5: 15,6: 1, \\ & 12: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 10,18: 5, \\ & 30: 22, \end{aligned}$ | program - $25: 3$ | $7: 8,16: 3,$ | regarding [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { resolve [3] } \\ & 16: 2,27: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| per - 36:5 | 33:25, 45:17 | progress | Ray - 3:17 | 5:24, 29:19, | 36:16 |
| perception [3] | potential [2] | 11:1 |  | 39:20 | resolved [2] |
| 34:20, | 24:18, 24:20 | property [2] | :21 | regardless | 27:5, 40:6 |
| 34:21, 35:19 | potentially | 27:12, 27:16 | ready [4] | 44 | Resources |
| periods - | 47:20 | propose [5] | 39:11, 41:1, | regulate - <br> 31.17 | 11:12 |
| 29:21 | practicing - | 15:9, 15:14, | 30.11, 41.1, | $31: 17$ | respect [2] |


| 12:15, | 23:22, | 16:1, 22:24, | 22:20, | 30:13, 30:17 | 38:20, 39:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18:8 | 23:25, 25:5, | 29:20, 36:2, | 22:24, 23:9, | sort [5] 14:2, | stayed [3] |
| respond [3] | 25:18 | 38:23 | 23:16, | 14:5, 15:4, | 8:17, 33:19, |
| 21:8, 32:13, | Rippling | sense [5] | 23:19, 24:5, | 15:5, 23:12 | 33:25 |
| 32:18 | 5:23 | 11:25, | 24:8, 24:11, | sought - | stays [20] |
| responded [3] | road [4] | 14:19, | 24:21, | 12:23 | 29:19, |
| 12:15, | 16:24, | 37:19, | 25:11, | sounds [2] | 31:16, |
| 14:21, 17:18 | 27:10, | 38:18, 47:23 | 25:14, | 34:19, 34:21 | 31:21, |
| response [40] | 40:18, 41:2 | senses - 38:3 | 25:20, | speak [2] 7:2, | 32:23, |
| 2:17, 3:25, | role [2] | September [2] | 25:22, | 27:2 | 32:25, 33:6, |
| 4:8, $4: 10$, | 43:11, 43:20 | 26:6, 26:9 | 25:24, | specific [3] | 33:12, 35:6, |
| 4:12, 5:11, | roll - 2:7 | serve - $31: 20$ | 26:20, | 40:22, | 35:15, $36: 1$, |
| 5:14, 5:17, | Roman - 8:25 | Services [2] | 26:25, | 41:14, 42:2 | 36:3, 36:5, |
| 5:19, 6:13, | Rosebud [2] | 3:10, 3:12 | 27:24, | specificity - | 37:15, |
| 6:15, 6:17, | 9:2, 11:6 | setting - 16:6 | 28:12, | 44:12 | 37:18, |
| 6:19, 6:21, | row - 47:20 | settlement [8] | 28:16, | speed - 45:6 | 37:22, |
| 6:23, 6:25, | RPR [3] 1:22, | 9:2, 16:22, | 28:22, | spending - | 37:24, 38:2, |
| 8:23, 11:10, | 50:5, 50:20 | 27:17, 28:5, | 28:24, 29:4, | 34:1 | 38:9, $38: 10$, |
| 17:2, 19:21, | rulemaking | 29:6, 33:13, | 29:9, 29:11, | spent-19:4 | 38:17 |
| 20:8, 22:23, | [2] 43:13, | 33:16, 38:9 | 29:13, | SS - 50:3 | stems-20:22 |
| 25:13, | 44:18 | settlements - | 29:15, | Stacy [2] | step [2] |
| 25:19, | rules [4] | 27:19 | 30:13, | 1:15, 22:17 | 35:23, 36:5 |
| 25:21, | 31:18, | several [3] | 30:17, 34:8, | staffing [2] | Steve [2] |
| 28:15, 29:3, | 31:21, 43:5, | 6:7, 33:5, | 34:16, | 13:22, 15:6 | 39:19, 42 :14 |
| 29:10, | 43:7 | 40:8 | 36:19, 37:7, | stand - 42:11 | stipulation [2] |
| 29:12, | run [3] 33:10, | short-47:11 | 37:9, 37:12, | standard [2] | 10:1, $26: 7$ |
| 29:14, | 33:17, 38:25 | shorthand - | 39:9, 39:11, | 32:2, 32:5 | Stout - 3:17 |
| 34:15, | Ryen - 3:12 | 50:10 | 39:14, 42:8, | standards - | straight - |
| 39:10, |  | Sidney - 8:14 | 43:12, | 10:11 | 22:25 |
| 39:13, | S | Sierra - 4:18 | 44:13, | standpoint [3] | studying |
| 46:11, |  | sign - $34: 11$ | 44:23, 45:7, | 7:20, 29:22, | 44:7 |
| 46:13, | sampling [3] | Signal - 4:23 | 45:15, 46:9, | 43:17 | subject - 44:6 |
| 46:15, | 10:11, | significant - | 46:12, | stands | submission |
| 46:23, | 10:16, 11:4 | 48:6 | 46:14, | 48:16 | 12:18 |
| 47:17, | Sandy [3] | Simpson [108] | 46:16, | start [4] | submit-25:7 |
| 48:25, 49:2 | 2:6, 2:25, | 1:13, 2:5, | 46:24, 47:9, | 4:17, 11:7, | submitted [6] |
| responsibilities | 47:7 | 2:8, $2: 9$, | 47:18, 48:9, | 11:17, 30:1 | 12:3, 12:9, |
| [3] 39:21, | SAR - 10 | 2:25, 3:20, | 48:22, 49:1, | State [3] 1:2, | 12:20, 13:9, |
| 40:1, 40:15 | Sara - 3:13 | 4:1, 4:6, | 49:3 | 50:2, 50:7 | 17:14, 17:17 |
| responsibility | saving - 33:16 | 4:9, $4: 11$, | site [3] 5:25, | statement [2] | substantial |
| - 40:10 | saying - 33:2 | 4:13, 4:22, | 24:22, 26:1 | 22:16, 48:7 | 32:6 |
| rest [2] 28:2, | scattered - | 5:12, 5:15, | sitting [3] | status [7] | sufficient [2] |
| 45:1 | 39:22 | 5:18, 5:20, | 9:13, 11:23, | 5:22, 8:14, | 28:9, 32:1 |
| result [3] | schedule [2] | 6:14, 6:16, | 33:22 | 11:18, 13:1, | Sugars - 8:14 |
| 17:21, | 16:8, 27:14 | 6:18, 6:20, | sketch - 15:2 | 16:6, 16:11, | summaries |
| 17:25, 18:6 | schedules [2] | 6:22, $6: 24$, | skipped - 30:5 | 16:16 | 45:3 |
| resulting - | 33:7, 37:25 | 7:1, $7: 19$, | Smith [7] | statute [3] | summarize [2] |
| 24:14 | scheduling - | 7:23, 8:8, | 1:14, 2:21, | 31:10, | 9:7, 45:10 |
| retain - 27:15 | $6: 5$ | 8:11, 8:20, | 2:22, 28:23, | 44:21, 48:7 | summarized |
| review [10] | screen [2] | 8:24, 9:12, | 44:13, | statutes [7] | 9:4 |
| 1:1, 3:21, | 34:9, 34:12 | 9:17, 10:24, | 44:24, 48:21 | 39:20, | summarizes |
| 5:1, 5:4, | seal - 50:16 | 11:11, 13:4, | smoothing - | 39:23, | 10:20 |
| 7:4, 13:8, | season-43:2 | 15:18, | 44:5 | 40:13, | summary [14] |
| 14:5, 25:7, | seconded [7] | 15:23, | soil [2] 24:9, | 41:20, | 12:11, |
| 32:21, 41:24 | 4:7, 22:13, | 16:18, 17:6, | 24:19 | 43:21, | 20:13, |
| reviewing [2] | 22:22, | 18:10, | somebody - | 44:12, 45:11 | 20:14, 21:7, |
| 13:14, 13:19 | 25:15, | 18:14, | 27:2 | statutory [3] | 21:19, |
| revoked - | 28:25, | 18:18, 19:1, | somehow | 21:15, | 21:22, 22:6, |
| 31:14 | 45:16, 48:23 | 19:6, 19:8, | 34:24 | 39:25, 41:3 | 22:15, |
| Richards [13] | section - 17:5 | 19:19, | someone [3] | stay [12] | 25:17, |
| 19:24, 20:2, | seeing - 6:5 | 19:22, 20:9, | 11:17, | 26:5, 32:17, | 26:12, |
| 20:6, 20:7, | seem [2] | 20:11, | 26:19, 39:5 | 32:20, 33:4, | 38:11, 42:9, |
| 20:24, | 29:21, 37:4 | 20:18, | somewhere - | 34:24, 35:3, | 42:25, 43:6 |
| 20:25, 21:8, | seemed - 27:8 | 21:11, | 34:12 | 35:4, 35:7, | supplied |
| 23:11, | seems [7] | 21:24, 22:3, | Sonja-3:16 | 35:23, | 14:20 |
| 23:13, | 10:17, 14:4, | 22:9, 22:12, | sorry [2] | 38:16, | suppose |


| 43:24 | 35:23, 35:25 | 15:19, | 14:21, | 24:16, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supreme [4] | thing [7] 7:9, | 19:25, 20:4, | 19:16, | 24:19, 32:2, |  |
| 5:16, 17:13, | 15:5, 32:10, | 20:15, 36:15 | 22:21, | 32:9, $40: 17$ |  |
| 18:11, 18:22 | 34:12, 39:6, | understood | 26:16, | Whitaker [10] |  |
| suspended - | 41:4, 43:15 | [2] 18:10, | 27:11, | 3:6, $20: 17$, |  |
| 31:15 | thinking - | 22:20 | 27:19, 30:2, | 20:19, |  |
|  | 39:24 | unfortunately | 31:6, 31:10 | 21:25, 23:9, |  |
| T | third [3] | - $31: 13$ | waste [3] | 23:19, 24:7, |  |
|  | 4:25, 36:1, | unlawful | 20:23, 23:8, | 24:10, |  |
| table - 15:15 | 39:6 | 24:23 | 23:14 | 24:21, 25:11 |  |
| tail - 30:6 | though - | unless - 19:5 | waters - 10:5 | Whitfield - |  |
| taken [2] | 38:23 | unusual - | wave - 26:18 | 3:12 |  |
| 47:24, 50:8 | thoughts - | 30:15 | we'd [2] 25:7, | whole [3] 7:9, |  |
| taking - 44:20 | 37:11 | up-to-date - | 37:1 | 8:5, 31:7 |  |
| Teck[2] 5:1, | throw [2] | 43:6 | we'll [8] 6:5, | Wilkerson [6] |  |
| 5:4 | 41:10, 41:14 | update [7] | 8:25, 10:3, | 3:11, 27:7, |  |
| Terisa [13] | timeline [3] | 9:4, 9:23, | 13:16, | 28:1, 28:2, |  |
| 3:5, 7:1, | 13:25, 14:2, | 10:7, 10:21, | 16:24, 18:3, | 28:14, 29:7 |  |
| 8:12, 26:20, | 14:5 | 16:25, | 46:24, 48:12 | wise [2] 41:4, |  |
| 30:18, | timelines - | 26:16, 46:25 | we're [17] | 48:17 |  |
| 34:17, | 19:15 | updated [2] | 9:24, 10:2, | within-46:20 |  |
| 34:20, | timely [2] | 11:18, 26:19 | 10:9, 10:25, | WITNESS - |  |
| 36:18, | 27:5, 27:21 | updates - 7:4 | 12:4, 12:5, | 50:15 |  |
| 36:20, 37:7, | today [6] | upon [2] | 12:19, | Woods - 5:23 |  |
| 37:18, | 9:14, 11:16, | 12:20, 12:20 | 12:23, 18:1, | workable - |  |
| 38:22, 48:7 | 21:14, | using - 50:11 | 25:5, 35:24, | 40:25 |  |
| term - 15:24 | 21:15, | usually - | 40:2, 42:20, | Workers - |  |
| terms [2] | 21:21, 33:15 | 31:22 | 42:25, | 47:5 |  |
| 17:23, 35:19 | top-34:1 |  | 42:25, 46:2, | Workman's - |  |
| thank [31] | topic [2] | V | 47:11 | 47:6 |  |
| 2:25, 3:20, | 14:18, 39:12 |  | we've [9] | works - 44:19 |  |
| 9:12, 10:24, | Torske - 3:10 | vacuum | 14:20, | written - 10:4 |  |
| 13:4, 14:1, | total - 32:23 | 45:20 | 17:17, 19:4, | wrong - 34:12 |  |
| 14:17, | totality - 32:3 | Valley - 3:17 | 23:23, |  |  |
| 15:18, | towards [2] | value - 27:11 | 36:22, | Y |  |
| 19:10, | 12:6, 14:12 | various [4] | 42:18, |  |  |
| 19:16, | track [2] 8:1, | 7:25, 41:7, | 43:24, | yet-30:14 |  |
| 19:19, | 10:17 | 41:7, 45:9 | 44:16, 47:1 | you'd [3] |  |
| 20:11, | transcribed - | Venture - | weather - | 10:18, |  |
| 25:11, 27:3, | 50:11 | 26:15 | 48:11 | 28:19, 36:2 |  |
| 27:23, | TRANSCRIPT - | versus [4] | weeks - 14:19 | you'll - 11:3 |  |
| 27:24, 28:1, | 1:8 | 4:19, 4:25, | weigh - 17:4 |  |  |
| 28:12, 29:7, | transcription - | 5:3, 35:11 | weren't - 15:4 | Z |  |
| 29:15, | 50:11 | via [3] 1:8, | Western [3] |  |  |
| 30:10, 30.8 | transferred - | 3:15, 25:23 | 4:19, 9 :7, | Zoom [3] 1:8, |  |
| 36:19, 39:8, | 43:13 | Vice - 2:10 | 18:14 | $3: 15,25: 23$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42: 7,42: 8, \\ & 44: 23,46: 8, \end{aligned}$ | transparent <br> [2] 46:2, 46:7 | Vicki [3] 3:7, <br> 26:14, 28:4 | Westmoreland <br> [9] 9:2, 9:15, |  |  |
| $44: 23,46: 8$, $46: 9,46: 16$, | travel - 47:23 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 26:14, 28:4 } \\ \text { violation [3] } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { [9] } 9: 2, ~ 9: 15, \\ & 11: 12,12: 3, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 48:23, 49:3 | true - 50:12 | 20:24, | 12:9, 13:14, |  |  |
| Thanks [2] | turn-27:1 | 23:11, 24:14 | 14:10, |  |  |
| 36:17, 38:22 | twelve - 6:24 | violations - | 17:14, 17:22 |  |  |
| there's [12] | type - 7:6 | 23:15 | what's [4] |  |  |
| 5:6, 7:1, |  | visit - 24:22 | 7:15, 8:18, |  |  |
| 11:6, 14:3, | U | voluminous - | 16:25, 23:18 |  |  |
| 19:5, 28:10, |  | 7:12 | whatever - |  |  |
| 33:5, 34:19, | uncertainty - | votes - 23:17 | 27:22 |  |  |
| 36:21, | 43:19 |  | WHEREOF - |  |  |
| 41:23, 44:4, | unchanged - | W | 50:15 |  |  |
| 44:11 | 13:2 |  | WHEREUPON - |  |  |
| they're [5] | unclear - 44:2 | wait - 26:18 | 2:1 |  |  |
| 8:17, 32:19, | understand | waiting - | wherewithal - |  |  |
| 33:25, 30.23 | [3] 19:1, | $17: 12$ | 15:16 |  |  |
| 36:13, 39:23 | 38:14, 38:15 | waive - 31:2 | whether [9] |  |  |
| they've [3] $35: 20$, | understanding [6] 9:16, | wanted [9] | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 4,10: 10, \\ & 11: 3,23: 4, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

