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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR SIMPSON: We will now move into Item (b), in the Matter of the Notice of Appeal by the Rippling Woods Homeowners Association, et. al., regarding approval of opencut mining permit No. 2949, Moudy Pit site, Ravalli County, Montana, BER 2019-08 through 21 OC. I believe the parties are represented here. Is that the case?

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Mr. Chairman, this is John Bloomquist, attorney representing the Appellants in the matter. I'm present.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you.
MS. WHITFIELD: This is Kaitlin
Whitfield with DEQ, and I'm also present.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. What I'd like to do here is proceed with statements from the parties, allocating fifteen minutes for each. What I suggest is ten minutes to review your position, and five minutes for rebuttal. I'll start with the Petitioners.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman, members of the Board. Again, my name is John Bloomquist. I'm an attorney from Helena here
on behalf of the Appellants.
This matter involves a very protracted appeal filed in October of 2019 regarding issuance by DEQ of a gravel permit in Ravalli County in the Victor area. The Board has had an opportunity, I assume, to see the findings of fact and the exceptions filed by the various parties.

The record in this matter is voluminous, and the record in this matter is important because the record will demonstrate that the DEQ decision to issue the Moudy permit violated the law, in particular the Opencut Mining Act at 82-4-434 Sub (2) sub(1), which was in place at the time this permit application was considered, and required DEQ to protect ground and surface water resources from deterioration consistent with State law, which may be affected by opencut mining activities.

We have numerous exhibits which we have cited in the exceptions. I want to go through just through a few of those. I'm not sure we're going to be able share the screen or not.

But the setting of this particular application is important. The Moudy gravel pit is situated near Victor, Montana, directly adjacent,
within 200, 250 feet of a stream called Big Creek. Big Creek is home to various fish species, including to protect bull trout, but more importantly is the source of irrigation water for numerous water users along the source. The Moudy site is in direct proximity to Big Creek, various wells and homes in the area.

And public comment, which is in the record of this matter -- I would refer you to Exhibits 4 through 6. I'm not going to pull those up. But if you review the record, Exhibits 4 through 6 are the public comment.

And early on in this matter, it was brought to the attention of the Department that given the high groundwater table at the site where Moudy was proposing to mine gravel, and the direct proximity of that groundwater to Big Creek, was of utmost concern, not only to water users in the area, but other residents.

And in fact early on, the importance of assessing groundwater and surface water impacts was initially a concern of $D E Q$, and was of the utmost importance to the agency. And I don't know if Ms. Reichert, Marlana, if you're on the line, if you can pull up Exhibit 17 or not. I would
appreciate that. I'll continue. Perhaps we're not going to be able to share.

But Exhibit $17, \mathrm{Mr}$. Chairman and members of the Board, is the Water Resource Assessment guidelines and requirements promulgated --

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Is this exhibit in the FOFCOL?

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yes, it is. It was referred to -- It is in the record of the FOFCOL, yes. Exhibit 17 was one of the exhibits produced to the Hearing Examiner, and has been cited in our exceptions.

Exhibit 17, the Water Resources Assessment, are the requirements that $D E Q$ promulgated for applicants to follow and to demonstrate that the surface water and the groundwater resources would be given appropriate protection.

In this particular matter, very early on, DEQ referred the Applicant to the requirements of the Water Resources Assessment, Exhibit 17. And $I$ would, as you review this matter and the exceptions to this matter, request that each Board member review Exhibit 17 , and observe the requirements that $D E Q$ was informing the Applicant
were necessary for purposes of complying not only with the statute, but also DEQ's rules, particularly 17.24 .218 sub (1) sub(h).

And within the Water Resources
Assessment and the guidelines, DEQ listed what was expected of the Applicant in assessing the water resources in the area, in particular groundwater and surface water; and in particular highlighting concerns for impacts to water rights in the area; and in particular irrigation ditches which run directly adjacent and through the Moudy site.

In particular, you will hear reference to the Park Hill Ditch. That ditch, as shown in the FOFCOL on Page 3 in the map, runs directly adjacent to the west boundary and the south boundary of the Moudy site.

Exhibit 8 of the hearing exhibits, which is also referred to in the FOFCOL and in our exceptions, were deficiency letters issued by DEQ to the Moudy application. And in particular, as of August 14 th, 2019 , almost a month prior to DEQ issuing its approval of Permit 2949, DEQ specifically identified numerous exceptions and numerous deficiencies in the Water Resources Assessment that had been tendered by the

Applicant's consultant Tetratech.
And $I$ would implore members of the Board to review Exhibit 8, in particular the August 14th, 2019 exceptions. And if you go to Page 2 of Exhibit 8, you will see under Item C, 1-4, numerous deficiencies, which continue on to the next page, that $D E Q$ had found regarding information provided by the applicant in a Water Resources Assessment which was dated February 8th, 2019. That is Exhibit 21 in the record of this matter.

And as seen on Page 2 and Page 3, DEQ was informing the Applicant that the Water Resources Assessment which was tendered February 8th, 2019 does not provide the information required by the Department for the Water Resources Assessment.

In particular, if you go to Page 3, it was explained to the Applicant that the description of the groundwater aquifer in the area was incomplete, and was inconsistent with the analysis and the information that was provided; and importantly, there was no cross-sections or explanation of the interaction with Big Creek regarding the groundwater in the area that was to
be mined, nor was there any indication or depiction or explanation of impacts on irrigation ditches.

As DEQ stated, "Big Creek and the irrigation ditches will have significant impacts on the interpretation. The irrigation ditches and creek will act as constant head boundaries, and it will have a profound effect on the behavior of the system." This was in August 14th, 2019.

In response to the deficiency, on September 27 th, 2019, Tetratech, on behalf of the Applicant, submitted another Water Resources Assessment which is Exhibit 32. And Ms. Reichert, if you could pull up Exhibit 32 .

Exhibit 32, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, is a revised Water Resources Assessment by Tetratech. And if you go to Page 5, you'll see two headings in the, quote, "Water Resources Assessment" provided by the Applicant. One heading is nearby water wells and water rights, where it is explained that Tetratech searched the GWIC data base for wells within 1,000 feet in the area.

Now, that is directly contrary to what was requested by $D E Q$, not only in the Water

Resources Assessment guidelines, but also in the deficiency letter issued to the Applicant, which stressed that the Applicant was required to identify wells, all wells, within 1,000 feet, and locate those wells -- not simply use the GWIC data base, which the record in this matter indicates is insufficient for identifying the location of wells.

But most importantly, here, if you read the probable effects analysis, this is the Tetratech explanation of effects of mining gravel in the area, and the impacts that mining would have on area groundwater and surface water sources.

The explanation is, as is shown, Paragraph 1, "No dewatering will occur. It will be necessary to extract the sand and gravel reserves within the permitted area, and the year around pond will not be used for any beneficial use as regulated by DNRC. Therefore no adverse effects on nearby surface water sources or groundwater well water rights are expected."

That's the analysis, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, that the Applicant provided DEQ in response to the obligations under the Water

Resource Guidelines, and in response to the deficiency letters tendered by the agency on the deficiencies of the Water Resources Assessment.

The difference -- and this is in the record as well -- between the September 27 th, 2019 Water Resources Assessment, which was ultimately determined to be acceptable by the Department, and the prior February 2019 analysis, as DEQ's hydrologist testified -- and I refer you to Exhibit 28, Page 53, Lines 1 through 22. We won't need to pull those up.

But when asked what was the difference between the deficient February 2019 Water Resources Assessment and the approved September 2019 Water Resources Assessment, DEQ's hydrologist stated that there was a statement added that the irrigation ditch -- this is in Paragraph 2, the last sentence -- the ditch does not convey water to downstream users, and that the 2019 Water Resources Assessment included a list of water rights.

Those are the two differences between the Water Resources Assessment of February which was disapproved by the Department in September of 2019 .

The point here, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, is DEQ simply did not require the Applicant to conform to the requirements of the law. DEQ did not require the Applicant to submit a sufficient Water Resources Assessment characterizing and assessing the impacts to groundwater resources in the area, nor to the surface water resources in the area, and in particular, impacts to the irrigation ditch known as the Park Hill Ditch, which goes directly adjacent to the site.

Now, in the contested case hearing -CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Bloomquist. MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yes. CHAIR SIMPSON: Two more minutes. MR. BLOOMQUIST: Okay. In order to review this record -- and it is the Board's obligation to review the record, and the whole record -- I would ask you go to the testimony at the contested case hearing from Charles Vandam, Lee Yelin, and Aimee McKinley in particular.

And the testimony will demonstrate and detail the deficiencies in the assessment and the analysis provided by Tetratech, and how those deficiencies and how the Water Resources

Assessment did not respond to the requirements that $D E Q$ set forth, and in particular impacts to the Park Hill Ditch.

The Park Hill Ditch was not assessed whatsoever by Tetratech in the Water Resources Assessment. Their testimony demonstrated impacts to the water delivery capabilities of the Park Hill Ditch were not only expected, but in fact have occurred.

And that deficiency in Tetratech and the Applicant's responsibility to identify and assess those impacts caused by mining should result in the Board reversing not only the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and not accepting those that we've identified, but also in revoking this permit, or at a minimum suspending this permit until an adequate Water Resources Assessment is conducted.

The proximity of the pit to Big Creek also is of concern. As demonstrated at the hearing, the mining at the Moudy Pit site will go below the level of Big Creek. In fact, the mining will go forty feet below the level of the Park Hill Ditch, but also eight feet below the level of Big Creek.

The impacts on Big Creek flows are already being seen negatively, and the continued mining will only further run the risk of dewatering an already over-appropriated water source, again, an impact which was identified by public comment, and identified as requiring assessment, but DEQ simply failed to do so. Now, the Hearing Examiner's misapprehension of the evidence -CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Bloomquist. MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yes.

CHAIR SIMPSON: You've used up your fifteen minutes, and we do need to move along, if you could wrap it up soon, please.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: I appreciate it. I would again implore the Board, and $I$ think the Board has the obligation, to review the record, and when you review the record, simply put up the requirements of the statute, simply put up the requirements of the Water Resources Assessment Guidelines, simply put up the deficiencies noted by DEQ prior to September 2019 , and compare those with what was provided by the Applicant which miraculously resulted in this permit being issued. And if nothing else the Board looks at,
take a look at finding of fact No. 35. In finding of fact No. 35 the Hearings Examiner essentially adopts the analysis of DEQ's hydrologist, where the finding is, "Following construction of the Moudy Pit, DEQ predicts that water table on the upgradient side of the pit or pond will lower, and the downgradient side will raise as water travels through the slanted site. These effects will remain within boundaries of the permit," citing to Mr. Krogstad, the hydrologist.

Now, that is an astounding statement not only of hydrology, but of hydrogeology, to think that the groundwater surface water impacts of mining the site will remain within the boundaries of the permit. I'm not sure, Mr. Hearing Examiner, if $I$ 've ever seen a more astounding finding regarding hydrologic impacts of mining in my career.

The other thing $I$ would like to point out, and $I$ will close, is the Hearing Officer's judicial notice of water rights. In several places the Hearings Officer states that our concern with groundwater is unwarranted because the water rights that we're concerned with in Big Creek are for surface water.

Well, Mr. Hearing Examiner, members of the Board, it is fundamental in Montana law, the Water Use Act and State law, that groundwater tributary or contributing to surface water, they're interrelated. They're one and the same. And for the Hearings Examiner to hold that our concerns with groundwater and groundwater contributions to and impacts to Big Creek are unfounded is simply erroneous under the law.

I apologize for taking up my time. In review of this matter, there's many things we did not cover in oral argument. We laid those out in our written exceptions. It is incumbent upon the Board to review that in making a final decision.

I would ask -- this matter has gone on for some time obviously, and $I$ know you have a lot of things to do, but $I$ appreciate the Board's review of this matter, its attention to the record of this matter, and ultimately it is our belief that if you do those things, you'll see the errors and the impropriety of the Department's issuance of this permit contrary to law and contrary to the rules of the Department.

With that, Mr. Chairman, $I$ will rest. CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Bloomquist. DEQ.

MS. WHITFIELD: Good morning, Chairman Simpson, and members of the Board. My name is Kaitlin Whitfield, and I'm here representing DEQ in the Moudy Pit matter. I'm anticipating that my opening argument will be about nine minutes, and any remaining time $I$ would like to reserve for rebuttal.

DEQ is here today to urge the Board of Environment Review to adopt the Hearing Examiner's over-arching determination that DEQ properly issued Permit No. 2949.

In addition, $D E Q$ is here to urge the Board to adopt DEQ's proposed exceptions to conclusions of law 149,150 , and 155 as stated in our exceptions brief submitted on January 16 th.

A hearing was held in this matter on June 19 th and June 20 th of 2023 . At that hearing, the Hearing Examiner heard testimony, and viewed exhibits from both Petitioners and DEQ. After hearing eleven hours of testimony, the Hearing Examiner utilized six months to write her own proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended decision, and that is before you today. The Hearing Examiner's proposed findings
of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended decision is based on the substantial evidence presented to her in this record.

As the Board may be aware, there were changes made to the Opencut Act during the 2021 legislative session, and the rules and statutes discussed today have been removed or amended. So if you hear me reference a rule or a statute with the year after it, it is because that was the rule or statute in effect at the time the permit was issued.

For example, Section 82-44-342(1) which dealt with the protection of water, has since been removed from the Opencut Act. In addition, ARM 17.24.218(1) (g), which dealt with well identification, was amended in 2022 after the Opencut Act was issued.

Today DEQ asks that the Board undertake its role as provided by Section 2-4-621 of the Montana Code Annotated, and review the record in front of it.

While the Board may reject or modify the conclusions of law and interpretation of Administrative Rules, the Board may not modify or reject the findings of fact unless it first
determines from a review of the complete record, and states with particularity in the order that the findings of fact were not based upon competent substantial evidence.

Today's oral argument is not meant to be a new trial in front of the Board. Today's oral argument is meant to give the parties the opportunity to be heard on their exceptions brief filed in the middle of January as provided by Section 2-4-621(1) of the MCA.

The Hearing Examiner correctly determined that DEQ properly issued Permit No. 2949, and DEQ requests that this Board affirm that decision. However, DEQ requests that this Board modify one issue within the conclusions of law. This issue can be found in conclusions of law 149, 150, and 155.

The issue DEQ finds with conclusions of
law 149 , 150 , and 155 is that the Hearing
Examiner's determination in these conclusions of law goes against a former Board decision, DEQ's interpretation of its own rule, and statutory interpretation.

In regards to conclusions of law 149 and 155, DEQ requests modification to reflect the
proposed conclusions of law provided in its exceptions brief, because DEQ is entitled to deference when interpreting its rules, and adopting the Hearing Examiner's proposed conclusion of law would be a violation of statutory interpretation and contrary to a former Board ruling.

First, conclusion of law 149 contradicts the previous Board decision in Golden West in 2018. There the Board determined that the identification of individual wells within 1,000 feet of a pit boundary under ARM 17.24.218(1)(g), 2019, is not for protection of the individual wells, but instead to protect the underlying water resource.

Additionally, conclusion of law 149 should be modified because it is contrary to case law determining that an agency is entitled to deference when interpreting its rules.

Finally, conclusion of law 149 is also contradictory of the Hearing Examiner's determination in conclusion of law 146. There she correctly determined that our expert Kevin Krogstad testified that DEQ uses the identification of wells to protect the underlying
water resource. It is important for the Board to understand that when the resource is protected, the wells are also protected, consistent with the Golden West decision.

Next, conclusion of law 155 should be modified because keeping it as-is is a violation of the statutory interpretation as governed by Section 1-2-101 of the MCA, and contradictory to the Golden West decision. Section 1-2-101 of the MCA makes clear that a Judge is not to insert into statute or rule what has been omitted or omit what has been inserted.

Here the Hearing Examiner determined in conclusion of law 155 that Petitioners had not carried their burden to produce evidence showing that DEQ's decision violated the law with respect to protection of individual wells under Section 82-4-434(2)(1), 2019, of the MCA.

However, this determination is a violation of statutory construction, as nowhere in Section 82-4-434(2) (1), 2019, of the MCA is there a requirement for protection of individual wells. Instead, there is a requirement for appropriate protection from deterioration of water quality and quantity.

As such, the Board should modify conclusion of law 155 to read "underlying water resource" rather than "individual wells" to comply with the rules of statutory construction and the former Board decision in Golden West.

Finally, conclusion of law 150 should be rejected by the Board because it is also a violation of statutory construction, and contradictory to the Board's holding in Golden West.

The Hearing Examiner incorrectly determined that the purpose of well identification is to protect individual wells. As discussed previously, this is contradictory to the Golden West decision, and goes against DEQ's interpretation of its own rules.

The Hearing Examiner also incorrectly determined that all wells within 1,000 feet of the permit boundary need to be identified. Again, this goes against statutory construction and the Golden West decision by inserting the term "all" into ARM 17.24.218(1) (g), 2019. As determined in Golden West, the purpose of identifying wells within 1,000 feet of a pit boundary is to protect the underlying water resource, not the individual well.

Because inserting the term "all" into ARM 17.24.218(1) (g), 2019, is a violation of statutory construction, and contradictory to the decision in Golden West, it should be rejected in its entirety from the Board's final findings of fact and conclusions of law.

While ARM 17.24.218(1)(g), 2019, is no longer in effect, it is important for the Board to remain consistent in its decisions and requirements of $D E Q$. In conclusion, while the Hearing Examiner's over-arching determination is that DEQ properly issued Permit No. 2949, DEQ requests that this Board modify conclusions of law 149 and 155 , and reject conclusion of law 150 in its entirety.

In doing so, the Board remains consistent in its decisions, and will not violate the rules of statutory construction and case law. Thank you for your time and review of this appeal.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Mr.
Bloomquist, no more than five minutes, please.
MR. BLOOMQUIST: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. Briefly $I$ concur wholeheartedly in the Department's arguments regarding statutory
construction, and the Board's obligation to construe the statute, as well as DEQ's obligation to construe the statute as written and the rules as written.

In doing so, in reviewing the law that was in place at the time this permit application was reviewed, the Board will have ample reason to revoke the permit or reverse the decision of $D E Q$, and to understand the flaws in proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.

As the statute 85-2-403 Sub (2) sub(1) is very clear, DEQ was obligated to protect groundwater and surface water sources from deterioration, and consistent with State law, State law meaning the Opencut Act; State law meaning do not dewater Big Creek and adversely effect water rights; State law meaning do not impact or interfere with water rights protected under Montana law conveyed via the Park Hill Ditch. Those were the requirements of State law. In addition comply with State law regarding the need for beneficial water use permits for the reclamation plan. We did not discuss that initially, but that's part of the exceptions. Statutory construction in regards to
the Opencut Act, in regards to the Water Use Act, State law, are clear, and they clearly should guide this Board in its review of the agency decision and review of the record.

And if the Board is guided by those statutory mandates, the Board will see that DEQ simply erred in issuing the permit, which did not protect area groundwater and surface water resources as required by law.

Deference to the agency. Yes, the agency gets deference, but it's not unfettered deference. The agency must, and the Board's decision must be based on scientifically driven, well-reasoned explanation of the analysis of the impacts on groundwater and surface water.

Unfortunately the Applicant has left the Department and left the Board with an empty box. The Water Resources Assessment did not provide any scientific basis or any analysis necessary to protect the groundwater and surface water resources of the area.

Although the record is large, if the Board goes to simply looking at Tetratech's analysis provided to the Department, and then compare that with what the Department was asking
for, you will readily see the deficiencies related to the obligations to protect ground and surface water resources.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I
appreciate the time. Again, I implore the Board to take a good hard look at this matter. If the Board does, and follows some of the guidance that has been set forth in our exceptions, you will be pointed to the record in this case which clearly demonstrate the errors of $D E Q$, and the errors of the application.

On that review, we would urge the Board to reject the proposed findings of fact, issue an order revoking the permit, or at a minimum suspending the permit from further operations until an adequate Water Resources Assessment is provided as required by the law. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr.
Bloomquist. DEQ, anything further?
MS. WHITFIELD: Thank you, Chairman
Simpson. DEQ would just note for the Board that because there is substantial evidence in the record, the Board cannot overturn the findings of facts of the Hearing Examiner's determinations. And if the Board goes through the record, they
will find that there's substantial evidence supporting DEQ's decision in issuing Permit No. 2949.

In addition, many of Mr. Bloomquist's arguments regarding the Park Hill Ditch were post hoc, meaning a lot of those measurements were taken after $D E Q$ had issued its permit, and that was not in front of DEQ at the time DEQ issued its permit.

And then one last thing for the Board is that DEQ would request that conclusions of law 149 and 150 are modified as stated in its exceptions brief, and that conclusions of law 150 is rejected. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much. Questions from the Board. Are there any questions for either of the parties before we move to a motion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I have one question.
Nowhere -- and maybe $I$ missed it -- but nowhere in the documents that $I$ have reviewed have $I$ seen anything documenting the typical depth of wells in the area. Did I miss something, or is that information available? I'm directing that to
either DEQ to the Petitioners.
MS. WHITFIELD: Thank you --
MR. BLOOMQUIST: Mr. Chairman -- go ahead.

MS. WHITFIELD: Sorry. The typical depth of the wells would be within the well logs within the permit.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: And the reason --
CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Bloomquist.
MR. BLOOMQUIST: Mr. Chairman, that is a good point. The only information that the Applicant and DEQ reviewed were a smattering of well logs related to the sites identified by the GWIC data base, which there's significant testimony on the deficiencies there.

But that is an important point. When you compare the depths of the area wells to the test well, the pump test well that was provided by the Applicant, and the aquifer test, which $I$ believe was somewhere in the neighborhood of 14 feet.

And we had extensive testimony on the deficiency in the record by both Mr. Vandam and Mr. Yelin regarding the aquifer test, the pump test, and in particular the deficiency or the
insufficiency of the well depth related to that test.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you.
vice Chair aguirre: I don't know that we can consider that. I mean that information is in the approved permit. And the statements in front of us, the record, provides information, provides information on -- I'm trying to make sure I say this correct -- I mean it provides information on the situation with groundwater and wells.

And I don't know. It's not untypical, or it seems like that's exactly what should have been done, is to review the well logs, so -- which was done, and that's part of the record, and then also part of the approved permit. So just trying to figure out -- I don't think that that is part of our decision. I know I'm kind of stumbling.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, I understand your point, Vice Chair Aguirre. And I guess I would direct this to our Counsel, Ms. Oomens.

In the AM4 decision, the Supreme Court made it pretty clear that the Board may consider all information, and this information is contained in the applications. It doesn't seem to have been
addressed in the FOFCOL itself.
But my point is this. I suspect -- I don't know -- but $I$ suspect that the wells that are, the domestic wells in the area are completed at a much greater depth than the depth of this gravel pit. And that being the case, I guess I would question whether the assertion that the shallow groundwater test was not appropriate because the gravel pit is in fact -- it's shallow. And so what the test would have done was to evaluate the hydrologic conditions close to the surface.

Be that as it may, $I$ don't know that it's the Board's responsibility to get too far into the weeds on the hydrology. I'm just trying to get at this question of the probability of impacts to local wells.

And I guess I'd defer to Mr. Reiten, who is much more versed in this than $I$ am, but it seems that the likelihood of impact to nearby wells is pretty small.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, $I$ agree with your comment there. Without having to go through every single detail of the initial report, it's kind of hard
for us to assess this. And $I$ probably should have looked into it a little bit more, but $I$ didn't. And part of it is just how to access that information. I don't really know how.

But it looks like it's quite a complicated little aquifer system, with shallow perch zones. One of the questions $I$ have -probably for $D E Q$-- is what $I$ read is leaving out the pump or discharge water to do the mining; is that correct?

MS. WHITFIELD: I'm sorry. I didn't quite hear your question.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: As they are mining, are they pumping water to access the gravel? Do they have to drop the water table? To me that's an important thing, and the way $I$ read it is that they did not.

MS. WHITFIELD: Correct. You are correct.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: So what is the source of the water for the pond after it's reclaimed?

MS. WHITFIELD: Groundwater.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: That's kind of counter intuitive to me. If they don't have to
get rid of water, where is it going come into the pit from? I don't know. That's a question $I$ have, but it's kind of a side point more than anything right now.

I suspect -- I don't know 100 percent -but most of the domestic wells -- I'd have to agree with Dave -- that they are probably significantly deeper than this gravel pit, and it is unlikely that they would be impacted. But that's my personal opinion. I don't have a lot of facts to come up with that. But $I$ think that's -based on my experience, that's what I see. A lot of times you do not see significant impacts along gravel pits that I'm aware of.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Reiten, a quick question. You mentioned the fact that the water in the pond being fed by groundwater. It makes sense. I guess my question is how that would potentially negatively affect the water table, or even surface water, the fact that it's different from groundwater. If it's not dewatered, wouldn't static water elevation in that pond just be directly tied to groundwater, and have minimal losses to the system?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Yes, you're
correct, but the issue is if yourre not -- Usually what $I$ see, digging a gravel pit, and it goes into the water table, you have to get rid of the water in most cases. And so $I$ still don't see where the water goes -- Apparently the groundwater has to be high enough to fill that pond. And so to me, they're really tied together. So I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: They are, but if they're not pumping, and they're not removing the groundwater from the pond, $I$ guess the question still is how that could negatively affect adjacent groundwater, or surface water for that matter.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I would say -- So they're mining under water. They're pulling it out below the water table. That's what you're saying. Okay. That was my confusion. I thought they'd need to dry things to do the mining, they needed a dry pit. But that --

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Mr. Chairman, if I may. This is John Bloomquist. I'd just point the Board to the depth that the pit is proposed to be mined, which is elevation 3372 . And as the record reflects, that's approximately 40 feet below the Park Hill Ditch elevation, and below the elevation of the Big Creek itself. And the impacts of that
are explained in the record.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Okay. That helps. Thanks.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any further questions?
Thank you, Mr. Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Chair Simpson, I do have another question that wasn't really brought up in either of the oral arguments. But in the exceptions, especially by the Appellant, it was brought up about the timing of this case, how long it's taken, and how it's negatively affected them.

But $I$ guess first off, this is something we've discussed a lot since both of us have been on the Board, is how we can potentially speed up these cases. And I'd love to have the opportunity -- maybe not during this conversation but later -to talk about how we can do that, maybe even with Ms. Oomens.

But $I$ guess my question for this conversation is how the timing, how could it have possibly negatively affected the Appellants in this case?

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Mr. Chairman, this is John Bloomquist. May $I$ answer that question?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, please.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: The negative impact -this is a MAPA contested case, Montana Administrative Procedures Act contested case. Contested cases by design, MAPA by design, is to afford timely, prompt and timely appeal processes in challenging agency decisions.

The negative effect here is quite frankly because the Department -- In order to get to District Court to review a matter, we are required to exhaust the administrative remedies. In other words, we're required to exhaust getting final agency action from the decision maker, in this instance $D E Q$ and the Board.

Having that opportunity to go to court delayed by four years, it took about four and a half years to get a decision in this case. Denying the opportunity to have judicial review of this matter is an impact on the procedural due process rights of the Appellants. It may not seem like, "Well, why don't we just wait for four or five years."

In the interim, Mr. Moudy has been mining gravel. In the interim, as the record reflects, there have been impacts to water delivery via the Park Hill Ditch, and so the
impacts are real. There are impacts to Big Creek. And delaying the opportunity to have judicial review is an impact on the due process procedural rights of the Appellants.

In other words, they won't be able to get their day in court for five or six years after this decision. In the meantime, Mr. Moudy is mining gravel; in the meantime there are impacts on the Park Hill Ditch. That's about as straight forward as $I$ can put it.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Thank you. That's helpful.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Anything further?
MS. WHITFIELD: Just quickly, Chair Simpson, if I may.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.
MS. WHITFIELD: I understand Mr.
Bloomquist's concern and the Board's concern in moving these cases along. I would like to note for the Board that we're not here to discuss that portion, but we're here to discuss whether there was substantial evidence in the record to support DEQ's permitting decision. So that's what we're here for today, and that the Board is not able to hear constitutional issues like due process.

Thank you.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Members of the Board, it's just a couple of minutes after ten. Why don't we reconvene at 10:10 to consider this matter. Take a short break.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR SIMPSON: We'll reconvene the meeting. 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: We have a quorum, sir.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much. The matter before us is to make a decision whether or not to accept the Hearing Examiner's
recommendation, findings of fact, and conclusions of law in the Moudy Pit case. Is there a motion? VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll make a motion to adopt the Hearing Examiner's findings of fact with the exceptions, with DEQ's exceptions added to modify 149 and 155 , and reject 150 , for the conclusions of law.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I'll second it. It's
been moved and seconded to accept the Hearing Examiner's findings of fact and conclusions of law incorporating the exceptions filed by the Department of Environmental Quality. Discussion. (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Discussion on the motion. Mr. Reiten.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, $I$ do have some reservations about this. I think I'll probably vote for it, but $I$ do have some reservations on the adequacy of the hydrologic investigation. It seems like they need to be a little bit more in depth, from what I've seen.

I admit $I$ did not go through the actual
permit, but was what reported in the FOFCOL seemed a little inadequate. But my overall reasoning behind this is -- I do not believe, I do not see the potential for impacts either to the canal or to the areas of groundwater.

The issue of the canal, there's observations, a lot of potential reasons why that flow could be lower than it is, than it used to be -- climatic, how much is coming out of the headgate.

It would be a lot more satisfactory if there were actual measurements that were reported rather than just an observation. I see flaws in that, but that's what we do in this state. You don't require a lot of monitoring, and $I$ suspect there's probably limited -- I didn't see any discussion of monitoring while mining was going on, of any of the groundwater or the surface water resources.

That would be some very strong evidence one way or the other, so -- but those are some of my concerns, and $I$ think it's just kind of the way that we do business in the state overall. Anyway, that's my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Reiten.

Further comments. Discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing nothing further, I guess I'd like to make a comment or two.

First of all, from a hydrologic standpoint, $I$ share Mr. Reiten's concern certainly to an extent. However, the question before us is whether the Department in issuing this permit complied with the law, that is, the Opencut Act.

I don't know that it's within our purview to reevaluate the hydrologic situation. And if there are impacts occurring, it seems to me that that's an enforcement issue, not really a permit issuance issue, since the permit was issued some years ago.

The other comment I'd like to make is that the Petitioners have filed extensive exceptions, and objected to virtually every item in the findings of fact and conclusions of law, but in so doing didn't really provide us with any alternate language that would satisfy them, although $I$ think their main concern is they would like, obviously they'd like to see this permit revoked.

I guess $I$ understand the -- Well, let me
put it this way. I think the real issue is just that there's this gravel pit was opened up in a neighborhood that has quite a few homes. I certainly wouldn't want a gravel pit next to my -establishing right next to my house; but on the other hand it's a legal issue, it's a private property issue, and it's a matter of complying with the statutes.

I don't see anything here that leads me to believe, after reviewing the findings of fact and conclusions of law, that the Department has erred in a legal sense, that is, that they failed to meet the requirements of the law for permit review. So I'll be supporting the motion.

Further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: We'll take the vote by roll call.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: AYe.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Rankosky.
BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Aye.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Reiten.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: AYe.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
CHAIR SIMPSON: The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much.
(The proceedings were concluded
at 10:23 a.m. )
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