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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR SIMPSON: Good morning, everyone.
Good morning, Sandy. Would you take the roll, please. We'll come to order, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: GOOd morning.
Chairman Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Stacy
Aguirre.
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Good morning. Present.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Rankosky.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Present.
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 five
members present, sir. We have a quorum.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Sandy. Could we also just document who else is on the call for the record, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I'm Sandy
Moisey-Scherer, Board secretary; Laurie Crutcher,
Court Reporter; Deputy Director James Fehr, Board liaison; Moira Davin, DEQ Communications; Board Counsel Terisa Oomens; Kirsten Bowers, DEQ; Vicki Marquis, Crowley Fleck; Bill Mercer, Holland and Hart; Sarah Bordelon, Holland and Hart; Andy Ulven, DEQ; Catherine Armstrong, DEQ; Angie Colamaria, DEQ; Emily Lodman, DEQ; Kaitlin Whitfield, DEQ; Kurt Moser, DEQ; Loryn Johnson, DEQ; Sam King, DEQ; Sarah Christopherson, DEQ; Sam Yemington, Holland and Hart. That's all I have.
(Katie Makarowsky, Elena Hagen, Jeremiah Langston also present)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Sandy. We'll begin with Item 1-A, review and approve the minutes. Are there any comments or corrections to the minutes of the October 2023 Board meeting?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, is there a motion?
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll motion to approve.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the October 2023 Board meeting. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Item
A-2, review and approve the proposed Board meeting schedule for 2024. That was included in our packet. Any comments on our schedule for the upcoming year?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I have no comment on it either. I think it looks good. And as we get closer to these meetings, we may have occasion to make adjustments, depending on availability of our Board members, but for now, do we have a motion to approve the schedule for 2024 ?
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and
seconded to approve our proposed Board meeting
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schedule for 2024. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

Briefing items. We have quite a bit going on here, so \(I\) would ask Terisa to review -Let's go through this item by item, and those that have new updated information, Terisa, if you could just point those out, and give us a short summary of what's going on with each of these cases.

MS. OOMENS: Sure. So the first one, A-1 (a) is one that we've been waiting on for a little while now. We finally got an order from the Montana Supreme Court, which I believe was also in your briefing packet.

Some of the issues got remanded to the District Court, and some of the issues got remanded to the District Court to remand to BER for further decision, and so that's something that once we get the remand from the Montana Supreme Court, we'll have to discuss how that case moves forward.

I think essentially we need to make sure everybody understands what is being remanded to the Board, and how those decisions are made moving
forward, but that's kind of the big news this week, is we got that decision from the Supreme Court.

As far as Item (b), one of the nice things about the Montana Supreme Court decision in Item (a) was that they noted that BER is not a necessary party to cases. And so as noted in Item (b), we'll be renewing our motion to dismiss in that case because we had previously asked for a motion to dismiss.

The Court said, "Well, I'm going to wait and see what the Montana Supreme Court decides." The Montana Supreme Court said we don't have to be involved if we don't want to be, and we don't want to be involved in that case, so we'll be renewing our motion to dismiss on that one.

Item (c) is one that \(I\) am not directly involved with. That's the DEQ v. BER case. I don't know if, Chair Simpson, if you have any update for that, but that's nothing \(I\) have a background in. So --

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Terisa. Yes. Since the agenda was prepared, there has been one development there.

The environmental groups have petitioned
the Court with two documents, reminder of submittal, and a request for a scheduling conference. Those were filed on the 21 st of November.

And the Judge has scheduled a scheduling conference for December \(19 t h\), so hopefully at that scheduling conference we'll gain a better understanding of just where this case is going. As of now, there are a couple of pending matters still before the Judge, specifically the request from the environmental groups to intervene in the case; and then the other has to do with counterclaims submitted by Teck Coal. That's all that's happening there.

MS. OOMENS: So in nonenforcement cases, the first one is one of my cases. This is also a case that the Board has been getting updates on the last couple meetings. The parties have said that they're working towards getting deadlines, and they did submit deadlines to me just a couple weeks ago, a week ago actually.

And so they have some suggested deadiines that they've agreed on amongst themselves to get this case finished up hopefully by November of next year. They're just working
their way through that permitting process. And so I'm just very happy that the parties came to some deadlines in that case.

Item (b) is a Rob Cameron case. This is one of the cases that was stayed pending the decision from the Montana Supreme Court. Now that they've made that decision, the parties have to decide whether their questions were answered and they're going to proceed with the case, or whether that case is going to continue to be stayed pending a final decision from the Board.

Item (c) is another one of my cases. Again, the parties are working their way through the application resubmittal process. They have been giving me regular updates, and so they are moving their way through that process. It's just taking some time.

Item (d), Moudy Pit. We had intended to have this case in front of the Board for this meeting, but in order to make sure that the parties have sufficient time to issue any exceptions and responses to exceptions, we extended it to the next meeting; and that also gives the Board ample time to review all of those documents.

So once \(I\) get the FOFCOL from the Hearing Examiner and exceptions from the parties, I'll make sure to send those to the Board so they can review before the next meeting.

Item (e). They've had a lot of motion briefing in this case, and so they're just working their way through all those motions.

Item (f) is one that's kind of been stagnant for a little while. Sidney Sugars is still trying to sort out the status of its ownership, and how it proceeds through that ownership with all of their other stuff, including its permit. So they're just in the process of trying to figure that out.

Item (g), again, is another one that has had a lot of motions. Rob Cameron, poor Rob Cameron, has a lot of motions briefing in front of him. So again, they're just in the midst of that. But the good news is once you get through motions briefing, you know, you're kind of towards the back end of the case, and so these cases are heading towards resolution.

The next one is in the middle of briefing again, in the middle of summary judgment briefing.

Moving on here, (j), they're still in the discovery phase, so a little bit earlier in the phases for that one.

Item --
CHAIR SIMPSON: ExCuse me, Terisa.
Which case are we on again? I'm sorry.
MS. OOMENS: That's okay. I think we're on Item (j).

CHAIR SIMPSON: (j). Okay.
MS. OOMENS: The CHS case. They're still in the discovery phase.

And then Butte Highlands was one that we had dismissed before. This is just a reminder that it will be removed from the agenda going forward.

Item (i) is in the discovery phase of the case -- or (l). I'm sorry. Item (l).

Clearwater has done some briefing recently, and so we're getting towards the end of that case in Item (m).

Item (n), Dairy Subdivision is still kind of in the beginning stages of that case.

And then for enforcement cases, we only have the one, and that's William Deveny, and we're still in discovery phase on that case.

That's about it from me unless you have any questions. I will say that the cases not assigned to Hearing Examiners, Subsection (4) Item (b) I believe is one that we have been receiving updates on. So other than that, \(I\) think that's it.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Terisa. On that last item, this is the Westmoreland Rosebud Mining MPDES permit settlement agreement, and work as described here moving forward on that.

I note here that the existing data has been compiled, and there's been a written determination, "In accordance the stipulation \(21(e), D E Q\) determined additional data is required to properly develop nonanthropogenic standards for EC and \(S A R\) in the receiving water," and then there's a target date of November 29 th to "determine whether the NAS sources alone cause EC and \(S A R\) to exceed the standards for the receiving waters."

That deadline has passed, and \(I\) was curious if that's been completed.

MS. OOMENS: Are you asking me that question? Oh, go ahead.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson,

Kirsten Bowers of DEQ has her hand up.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Bowers.
MS. BOWERS: Good morning, Chair, members of the Board. I can update you a little bit on the Westmoreland Rosebud Mining stipulation, and the process that's been made under that stipulation.

And yes, we did, DEQ did determine that nonanthropogenic sources caused the EC and SAR standards to exceed the water quality standards in the receiving waters, and so we're now in the process of working with Westmoreland to develop a sampling and analysis plan to collect some additional data to develop a nonanthropogenic standard.

And I believe Westmoreland has Counsel on the call, too, if they have anything to add.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Mercer.
MR. MERCER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the summary that Ms. Bowers provided, and \(I\) would only add that that next date is coming up later in the month, and the parties will continue to work to try to meet that deadiine as well.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you very
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much. We'll look forward to hearing from the parties as this progresses, but it sounds like progress is being made, which on behalf of the Board we certainly appreciate. So thank you very much.

Anything further on these briefing items? Any other questions, comments?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, let's move along. There are no action items for the Board for this meeting. I think \(I\) was talking with Ms. Oomens the other day, and I believe this is the second meeting in a row where we haven't had any new cases, which is something to be noted, I think.

Item IV, any general public comment?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, we'll move to the Board Chair update. The agenda is so brief that we seriously considered just dispensing with the meeting, and covering these items next time around, but decided to go ahead with it because of this Supreme Court decision that Terisa summarized a short time ago, and which \(I\) hope you all had a chance to read.

Just as a matter of background information, the subject of this case, that is, the Rosebud, the Westmoreland Rosebud Amendment 4 to Area \(B\), the application was received by DEQ June 15th of 2009 , and the permit was issued after going through the prescribed process on December 4th of 2015. So this process has been going on for just about exactly eight years.

MEIC filed objections to the permit on the 4 th of January of '16, and the FOFCOL, findings of fact and conclusions of law, was issued by the Hearing Examiner on the 15 th of March, 2018 .

That date of course is before any of us at this meeting were on the Board, so there really isn't any background knowledge by any of us currently on the Board as to the history of this case, other than what is contained in the Supreme Court decision, and also the findings of fact and conclusions of law.

I've read the FOFCOL. I think it's very useful in moving forward with this, so as we move forward here, that will be distributed to the Board before the next meeting.

What I'd like to propose is that at the

February meeting, that if at all possible, considering winter weather conditions, that be an in-person meeting, and also that it be a two-day meeting. That date \(I\) believe is the -- Is it the 15th of February? I don't have the schedule right in front of me.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: It's the 16 th . CHAIR SIMPSON: 16 th. Okay. So the Friday would be the \(16 t h\), that would be our regular meeting. And what I'd like to do is to, on the day before have a scheduling conference -not a scheduling conference -- a status conference -- excuse me -- on this Westmoreland Rosebud Amendment 4 case.

And we will flesh out just exactly what the agenda for that meeting will be within the next couple of weeks, but in general, what \(I\) have in mind is a briefing from Westmoreland Rosebud on the subject of this case, that is, the Rosebud Mine layout, the mine plan, and specifically the Area B Amendment.

I think this is important for a couple of reasons. One is, as I mentioned, the Board really doesn't have any hands-on background in this case. And also there are two other related
cases, as mentioned during Terisa's briefing, that are potentially affected. The first would be the Area \(F\) case, and then -- Westmoreland Rosebud Area F, and also Area B Amendment 5, both of which have been, there have been petitions from MEIC opposing those permits.

So as we move forward, I think it will be very helpful to have a little bit of familiarity with the layout at the mine. I'm probably a little bit ahead of the Board here because of my background in mining, and also although \(I\) never worked at Colstrip, I did work with Westmoreland, and I'm generally familiar with the layout of the mine, although I've never worked on any permitting work there.

So that would be the first item. The second item would be to go through the three specific items remanded to the Board by the Supreme Court, and to get the perspective of the parties on those issues. I won't go into those in any detail now. I think they're fairly self-explanatory from the Supreme Court decision. But then in addition to that, \(I\) would also like to hear from the parties on their views of how the Supreme Court decision affects those
other two pending cases, and whether it will be necessary to back up on the status of those cases or make any adjustments going forward, to be sure that as those cases eventually are to be resolved.

One is in -- There's been, if I'm not mistaken, there's been a hearing on the Area \(F\) case, and the parties are still reviewing and filing motions back and forth on that FOFCOL. Please correct me if \(I\) 'm wrong, but \(I\) think that's the status, having read through that.

And then the Area \(B\) Amendment 5 case has not been heard yet.

So I guess \(I\) would ask for comments from the Board on the schedule \(I\) 'm proposing here, and the subject matter of that meeting.

Excuse me. Before going any further, as was mentioned earlier, we expect the Moudy Pit case -- that's an opencut gravel pit case -- to be before the Board at that meeting also, which is why I'm suggesting two days in person. That case I think -- we've not seen any of the paperwork on it, but \(I\) expect that it will be fairly complex. This will be the first opencut case to come to the Board since revisions were made in the opencut law, \(I\) believe in the ' 21 session, if I'm
not mistaken.
So with that, any comments or questions from the Board about the proposed two day meeting and the subject matter thereof?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Jeremiah Langston of DEQ has his hand up.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry.

Jeremiah.
MR. LANGSTON: Chairman Simpson, thanks for the opportunity just to interject here for a moment. I just wanted to add one bit of detail on the Rosebud AM4 Montana Supreme Court case that you were previously discussing.

I just wanted to bring to the Board's attention that DEQ has filed a petition for rehearing of the Montana Supreme Court's decision on a very narrow issue regarding attorneys fees, and that relates to when the Montana Supreme Court will issue remittitur, which is what's essential for this Court to obtain jurisdiction over AM4. I don't think it's necessarily the case that that won't happen before the February meeting, and \(I\) think it's fine for the BER to be proactive, and \(I\) think it's actually quite good for the BER to be thinking about this case; but \(I\) just wanted to mention that as a detail that will affect when this matter gets back to the Board.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Langston. I was not aware of that. We're assuming that the remands on these three items that we talked about earlier will be forthcoming before the February meeting. I don't believe the issue of attorneys fees really impacts Board deliberations, so I agree with your assessment that it shouldn't really have any bearing on whether we proceed. Mr. Yemington.

MR. YEMINGTON: Good morning, Chairman Simpson, members of the Board. Samuel Yemington, Holland and Hart on behalf of Westmoreland.

I echo Mr. Langston's comments, and just wanted to put the Board on notice that we have a conflict on February \(15 t h\), an oral argument on \(a\) matter that has matriculated through the Board is scheduled before Judge Davies in Billings that day, that afternoon. So it may make sense to coordinate this in a way that doesn't conflict with that oral argument or otherwise.

I think that's something that we can
move. I'm hesitant to make any commitments without Counsel for MEIC being part of this
conversation, but that's currently on the calendar for February 15 th.

CHAIR SIMPSON: What would you suggest in terms of scheduling?

MR. YEMINGTON: Again, I caution that Counsel for MEIC is not on this call, to my knowledge, so with that caveat, I think there's two options here. One would be to the extent that the Board requires those extra days, needs us either before or after the regular scheduled hearing, we can accommodate that.

Alternatively \(I\) think we have enough time to revisit that scheduling with Judge Davies, and reset that oral argument in a manner that would free up the 15 th. But again, \(I\) think there's other folks at the table here -- DEQ, their Counsel, can weigh in on this -- and \(I\) would emphasize that MEIC needs to be part of this conversation.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, I'm under the assumption that we'll go ahead with this concept, and we will be distributing documentation to the parties as to when the meeting will be, and what the subject matter will be, and any specifics about specific information that the Board may
request.
And the reason \(I\) say that is that, as \(I\) mentioned earlier, I've read through the FOFCOL. There are some informational items that \(I\) don't see in there, but I'm going to go through it again, just to double check -- that \(I\) think are probably available, certainly in the mine plan and/or the CHIA -- that might be helpful in resolving the issue going forward.

But \(I\) guess one possibility would be to flip those days, that is, to do the Moudy Pit on Thursday and the status conference on this case on Friday.

But Terisa and \(I\) will discuss that, and I think if you would please advise her of specifics. In fact as we go forward, we'll be sure to get the concurrence of the parties on the date, but that's something that could be rescheduled as well if necessary.

Further comments, questions?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Terisa, do we need a motion on this?

MS. OOMENS: A motion on what?
CHAIR SIMPSON: On scheduling a status
conference with the full Board.
MS. OOMENS: I think we should wait until we know for sure whether we get the remittitur from the Supreme Court. As Mr.

Langston stated, when we get that remittitur is when the Board obtains jurisdiction, so if we don't get that before the February meeting, we don't have jurisdiction over the case. And so \(I\) think we should wait before we decide for sure to pass a motion that we're having a two day meeting.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Very well. Let's defer that decision then until we hear from the Court. In the meantime, we'll continue compiling our preparations, so that when we're ready to send out a notice, we'll have all the information we need. Anything else from the Board?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, I was wondering. Do you have an update on the status of filling that seventh seat, our Board seat? Do you know what's going on there?

CHAIR SIMPSON: I do not. Is there any word on that, sandy?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, I have not heard from the Governor's Office on that yet. They have a few people that they are
considering, but \(I\) have not heard any names at this point in time.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I see. Thank you very much. Thank you for the reminder, Julia. Hearing nothing further, do we have a motion to adjourn? BOARD MEMBER RANKOWSKY: Motion to adjourn.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Thank you everybody. It's been a brief one, but \(I\) think necessary reviewing what lies ahead of us. So we'll keep everyone posted as we move forward with developing this case. I'm sorry. Excuse me?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chair Simpson, did we ask for public comment?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, we did.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: We did. Okay.
Sorry. Thank you.
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Once again, thank you, everyone, and we'll see you here in a couple
(The proceedings were concluded
at 9:38 a.m. )
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\hline 25:5, 25:19 & 18:11, 19:1 & essenti & five - 2:25 & 9:22 & 3:20, 4:10, \\
\hline curious & determination & 1 & Fleck - 3:10 & hear [2] & 5:7, 5:7, \\
\hline 11:22 & - 11:13 & essentially - & flesh - 15:15 & 16:24, 22:12 & 6:4, 6:6, \\
\hline currently [2] & determine [2] & 5:23 & flip - \(21: 11\) & heard [3] & 6:7, 6:17, \\
\hline 14:17, 20:1 & 11:18, 12:8 & eventually - & FOFCOL [5] & 17:12, & 8:4, 8:12, \\
\hline & determined - & 17:4 & 9:1, 14:10, & 22:24, 23:1 & 8:18, 9:5, \\
\hline D & 11 & everybody [2] & 14:21, 17:8, & hearing [10] & 9:8, \(9: 15\) \\
\hline & develop [3] & 5:24, 23:11 & 21:3 & 3:24, 9:2, & 10:4, 10:8, \\
\hline Dairy - 10:21 & 11:15, 12.14 & everyone [3] & folks - 20:16 & 11:3, 13:1, & 10:16, \\
\hline data [3] & 12:12, 12:14 & 2:4, 23:13, & foregoing & & 10:17, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline 10:20, & 15:20, 16:9, & members [5] & 9:17, 9:19, & occasion & 16:5 \\
\hline 10:21, 11:3, & 16:14 & 1:15, 3:1 & 17:8 & 4:18 & phase [4] \\
\hline 11:8, \(13: 16\), & let's [3] 5:7, & 4:20, 12:4, & Moudy [3] & October [2] & 10:2, 10:1 \\
\hline 16:16, 16:17 & 13:9, 22:11 & 19:13 & 8:18, 17:17, & 3:22, 4:5 & 10:16, 10:25 \\
\hline items [7] 5:5, & Lewis [2] & mention - & 21:11 & Office - 22:24 & phases - 10:3 \\
\hline 13:7, 13:10, & 25:4, 25:6 & 19:1 & move [6] & Oomens [9] & pit [4] 8:18, \\
\hline 13:21, & liaison-3:8 & mentioned [4] & 13:9, 13:18, & 3:9, 5:11, & 17:17, \\
\hline 16:18, 19:5, & lies - 23:12 & 15:23, 16:1, & 14:22, 16:7 & 7:15, 10:7, & 17:18, 21:11 \\
\hline 21:4 & Lodman - 3:13 & 17:17, 21:3 & 19:24, 23:13 & 10:10, & plan [3] \\
\hline IV - 13:16 & looks - 4:17 & Mercer [3] & moved [3] & 11:23, & 12:13, \\
\hline & Loryn - 3:14 & 3:10, 12:18, & 4:4, 4:22, & 13:12, & 15:20, 21:7 \\
\hline J & & 12:19 & 4:24 & 21:24, 22: & please [5] \\
\hline & M & middle [2] & moves & opencut [3] & 2:6, 2:6, \\
\hline James - \(3: 7\) & & 9:23, 9:24 & moving [5] & 17:18, & 3:4, 17:9, \\
\hline January & Makarowsky & midst - 9:18 & 5:25, 8:16, & 17:23, 17:25 & 21:15 \\
\hline 14:10 & :17 & mind - 15:18 & 10:1, 11:10, & opportunity - & point [2] 5:9, \\
\hline JENNIFER & manner & mine [5] & 14:22 & 10 & 23 \\
\hline 1:16 & 20:14 & 15:20, & MPDES - 11:9 & Opposed - 4:8 & poor-9:16 \\
\hline Jeremiah [3] & March [2] & 15:20, 1 & & opposing - & possibility - \\
\hline 3:18, 18:6, & 14:13, 25:22 & 16:14, 21:7 & N & 16:5 & 21:10 \\
\hline 18:8 & Marquis - \(3: 10\) & mining [3] & & options - 20:8 & possible \\
\hline Johnson & matriculated - & 11:9, 12:5, & named - 25 & oral [3] & 15:1 \\
\hline 3:14 & 19:18 & 16:11 & names - 23 : & 19:17, & posted \\
\hline JON - 1:15 & matter [6] & minutes [3] & narrow & 19:22, 20:14 & 23:13 \\
\hline JOSEPH - 1:15 & 14:1, 17:15, & 3:21, 3:22, & 18:17 & order [3] 2:6, & potentially \\
\hline Judge [4] 7:5, & 18:4, 19:2 & 4:5 & NAS - 11:18 & 5:13, 8:20 & 16:2 \\
\hline 7:10, 19:19, & 19:18, 20:24 & mistaken [2] & necessarily & otherwise & preparations \\
\hline 20:13 & matters - 7:9 & 17:6, 18 & 18:21 & 1 & 22 : \\
\hline judgment - & meantime - & Moira - 3:8 & necessary [4 & ownership [2] & prepared [2] \\
\hline 9:24 & 22:13 & Moisey-scherer & 6:7, 17: & 9:11, 9:12 & 1:22, 6:23 \\
\hline Julia [2] 1:16, & meet - 12:23 & [13] 2:7, & 21:19, 23:1 & & prescribed - \\
\hline 23:4 & meeting [28] & 2:10, 2:13, & needs [2] & P & 14 : \\
\hline June - 14:5 & 1:5, 3:22, & 2:17, 2:20, & 20:9, 20:18 & & present [4] \\
\hline jurisdiction & 4:6, \(4: 11\) & 2:23, 2:25, & news [2] 6:1, & packet [2] & 2:16, 2:19, \\
\hline [3] 18:20, & 4:25, 8:20 & 3:5, 3:6, & :19 & 4:13, 5:15 & 3:1, 3:18 \\
\hline 22:6, 22: & 8:23, 9:4 & \[
11: 2
\] & nice - & pages - 25:12 & previously [2] \\
\hline & 13:11, & 18:5, \(22:\) & nonanthrop & caperwork & 6:9, 18:13 \\
\hline K & 13:13, & moment & [3] 11:15 & 17:21 & proactive \\
\hline & & Montana [12] & no & parties [13]
\(7: 18,8: 2\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
18:24 \\
probably [2]
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Katie - 3:17 & 14:24, 15 & 1:2, 5:14, & 13:9, 13:18 & 8:7, 8:13, & 16:10, \(21: 7\) \\
\hline King - 3:15 & 15:3, 15:4, & 5:20, 6:5, & nonenforcement & 8:21, 9:2, & proceed [2] \\
\hline Kirsten [2] & 15:10, & 6:12, 6:13, & - 7:15 & 12:22, 13:2, & 8:9, 19:10 \\
\hline 3:9, 12:1 & 15:16, & 8:6, 18:12, & notarial & 16:20, & proceedings \\
\hline knowledge [2] & 17:15, & 18:16, & 25:16 & 16:24, 17:7, & [6] 1:8, 2:1, \\
\hline 14:16, 20:7 & 17:19, 18:3, & 18:18, 25:2, & Notary [3] & 20:23, 21:17 & \[
24: 2,25: 8,
\] \\
\hline Kurt - 3:14 & 18:23, 19:7, & 25:7
month - 12.22 & 1:23, \(25: 6\) & \[
\text { party - } 6: 7
\] & 25:10, 25:13 \\
\hline & 20:23, 22:7, & month - 12:22
months - \(24: 1\) & 25:20 & \[
\text { pass - } 22: 1
\] & proceeds -
\[
9: 11
\] \\
\hline L & 22:10, & mornin & note - 11:11 & passed & \\
\hline & meetings [2] & 2:4, 2:5 & \[
6: 7,13: 14
\] & pending [4] & 8:1, 8:14, \\
\hline \[
3: 18,1
\] & 4:18, 7:18 & 2:7, 2:15 & nothing [2] & 7:9, 8:5, & 8:16, 9:13 \\
\hline \[
18: 9,19: 3,
\] & MEIC [5] & 12:3, 19:12 & 6:20, \(23: 5\) & 8:11, 17:1 & 12:6, 12:12, \\
\hline \[
22: 5
\] & 14:9, 16:5, & Moser - 3:14 & notice [2] & permit [4] & 14:6, 14:7 \\
\hline Langston's - & 19:25, 20:6, & motion [16] & 19:16, 22:15 & 9:13, 11:9 & progress \\
\hline 19:15 & 20:18 & 3:25, 4:1 & ber [3] & 14:5, 14:9 & 13 \\
\hline later - 12:22 & Member [17] & 4:10, 4:20, & 4, 7:25, & permits - 16:6 & progresses \\
\hline Laurie [4] & 2:13, 2:15, & 5:3, \(6: 8\), & \(1: 17\) & permitting [2] & 13 \\
\hline 1:22, 3:6, & 2:17, 2:19, & 6:10, 6:16, & & 8:1, 16:15 & properly \\
\hline 25:5, 25:19 & 2:20, 2:22, & 9:5, \(21: 23\) & 0 & perspective - & 11:15 \\
\hline lauriecrutche & 2:23, 2:24, & 21:24, & & 16:19 & propose \\
\hline - \(1: 24\) & 4:1, \(4: 3\) & 22:10, 23:5, & objections & petition & 14:25 \\
\hline law [3] 14:11, & 4:22, 4:23, & 23:6, \(23: 9\), & 14:9 & 8:15 & proposed [3] \\
\hline 14:20, 17:25 & 22:17, 23:6, & & obtain - 18:20 & petitioned & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 4: 11,4: 25, \\
& 18: 3
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline layout [3] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 23: 8,23: 15, \\
& 23: 18
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { motions [5] } \\
9: 79: 16
\end{gathered}
\] & obtains - 22:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 6: 25 \\
& \text { petitions }
\end{aligned}
\] & proposing - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 17:14 & 18:19, 22:4, & Samuel - & 18:9, & 11:3 & [3] \\
\hline provided - & 22:5 & 19:13 & 19:13, 20:3, & sufficient - & 7:23, 8:7, \\
\hline 12:20 & remov & Sandy [5] & 20:20, & 8:21 & 9:5 \\
\hline public [5] & 10:14 & 2:5, 3:3, & 21:22, & Sugars - 9:9 & thinking \\
\hline 1:23, 13:16, & renewing [2] & 3:5, 3:19, & 21:25, & suggest - 20:3 & 18:25 \\
\hline 23:16, 25:6, & 6:8, 6:15 & 22:22 & 22:11, & suggested - & Thursday - \\
\hline 25:20 & reported - & SAR [3] & 22:21, & 7:22 & 21:12 \\
\hline & 25:10 & 11:16, & 22:23, 23:3, & suggesting & towards [4] \\
\hline Q & Reporter [4] & 11:19, 1 & 23:9, \(23: 15\), & 17:20 & 7:19, 9:20, \\
\hline & 1:23, 3:7, & Sarah [2] & 23:17, & summarized & 9:22, 10:19 \\
\hline quality & 25:5, 25:20 & 3:11, 3:15 & 23:20, 23:24 & 13:23 & transcribed \\
\hline 12:10 & request [3] & schedule [6] & Smith [6] & summary [3] & \[
25: 11
\] \\
\hline quite [2] 5:5, & 7:2, 7:10, & 4:12, 4:13, & 1:15, 2:23, & 5:9, 9:24, & TRANSCR \\
\hline 18:24 & 21:1 & 4:21, 5:1 & 2:24, 4:1 & 12:20 & 1:8 \\
\hline quorum - 3:1 & required & 15:5, 17:14 & 4:23, 23:8 & Supreme [16] & transcription \\
\hline & 11:14 & scheduled [3] & sorry [5] & 5:14, 5:20, & 25:11 \\
\hline R & requires & 7:5, 19:19, & 10:6, 10:17 & 6:2, 6:5 & true - 25:12 \\
\hline & 20:9 & 20:10 & 18:7, 23:14, & \(6: 12,6: 13\), & two-day - \\
\hline Rankosky [3] & rescheduled & scheduling [8] & 23:19 & 8:6, 13:23, & 15:3 \\
\hline \[
1: 16,2: 18,
\] & 21:19 & 7:2, 7:5, & sort-9:10 & 14:18, & \\
\hline 2:19 & reset - 20 & 7:7, 15:11, & sounds - 13: & 16:19, & U \\
\hline RANKOWSKY - & resolution & 15:12, 20:4 & sources [2] & 16:22, & \\
\hline 23:6 & 9:22 & 20:13, 21:25 & 11:18, 12:9 & 16:25, & Ulven-3:12 \\
\hline ready - 22:14 & resolved & seal-25:16 & specific [2] & 18:12, & understanding \\
\hline really [4] & & seat [2] & 16.18, 20 & & 7:8 \\
\hline 14:15, & resolving 21:9 & 22:19, 22:19 & \begin{tabular}{l}
specifically \\
[2] 7:10
\end{tabular} & 18:18, \(22:\) & understands \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 15: 24,19: 8, \\
& 19: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & response [10] & 4:5, 4:2 & 15:20 & T & unless - 11: \\
\hline reason - 21:2 & 2:12, 3:23, & 23:10, 23:2 & specifics [2] & & upcoming \\
\hline reasons - & 4:7, \(4: 9\), & secretary - & 20:24, 21:1 & table - 20:16 & 4:14 \\
\hline 15:23 & 4:15, 5:2, & 3:6 & SS - 25:3 & ken - 25:8 & update [4] \\
\hline received & 13:8, 13:1 & self-exp & Stacy - 2:10 & taking - 8:17 & 6:20, 12:4 \\
\hline 14 & 21:21, 23:23 & - 16:22 & stages - 10:22 & target - 11:17 & 13:19, 22:18 \\
\hline receiving [4] & responses - & send [2] 9:3, & stagnant - 9:9 & Teck - 7:13 & updated - 5:8 \\
\hline 11:4, 11:16, & 8:22 & 22:14 & standard & Terisa [9] & updates [3] \\
\hline 11:19, 12:11 & resubmitta & sense - 19:20 & 12:15 & 3:9, 5:6, & 7:17, 8:15, \\
\hline recently - & review [6] & seriously & standards [4] & 5:8, \(6: 22\), & 11 \\
\hline 10:19 & review [6] & : 20 & 11:15, & 10:5,11:7, & useful - 14:22 \\
\hline record [2] & 1:1, 3:20, & session & 11:19, & 13:23, & using - 25:11 \\
\hline 3:4, 25:13 & 4:11, 5:6, & 17:25 & 12:10, 12:10 & 21:14, 21:22 & \\
\hline regarding - & 8:24, 9:4 & settlement & State [3] 1:2, & Terisa's - & V \\
\hline 18:17 & reviewing [2] & 11:9 & 25:2, 25:7 & 16:1 & \\
\hline regular [3] & 17:7, 23:12 & seventh & stated - 22:5 & terms - 20: & VIA - 1:8 \\
\hline 8:15, 15:10 & revisions - & 22:19 & status [7] & thank [14] & Vice - 2:10 \\
\hline 20:10 & 17:24 & short [2] 5:9, & 9:10, 15:12, & 3:2, 3:19, & Vicki - \(3: 9\) \\
\hline rehearing
18:16 & revisit - 20:13 & 13:24 & 17:2, 17:10, & 5:3, 6:22, & views - 16:24 \\
\hline 18:16 & Rob [3] 8:4, & shorthand & 21:12, & 11:7, 12:19, & \\
\hline Reiten [4] & 9:16, 9:16 & 25:10 & 21:25, 22:18 & 12:25, 13:4, & W \\
\hline \(1: 15,2: 21\),
\(2: 22,4: 3\) & roll - \(2: 5\)
Rosebud [9] & shouldn't -
19:9 & stayed [2] & \[
19: 3,23: 3,
\] & \\
\hline 2:22, 4:3 & Rosebud [9]
\(11: 8,12: 5\), & 19:9 - 9 :
Sidney - & stipulation [3] & \(23: 4,23: 10\),
\(23: 19,23: 24\) & wait [3] 6:11, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { related } \\
& 15.75
\end{aligned}
\] & 14:3, 14:3, & Simpson [43] & 11:13, 12:6, & thanks - 18:9 & 22:2, \(22: 9\) \\
\hline relates & 15:13, & 1:14, 2:4, & 12:7 & themselves & wanted [4] \\
\hline 18:18 & 15:18, & 2:8, \(2: 9\) & stuff - 9:12 & 7:24 & \\
\hline remand [2] & 15:19, 16:3, & 3:2, 3:19, & Subdivision - & there's [6] & 18:14, \\
\hline 5:18, 5:20 & \(18: 12\)
row -13.13 & 3:24, 4:4, & 10:21 & 11:12, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 18: 14, \\
& 19: 16
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline remanded [4] & row - 13:13 & 4:8, \(4: 10\), & subject [5] & 11:17, 17:5, & waters [2] \\
\hline 5:16, 5:18, & RPR [3] 1:22, & 4:16, 4:24, & 14:2, 15:19, & 17:6, 20:7, & 11:20, 12:11 \\
\hline 5:24, 16:18 & 25:5, 25:19 & 5:3, 6:19, & 17:15, 18:4, & 20:16 & we'll [14] 2:6, \\
\hline remands & & 6:22, 10:5, & 20:24 - 7 20 & thereof - 18:4 & \[
3: 19,5: 21 \text {, }
\] \\
\hline 19:5 & S & 10:9, 11:7, & submit - 7:20 & they're [9] & \[
6: 8,6: 15,
\] \\
\hline reminder [3] & & 11:25, 12:2, & submittal - & 7:19, 7:25, & 7:7, 13:1, \\
\hline 7:1, 10:13, & Sam [2] 3:15, & 12:18, & 7:2 & 8:9, 9:6 & 13:18, \\
\hline 23:4 & 3:15 & 12:25, 13:9, & submitted & 9:13, 9:18, & 20:21, \\
\hline remittitur [3] & sampling - & 13:18, 15:8, & 7:13 & 10:1, 10:10, & \\
\hline & 12:13 & 18:5, 18:7, & Subsection & 16:21 & 21.16, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

