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CHAIR SIMPSON: We'll bring the meeting to order. Sandy, would you take the roll, please. MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson. CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Here.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Rankosky.
BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus said she was ill today.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Sandy.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We have a quorum.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Could we also review who else is on the call.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I'm Sandy
Moisey-Scherer, Board secretary. Deputy Director

James Fehr, Montana DEQ; Laurie Crutcher, Crutcher Court Reporting; in Room 111 I have Kaitlin Whitfield; Terisa Oomens, Agency Legal -- she's also the Board Counsel; Kirsten Bowers, DEQ; Kurt Moser, DEQ; Liz Leman, Agency Legal Services; Sarah Bordelon; Sarah Christopherson, DEQ; Aaron Pettis, DEQ; Aislinn Brown, Agency Legal Services; Frank Tabish; Jeremiah Langston, DEQ; Madeline VerWey, DEQ; Marlana Reichert; Marley Held-Wilson, DEQ; Nancy Jacobsen; Robert Smith; Sam King, DEQ; Todd Briggs; Vicki Marquis; and also John Bloomquist.
(Moira Davin, DEQ; Loryn Johnson, DEQ; Jennifer Lint; Kevin Krogstad, DEQ; Emily Lodman, DEQ; Elena Hagen also present)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Sandy. What I'd like to do this morning is to alter the -shift around the agenda just a little bit, the reason being that Vice Chair Aguirre needs to leave at about 10:30 to 10:40.

So what we'll do is first approve the minutes for the last meeting, and then move immediately into the action items, because we do
have a case that we need to review and decide, and then return to the review items toward the end of the meeting.

So with that, are there any comments or alterations to the minutes from the December 8 th meeting?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion?
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the December 8th, 2023 meeting. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you very much. Let's move along then to the action items under Roman Numeral III.

The first is the matter of request for hearing on order of revocation of certified operator license, Case No. BER 2023-05 PWS. Could someone from the Department review the status of this and what we need to do. MR. PETTIS: This is Aaron Pettis. Can you hear me?

MS . MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes.
MR. PETTIS: I'm the attorney on this.
Mr. Deveny had initially requested, you know, had initially appealed this matter. He had some questions about it, and talked to the program, and then ultimately decided that he did not want to pursue this appeal, and so he asked to dismiss it. That's where we are with it.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Oomens, any further comment?

MS. OOMENS: (No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: This appears to me to be pretty straight forward. Is there any other comment from -- I presume the party's not represented this morning, Mr. Deveny?

MR. PETTIS: Mr. Chair, that's correct. He's not represented.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Pettis. Okay. Is there a notice to adopt the final agency action of dismissal on this case?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Do we need to make a motion?

MS. OOMENS: Isn't that what you're
looking for, Chair Simpson?
CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, please.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: My audio is having a struggle today. I'll make a motion that we adopt the Hearing Examiner's order of dismissal without prejudice, and issue a final agency action dismissing this matter.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I second that.
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded to accept the agency action or the order of dismissal. Any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, we'll proceed with the vote. All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries.

*     *         *             *                 * 

(BER 2019-08 through 21 OC, Rippling Woods Homeowners Association oral argument
transcript bound separately)
(9:13 a.m. to 10:23 a.m.)

*     *         *             *                 * 

CHAIR SIMPSON: Shall we back up to the
review items -- briefing items, I should say. Ms. Oomens, would you please go through those.

MS. OOMENS: As you can tell from the bolded, or lack thereof, bolded, a lot of the cases haven't had a whole lot of movement since the last meeting. I think a lot of them are in the discovery phase, so the parties are handling that outside of Hearing Examiner involvement.

The one that $I$ will specifically point out is the Signal Peak. They did have oral argument with the Court yesterday, and so who knows how long we'll be waiting for that decision. But just so the Board is aware that they did have oral argument, so we should be getting a decision in the next couple of months.

I'm happy to answer any questions, but otherwise I'll try not to bore you going through each case individually.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, certainly. Where was that case heard, the Signal Peak?

MS. OOMENS: I believe it was
Yellowstone County.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Yellowstone County.
Okay. Just leafing through here, I had a couple of comments or questions. Nothing too extensive.

I guess $I$ would comment in the DEQ versus $B E R$ case having to do with the selenium rule. Nothing has changed there. You'll notice there's not an update in our agenda. We're still waiting on some action from the Judge on consolidation of the cases, and also the counterclaims by Teck.

Item (d), Western Sugar Cooperative, it appears -- I see here that the parties are entering into a settlement agreement, and reading through the motions here, I was just wondering, Ms. Oomens, if that can be stated in English rather than lawyer.

MS. OOMENS: Sure. Let me find where you're at. In Item (e), is that what you're talking about?

CHAIR SIMPSON: (d) is where I am right now, but $I$ think $I$ had the same comment on another one of these, but (d) is the one we're looking at right now.

MS. OOMENS: So the parties, the motion in limine is specifically what you're probably focused on.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. I understand that has to do with excluding some matters from
argument, but you can maybe be a little bit more clear in just what that does mean.

MS. OOMENS: No, you're correct. So during -- the parties will enter motions for what can and cannot be introduced into the hearing specifically. This might apply to experts, what experts can and cannot testify to, that kind of thing.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I see. Okay. Moving along as I leaf through this. I think with respect to matter (f), Valley Garden Land and Cattle regarding opencut mining permit No. 674, I had the same question there as to what all of that means.

MS. OOMENS: "The Hearing Examiner issued an order continuing the hearing"?

CHAIR SIMPSON: At the top of Page 11.
MS. OOMENS: Oh, the motions in limine is the same thing. I'm not sure specifically what is going on in these cases, $I$ 'm not privy to the actual details, but motions in limine, it looks like the hearing was rescheduled, and so they're filing motions again as to what can and cannot be introduced as evidence at the hearing.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. On the next item,

Item (g), hearing regarding Rosebud Mine Area B Amendment 5. I guess this is a little confusing to me because it appears that there are motions for summary judgment by both parties, along with a supplemental statements of disputed facts.

Again, my understanding of legal process is pretty shallow, but my understanding of summary judgment is that it's appropriate whenever there is no disagreement as to the facts; am incorrect in that?

MS. OOMENS: So generally when you have a summary judgment, there's some -- there may be some dispute on the facts, but legally, even if you take the other party's argument as completely true, you would still win under the law. So you're saying, "I don't agree to their facts, but even if you took their facts as true, then we still win under the law."

CHAIR SIMPSON: Understood. Okay.
Thank you very much.
MS. OOMENS: It looks like Sarah may have some insight into that case specifically, if you have a specific question.

CHAIR SIMPSON: No, that was my only question.

MS. CHRISTOPHERSON: Chairman --
CHAIR SIMPSON: Sarah, you have your hand up?

MS. CHRISTOPHERSON: Yes, just a quick correction. On the dates there, it says that Westmoreland filed its reply on January $21 s t$, 2023. That was December 21 st, the same as the other party's. Just a quick correction.

MS. OOMENS: Thank you.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Excuse me for taking so much time leafing through here. Oh, I did have a question on --

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: One quick question on Item (g). What is the next, what's the timing of the next step? To kind of follow up on your question, Chairman Simpson.

MS. OOMENS: Sure. So the next step would be --

CHAIR SIMPSON: Item (d)?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: On Item (g) that you were just asking about.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm sorry, Terisa. I interrupted.

MS. OOMENS: No, that's okay. I believe the next step would be a summary judgment order,
but it looks like maybe Sam King might have something to add.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I saw your hand up, Mr. King.

MR. KING: Yes. Good morning, Chairman.
Can you hear me?
CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.
MR. KING: So all the parties have submitted cross motions for summary judgment. We're just waiting for an order from the Hearing Examiner on those pending motions before -- to determine whether this case is going to proceed to a hearing, or whether the case will be resolved on summary judgment.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: So Mr. King, that doesn't require any action by us?

MR. KING: That's correct.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay. Thank you for clarifying.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. I did have a comment on -- this is Item (b) under "Matters not before a Hearing Examiner." This goes back to the Westmoreland Rosebud Mining, LLC, regarding issuance of MPDES Permit No. 0032042, Colstrip.

This is the one where they're attempting
to quantify the natural water quality in these ephemeral drainages in the Rosebud Creek drainage. And $I$ see here, it says, "After determining that additional data are required to properly develop nonanthropogenic standards for EC and SAR for receiving waters, $D E Q$ and Westmoreland developed a sampling analysis plan which specifies that site visits for the purpose of sampling must occur every month for twelve months."

The question $I$ had is -- just my own limited familiarity with the area -- but I believe on the Rosebud Creek side of the divide is where the Peabody Big Sky Mine was. The mine has been closed, and $I$ understand all bonds have been released.

But $I$ wanted to ask the parties -- if anybody's on the call right now -- whether or not you've looked at data that may have been collected by the Big Sky Mine for drainages on that side of the divide. Is there anyone on the call representing Westmoreland? I don't believe there is.

MS. BORDELON: Yes, Your Honor. This is Sarah Bordelon. Although I'm not as familiar with that question, $I$ was wondering if Kirsten Bowers
-- because she was a little closer to the data -is on the call.

MS. CHRISTOPHERSON: Kirsten is not on the call, but this is Sarah Christopherson from DEQ.

I don't have much knowledge about this case either, but we will be looking at all existing data. However, I'm not sure if we have the Big Sky data currently.

MS. BORDELON: I believe before they got to the sampling and analysis plan, there was a survey of existing data, and $I$ believe that included the Big Sky, but I'm not certain. Would you like us to follow up and provide an update to the Board on that?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, you could do that for the next meeting, please.

MS. BORDELON: Sure.
CHAIR SIMPSON: The Big Sky Mine was in operation for close to fifty years, and over that time there would have been a lot of monitoring data on that side of the divide, and potentially some of it might be applicable to the questions here as to the natural water quality in those ephemeral drainages.

MS. BORDELON: We'll do that.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.
That's all $I$ have. Anything further on the briefing items?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, on to Item IV, General Public Comment. Members of the public may comment on any public matter within the jurisdiction of the Board that's not otherwise on the agenda for the meeting. Individual contested case proceedings are not public matters in which the public may comment. Is there any public comment?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to Item $V$, the Board Chair update. I don't really have much to offer this morning. I guess I would observe that given the weather, I'm relieved that we didn't schedule an in-person meeting in Helena. It's pretty snowy here this morning, and I presume it is across the rest of the state as well.

I did mention the status of the DEQ $v$.
BER case. We're still waiting there.
Also $I$ hope to have something for the
next meeting on the matter of potentially developing a bill for the next Legislature to more clearly define the responsibilities and authorities of the Board. I've been holding off on that to give us an opportunity to gather a little bit more information, but $I$ think we'll have something ready by the April meeting.

Also in April, Sandy, you had mentioned to me that you might have a conflict there.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I was able to work it out. I don't anymore.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. So we're okay with the date. I don't recall what it is, but -MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I believe it's April 19 th .

CHAIR SIMPSON: I believe that's right. Let me check my magic machine here. Yes, April 19th. I guess $I$ would ask Legal Services if we have anything on the burner for that meeting. It doesn't appear from the briefing items that we do. MS. OOMENS: So hopefully -- I'm crossing my fingers and toes and everything $I$ have that we will have the remand of the Western Energy case. They have had an order in that case from the Supreme Court, so it's working its way down at
this point hopefully.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Oh, they have.
MS. OOMENS: Yes. They just issued the order a little bit ago, and so it's working its way down hopefully, so I'm hopeful that that will be during the April meeting.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. So with enough lead time, we might be able to schedule something the way of a status conference.

MS. OOMENS: Correct.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Very good.
That's all $I$ have. Anything else for the good of the order?

MS. OOMENS: Just as a curiosity
question. Do we have any update on filling the attorney spot -- I'm sorry if I missed that -- on the Board?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Sandy.
MS . MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson, I have not heard anything back from the Governor's Office on that. I did ask, but they have not come back with any replacement.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. I had not heard anything either, and thank you for the reminder. I believe that wraps it up. Is there a
motion to adjourn?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I will make a motion to adjourn.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let the record show that we're two minutes early, Stacy.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you very much, Chairman Simpson.

CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded to adjourn. All in favor, say aye. (Response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much, everyone.
(The proceedings were concluded at 10:41 a.m. )
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