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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR SIMPSON: It's 9:00. Let's bring the meeting to order. Sandy, would you call the roll, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: GOOd morning.
Chair Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Good morning.
Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We have a quorum.
BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: You didn't ask me.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Jennifer Rankosky. I thought I called you. I'm sorry.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Sorry. Maybe I didn't hear it.
(Others present via Zoom:
Board Attorney Present: Terisa Oomens. DEQ
Personnel Present: Board Secretary, sandy Moisey Scherer. Board Liaison: Deputy Director James Fehr. DEQ Communications: Moira Davin, Rebecca Harbage. DEQ Legal: Catherine Armstrong, Kirsten Bowers, Sarah Christopherson, Sam King, Loryn Johnson, Jeremiah Langston, Jon Morgan, Kurt Moser, Aaron Pettis, and Kaitlin Whitfield. DEQ Air, Energy and Mining: Sonja Nowakowski, Anne Spezia. Other Parties Present: Laurie Crutcher, Crutcher Court Reporting. Aislinn Brown, Elena Hagen, Montana DOJ, Agency Legal Services Bureau. Vicki Marquis, Mark Stermitz, Crowley Fleck. Graham Coppes, Ferguson \& Coppes, PLLC. David Kim Wilson, Robert Farris-Olsen, Morrison Sherwood Wilson \& Deola. Frank Tabish, LHC MT. Jeff, LHC MT. Todd Briggs - Westmoreland. David Smith, MT Contractors Association. Gayla Nicholson. Jon, Clearwater MT. Ken Stoeber, TMC-Belgrade. Terry Martin-Denning. Libby Langston. Gayla Nicholson.)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Before proceeding with the agenda, my intention was to welcome our newest Board member, Amanda Knuteson, who is filling the attorney spot. I don't believe she's on the call at this point. Sandy, do you know if she'll be joining us?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: No, sir, I don't.
I sent her the information.
CHAIR SIMPSON: She probably saw the 212
page packet and decided maybe she'd made a mistake? Yes? No? Maybe? Anyway, I'm pleased to say that we have a full board again. It's obviously taken a little while.

The first item on the agenda as always is approval of the previous Board meeting minutes February 16 th. Is there a motion?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So moved.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to approve the February 16 th meeting minutes. Is there any discussion, additions, or alterations, revisions to the minutes?
(No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, say aye. (Response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Let's move on to the briefing items. Terisa, would you walk us through the briefing items and the updates, please.

MS. OOMENS: Sure. So kind of like we talked about a couple meetings ago, all of the new updates or all of the new actions or tasks that have taken place since the last meeting are in bold.

The only one that $I$ 'm not sure made it into the packet was on Sidney Sugars. They've been working on their permit for awhile now. It's anticipated that the parties will enter into a new Administrative Order on Consent in the next month, so they are making progress on those negotiations between them and DEQ.

Other than that, I'm happy to answer any questions, but all of the cases are moving forward and going as they need to.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, let's just briefly go through it page by page. Page 1 , going into

Page 2, this is the Rosebud Mine AM4 case, I believe. Is there anything new on this, Terisa? We've talked several times about speculating on when we might hear from the Court on this. I gather we have not yet.

MS. OOMENS: We have not. I did reach out to the Court. The District Court has received the remand from the Supreme Court. The District Court then has to remand a portion of it back to us. I've reached out to them. The Judge is in other trials right now. I guess she has a couple of trials back to back. So I'm not anticipating that in the near future, but hopefully sometime in the next couple months we'll receive that remand from her.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Something to look
forward to to be certain.
MS. OOMENS: Right.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Moving on, starting on
Page 2 and continuing on Page 3 is the DEQ suit against -- $D E Q$ versus the Board having to do with the selenium rule. There's a rather lengthy update at the end.

And just to recap, the Judge has issued several orders, three orders now on this. Two of
them are covered in this update. The first was the Judge approved the consolidation of the cases, that is DEQ versus BER, and MEIC, et al., versus BER.

The second motion had to do with the Teck Coal motion to strike a portion of DEQ's reply brief. That was denied.

And then also since the packet went out -- we received this early this week -- the Judge has ruled on a number of counterclaims, and $I$ have a summary here from our attorney Dana Hupp. It's rather lengthy, and I'm not going to read through it. I'll just recap with the last paragraph, entitled, "What this means for litigation going forward."
"The environmental groups will have 14 days to file answers to BER's counterclaim. In addition by limiting the litigation claims relating to the interpretation of the stringency statute, and whether $B E R$ erred in directing the DEQ to initiate new rulemaking, Judge Seeley has significantly reduced the complexity of the suit," meaning that there will be less recovery in briefing, and hopefully a quicker resolution.

And she anticipates that Judge Seeley
will hold a scheduling conference sometime in late May.

In summary, most of the counterclaims were dismissed with the exception of those that have to do specifically with the process that the Board followed in issuing its order, so that should -- as is stated here -- simplify things considerably. Is there any questions from the Board on that?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: We've waited a long time for these orders, so now hopefully things will start moving again.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chair Simpson --
CHAIR SIMPSON: I don't have my -- I cannot see hands that are raised, so please speak up.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: So Chair Simpson, this is Julia Altemus. Can you forward that to the Board when we're done?

CHAIR SIMPSON: I can certainly do that, yes. I'll send it to Sandy and have her distribute it.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Great. I would love to see it. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Anything further on that?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Terisa, anything -- on Page 3, it looks like we have an update on the Westmoreland Resources appeal of the MPDES permit. MS. OOMENS: Are you asking me if there was an update? Sorry. I guess I just don't want to bore you guys walking through each one.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I guess that's pretty straight forward. Any other questions or comments from the Board on the briefing items?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I see there's been an update to NorthWestern Energy -- excuse me -Rosebud Mine. It's moving forward. It is encouraging to see something happening on a number of these cases, so hopefully things will move forward expeditiously more so than they have been. I didn't have any particular questions on these briefing items, so unless there are other questions from the Board, let's move on.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, let's proceed to the action items.

The first has to do with the Notice of Appeal and Request for Hearing by the Western Sugar Cooperative regarding its Montana Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit No. MT0000281, and that has to do with a settlement agreement to be approved by the Board. I guess I would ask if the parties are present, and whether they could provide a brief update of what this settlement agreement does.

MS. MARQUIS: Chairman Simpson, members of the Board. This is Vicki Marquis. I represent Western Sugar in this matter.

MR. MOSER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, this is Kurt Moser. I represent Montana DEQ in this matter.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm sorry. I'm rather computer illiterate. I'm having trouble getting back to the meeting screen here. I think I've finally got it. Okay. Please proceed.

MR. MOSER: Can You hear me, Mr.

Chairman?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, I can. Thank You.

MR. MOSER: Thank you. Again, this is

Kurt Moser with Montana DEQ.

Yes. The parties had filed a joint
motion for remand, and a stipulation for dismissal of proceedings. And there is a fairly lengthy settlement agreement that's attached to the joint motion for remand, wherein during the proceeding, basically the action of the agency was to issue a permit.

Under the terms of the settlement, the permit goes back to the agency, and under the terms of that settlement agreement, and then the at some point in the future the agency will, as stated in the settlement agreement, the agency will issue a new permit. And $I$ guess at that point if there are still issues with the permit between the parties, the appeal process could be pursued again, but at this point this matter would be dismissed and removed from your docket.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Moser.
Is there a representative of Western Sugar that would care to make a comment?

MS. MARQUIS: Yes. Good morning, Chairman Simpson, members of the Board. My name is Vicki Marquis, and I represent the Western Sugar Cooperative in this matter. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, I can hear you.
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MS. MARQUIS: Okay. Great. Thank you. Yes. As Mr. Moser explained, the parties were able to reach an agreement in this case. As you'll see in the settlement agreement, one of the issues involved groundwater and how discharges move through groundwater.

And so on Page 9 of your packet, it's Page 3 of the settlement agreement, it steps through some of the timelines by which the Western Sugar Cooperative will design a fate and transport study, and then implement that study to collect additional data that will go into an updated renewal application, and be available for $D E Q$ to use when it issues the next draft permit.

So I think it was a good resolution. We've all got some work to do in the interim, but we're excited to move this forward without having to go through expensive and time consuming litigation.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Ms. Marquis. I can certainly agree. I compliment the parties on making an effort to settle this and hopefully move forward. Any other comments on this matter?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we remand this matter to DEQ for further consideration in accordance with the terms of the settlement agreement.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to approve this settlement as requested by the parties. Is there any discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, all in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you.

$$
\begin{gathered}
* * * * * \\
\text { (Protect the clearwater Oral Argument } \\
\text { Opencut Mining permit } \# 3473 \text {, BER } 2023-03 \mathrm{OC} \\
\text { bound separately } \\
9: 18 \text { a.m. to } 10: 55 \text { a.m.) } \\
* * * * * \\
\text { CHAIR SIMPSON: Our next action item is }
\end{gathered}
$$ a new contested case or cases. We have three

petitions all having to do with the same project, which is the gravel pit that's proposed outside of Gallatin Gateway. I believe it's called the Black Pit, if I'm not mistaken, from reading through all the materials.

A couple of comments here. I guess the first has to do with the fact that these are all addressing the same project, and is there a motion to consolidate these cases into one?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I have a question, Chairman. I don't know that we should consolidate them, because of the third contested case where Gateway Conservation Alliance is the -- they're different petitioners.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, we have three different petitioners, but $I$ do believe we have the authority to consolidate these cases because they address the same project.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I am respectfully going to vote against consolidating them. I feel they should be kept separate, based on issues that are brought by individual petitioners.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Oomens, could you advise us please on whether we have the authority to consolidate these cases, and what reasons we
might have not to.
MS. OOMENS: Sure. So you do have the authority. This would be very similar to what happened with the Moudy Pit case. You had multiple different individuals, multiple different groups that had objected to the permit. But to save the same argument being made in three different cases, you could consolidate them all into one.

You definitely have the authority.
Whether or not you want to $I$ guess is a discussion you can have amongst yourselves, but again, the risk of not consolidating is that you have the same argument being made in three different cases, and the risk of possibly different decisions in each case if they're assigned to different Hearing Examiners.

And even though there may be three different petitioners in the case, they can still all make their own arguments. They don't have to agree on arguments together, it is just it's all heard in one spot by the same Hearing Examiner. CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: I'll second.

CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded. Further discussion.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, I think in deference to the people that have filed their petitions, I'm going to agree with Board Member Aguirre that we keep them separate. So I guess $I$ will have to be a nay on the consolidation. I just think in deference to their issues, which they may blend together a bit, but they may not, and so $I$ would prefer to keep them separate.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'd like to hear a little bit more. What specific issues would make it easier to hear these cases separate rather than combine them? It just seems inherently simpler to me to combine these cases. And like Ms. Oomens said, it seems like it would prevent a lot of miscommunication or misunderstanding.

I guess is there some specific facts here that we think would be better to keep them separate?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'm going to add to Board Member Altemus's thought that we're basically giving each petitioner their chance to
have a voice.
And $I$ feel because this seems to be an area that is going to be coming before us quite a bit, based on the time we just spent in discussion, and now these three new contested cases, that giving those petitioners a voice I think is important to the process, and letting them be heard. And I believe that the ultimate decisions that are made are better as a result of giving the petitioners their individual voices. BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I guess how by combining it would they not still have their individual voices heard? Because like someone said, we just went through this on the Moudy Pit, and there were multiple different parties on that one, and $I$ didn't feel like any of their voices were not heard in that process.

CHAIR SIMPSON: If I could add to the discussion, please. If we were to separate these cases, we would have to hear all three before the issue was resolved, and $I$ believe Ms. Oomens makes a good point, particularly if the cases went to different Hearing Examiners, if they came up with different results.

I'll also make the point -- this was
going to be my next motion -- that rather than assign this to Hearing Examiner, it be heard by the full Board, because this, $I$ think as the point has been made, this is a harbinger of things to come. We're seeing a lot of these gravel pit cases, we will see more of them, and it's an issue that $I$ think is going to need to be addressed more directly by this Board going forward.

And when we get to the next item, that is, the BER authorities memo, that will be a subject of some discussion there as well.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chairman Simpson, if I may. So if we assign each individual one to a Hearing Examiner, and something different comes out in each one, $I$ don't think that's a bad thing. That just means that different information came forward. I don't think you're going to get the same, and maybe we'll get the same decision.

But if we do decide to hear it before the full Board, then we're going to hear them all at the same time anyway. And then $I$ guess my question would be has anybody asked petitioners if they're okay if we consolidate them? I mean they may have really strong feelings that they want to stand on their own, but maybe they don't.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Julia on this. I think that was -- I was going to make the comment that what is the status of these petitioners? Do they want to be together or not? I think that might be a part of the solution. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Let me put that question to our legal Counsel. Ms. Oomens.

MS. OOMENS: All we have from the parties at this point is their Notice of Appeal from each one. I will say that in the event the Board decides to consolidate, the parties could file a request to separate the cases back out if they didn't like that they were consolidated.

But as far as have we asked the parties if they're okay with consolidating, the answer to that would be no, not at this point.

CHAIR SIMPSON: But there is a process by which the parties could request to be heard separately?

MS. OOMENS: Correct.
CHAIR SIMPSON: So rather than
consolidate the cases, as an alternative perhaps the thing to do would be to make that request of the parties.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman, one thing we might consider is that if we decide to assign to a Hearing Examiner, we assign them all to one Hearing Examiner. And there are differences, some differences to the extent of the petitioners' cases, and so they do have some differences. There's some overlap, and then there's some differences in each petitioner's information they submitted.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well --
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: We could assign these to the same Hearing Examiner. CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, and that's a consideration as well. I don't know that any of the points raised by the various petitioners are in conflict with each other. I think there's probably some value to be gained by considering all of the various viewpoints at one time, which other than simple efficiency and cost would be, to me is an advantage to consolidating the cases, is because you're bringing all of the points of view into a single forum, rather than hearing them separately.

I believe my motion has died for lack of a second, so --

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson. CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Sam King of DEQ has his hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Mr. King, comment?

MR. KING: Yes. Good morning, Board Chair and Board members. Can everybody hear me? CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, I can.

MR. KING: I just want to jump in on this discussion because $I$ anticipate representing DEQ with respect to this Black site, and obviously don't want to speak for any of the petitioners for those separate cases that all concern the same site.

But at least from DEQ's perspective, I think it would be preferable to have case consolidation, just simply as a matter of efficiency, and certainly acknowledging the Board's concerns about ensuring that everybody has their voice.

But $I$ think from our perspective we wouldn't think this would impede their ability to raise and adjudicate their own claims to the extent they are distinct from one another. And I
do think that it would be helpful, at least from our perspective, just to sort of streamline this process, and ensure we're not filing multiple briefs on certain issues.

And the other consideration, too, is as Board Chair noted, we're seeing an increased number of litigation regarding these gravel pits, and so that's also a factor $I$ think from our perspective that weighs in in trying to streamline this process, just because we're going to be litigating a lot of these cases.

So to the extent that we can streamline that, $I$ think that would be appreciated from the Department's position. But that's all $I$ have. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to second your motion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Jon. I hadn't withdrawn it yet, so $I$ guess we're still working on that same motion.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Could you repeat your motion, Mr. Chair?

CHAIR SIMPSON: My motion was to consolidate these cases, these three cases for the purpose of --

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: To have them to go before a Hearing Examiner, or have a hearing before the Board?

CHAIR SIMPSON: I planned on a separate motion or a separate discussion, but since you have raised it. As a matter of, just a matter of general practice, we've been assigning these cases to Hearing Examiners. And given the interest in this case, and the fact that what's being considered here is a commercial gravel pit with a 40 year life, $I$ believe it's something where the Board should participate in the process.

Now, what $I$ envision is that our attorney Ms. Oomens would take care of the - - or someone in ALS would take care of all of the legal processing that needs to be done, but that the Board would participate in the hearing, which might certainly take a day, it might take several days, particularly with the three petitioners.

But this case is of sufficient
importance that $I$ think the Board ought to take a larger role than what we normally take by simply assigning to a Hearing Examiner. So I will add that to my motion, amend my motion to have the Board participate actively in this case.

And I guess what I'm suggesting is some type of hybrid. I know I'm not prepared to write all of the legal documents that would need to be dealt with here, not being an attorney.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second the amended motion.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chair Simpson, I was just going to ask for them not to be put together. But if that's too late, then $I$ was going to ask for you to keep your original consolidation motion separate from the process motion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, the process motion will depend on the result of the consolidation motion. I don't know that the Board is prepared to hear three separate cases here on the same subject.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, if your motion is to consolidate and have them go before a full Board hearing, then $I$ would support that. If your motion was to consolidate and go before a Hearing Examiner, $I$ would have to oppose. But I think what I'm hearing you say is you want to consolidate the three, and have them go before the Board for a hearing, which $I$ think then gives
them the opportunity to have their voice heard. So then $I$ would support that. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Julia. I've kind of lost track of where we are with the motion. And $I$ believe the motion as it stands right now is to consolidate and to hear the case before the Board. And it's been seconded.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: And I seconded it.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Am I correct? 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.

The next item is a memo that was circulated to the Board having to do with Board of Environmental Review powers, authorities, and responsibilities. And this goes back to a discussion we had a couple Board meetings ago where $I$ informed the Board I'd had discussions with former Chair Steve Ruffato about the possibility of going to the Legislature to try to
clarify the authority of the Board. And in making that suggestion, $I$ was assuming that the powers of the Board flow through the authorities contained in the environmental statutes that are administered by the Department.

And so in investigating this, $I$ went through all of those statutes, and compiled what at the time was about a 20 page memo, looking at all of those responsibilities as referenced by the environmental statutes.

And as it turned out, that was the wrong rabbit trail to go down, because the quasi-judicial functions -- we are a quasi-judicial board -- the quasi-judicial functions and operation of quasi-judicial boards are addressed adequately in my opinion in Title 2, General Administration, not Title 75, Environmental, 76 which is water supply, and I believe that 82 is mining.

So I've compiled this memo to provide to the Board the language from the statutes, and I'm just going to go through it here very quickly.

The first thing that is relevant here is the creation of the Board of Environmental Review in 1995 as part of Senate Bill 234 . And it was a
real walk down memory lane looking at the legislative hearings from 1995, because there are a lot of acquaintances of mine who were involved in that, both in the Legislature, and the Environmental Quality Council, and in the Governor's office. And in fact $I$ talked to several of them about their recollections of what the legislative intent was here.

And $I$ think it's pretty well stated in both the Senate and House committee hearings that the new Board of Environmental Review was to be a public board established to provide an appeal process, which is the contested case process that we regularly go through, and oversight of the Department decisions and rulemaking.

And at the same time, the BER was designated as a quasi-judicial board, the establishment of which requires members with specific backgrounds. And I've included a copy of the statute here as it reads.
"The Board of Environmental Review must consist of a variety of backgrounds," which argues pretty strongly that as a public board, we're to bring our various areas of expertise to bear on the activities of the Department, as well as the
contested cases that we consider. I'll get back to that in just a moment.

In 2021, Senate Bill 233 transferred the quasi-legislative responsibility under the various environmental statutes from the Board to the Department. I'm not sure that was necessarily a bad thing. As it stood, there were some of the statutes that specified rulemaking by the Board, others by the Department.

And so what that bill did was -- it was a very complicated and complex bill, if any of you have read it -- long and complex I should say -that went back and changed the language in each of the environmental statutes to make it clear that the rulemaking was to be the responsibility of the Department, and not the Board.

So that takes us to definitions
contained in 2-15-102, MCA. Under those definitions, the definition of agency includes a board. Function -- which $I$ think is an important definition -- means a duty, power, or program exercised or assigned to an agency, whether or not specifically provided for by law.

Quasi-judicial function is defined as well, which is in short the function of this

Board, "An adjudicatory function exercised by an agency involving the exercise of judgment and discretion, and making determinations in controversies. The term includes, but is not limited to, the functions of interpreting, applying and enforcing existing rules and laws; granting and denying privileges, rights, or benefits; issuing, suspending, or revoking licenses, permits, and certificates; determining rights and interests of adverse parties; evaluating and passing on facts; awarding compensation; fixing prices; ordering action or abatement of action; adopting procedural rules; holding hearing and any other act necessary to the performance of a quasi-judicial function."

Now, along with that, there is a public participation statute which we observe in our agendas, Board meeting agendas. But Montana includes, the law includes the following requirement with respect to public participation in an agency meeting.

> "The agenda must include an item allowing public comment on any public matter that is not on the agenda of the meeting, and that is within the jurisdiction of the agency conducting
the meeting. However, the agency may not take action on any matter discussed unless specific notice of that matter is included on an agenda, and public comment has been allowed on that matter."

So what we have is a situation where public participation is mandated by law, and matters brought before the Board as a result of public participation must be considered by the Board, as far as whether or not any further action is appropriate. And the action that would be taken in such a case is holding a hearing. The Board does have the authority to hold hearings.

So once a hearing is held, then the Board may or may not take action in the form of an order, and an order, the only form that an order could take, that $I$ could see, is an order to the Department to initiate rulemaking on that particular matter, whether it's new rulemaking, whether it's amendments, or whether it's just a question of reviewing a rule to see if a change is appropriate.

So the quasi-judicial function and the public participation requirements combine to provide direction to the Board in how we should
proceed on various matters that come before us. I think it also argues for the oversight function of the Board when you consider the various -- that's represented here by the various backgrounds that we bring to bear on our participation in the Board.

In looking at the various environmental statutes, $I$ think the one that most closely describes the general powers of the Board is that associated with the Air Quality Act, and that's included in this memo at 75-2-111, Powers of the Board, where it says, "The Board shall hold hearings relating to any aspect of or matter in the administration of this chapter in a place designated by the Board. The Board may compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence at hearings. The Board shall designate an attorney to assist in conducting hearings, and shall appoint a reporter who must be present at all hearing, take full stenographic notes of all proceedings, transcripts of which must be available to the public at cost."

Two, "Issue orders necessary to effectuate the purposes of this chapter." And three, have the power -- Three isn't really
relevant. It's included in there, but it has to do with non-ferrous smelters, something required by federal statute.

Similar language, although not identical language, generally not as detailed, is found in programs for regulating water quality, coal and uranium mine reclamation, metal mine reclamation, opencut reclamation.

And I suppose one approach to this that I'd been considering early on was to take this language that's in the Air Quality Act and apply it to all of the various statutes; but given the direction that we have in Title 2, $I$ don't think that's necessary.

So I don't see any reason to proceed with any proposed amendments to the Legislature that would clarify Board responsibilities and authorities. I think it's adequately presented here. And $I$ guess I'd be interested in any thoughts or comments from the Board members, because the question has been put to me a number of times, which is what our authorities and responsibilities are, and $I$ think this lays it out pretty well.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, I

100 percent agree with you that this lays it out very well, and it was even a clarification $I$ think that needed to really be made for our Board members, that the quasi-judicial responsibilities still remain with the Board, and that the quasi-legislative responsibilities were removed.

And the references that you made and the way you went through this evaluation $I$ think was powerful to support, and beneficial to your conclusion that no immediate need is there for proposing legislation to clarify the powers. And thank you. I appreciate your work on this very much.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much. It was an interesting exercise, and extremely educational, but $I$ guess it demonstrates something that I've tried to keep in mind through my whole career. When $I$ first started working, back -- I think Grant may have been President -- but my employer sent me to management school, and one of the first things they hammered into our heads was that, "Before you go to solve a problem, be sure you have identified the problem."

And quite often we tend to come up with solutions before having precisely identified what
the problem is. And not surprisingly, sometimes one has to go down quite a few rabbit trails before you find a rabbit, and this was a case where $I$ got a real education in State law, among other things.

So I think I guess just to recap, this Board's activities for the most part, with the exception of the matter having to do with the stringency of the selenium rule, have had to do with contested cases, but our responsibilities and authorities are not limited to contested cases.

Which brings me to my next point, if there are no other comments on this.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: No, Mr. Chair, other than to say thank you. That was a lot of work, and so $I$ really appreciate what you've done. It's very helpful. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Yes. Thank you for your efforts, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
Thanks to you all for your support here.
And so my next point is that we have just been through a rather -- I don't know what's the better word -- grueling or tedious review of an opencut case, and then obviously we've got at
least one more coming up. I don't know how many we have on the docket right now, but there are at least two or three more coming through the pipeline.

And so what I'd like to propose to the Board is that we schedule a hearing on the opencut statute and rules for the benefit of the Board, to understand how the process works, and to probe as to whether there are any changes to the rules that might be appropriate in order to eliminate some of these controversies that have come up consistently, at least so far in our experience, with the opencut statute.

I don't know enough about the process. I haven't at this point taken the time to go and read the statute and the rules. I'll take that back. I did look at the statute. I haven't looked at the rules.

But it's clear that there are going to be quite a few of these cases coming our way, and I think it would be to the benefit of the Board to have an understanding of process and what's involved, and also to provide any feedback to the Department where we see potential improvements to improve that process, and maybe avoid some of
these issues that at this point seem to accompany opencut challenges.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, do you anticipate having anyone from DEQ explain the process to us, or what are you thinking?

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm anticipating a public hearing where the Department would be the primary player here in explaining to us how the process works, but $I$ would also expect to hear from the regulated community and the interested parties, which would include environmental interests as well, to try to get --

Well, our objective will be to get a better understanding here of the opencut process and issue in general, and to the point where, one, it would be of great help to us in reviewing future petitions; and secondly, not being familiar with the rules that are governing this -- I mean we had a long discussion today about this dryland opencut rule. It sounds like maybe a little bit more definition in that regard might be helpful. I just don't know.

But in order to try to put some side boards on this, $I$ think it would be well worth our time and the Department's time to go through a
hearing process to identify what those issues might be.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I agree. I've got several. I've worked with several people that are concerned about some of the rules in places where -- that are essentially dryland, but there's some questions $I$ have for DEQ on it. So I think it would be great.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson, Graham Coppes of Ferguson and Coppes has his hand up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm sorry. Mr. Coppes. I think your microphone is off.

MR. COPPES: I want to say I think that's a fantastic idea. I really appreciate the sentiment. And as you guys all probably are aware, $I$ represent four of the different petitioners in cases in front of you right now, and $I$ know $I$ could speak for all of those clients that they would very much appreciate the opportunity to share their side of the story, what we have learned from litigating these cases throughout the process, about how it works, and ways in which that we believe it could be improved from the public and sort of neighboring public perspective.

So I just wanted to share. I think that's a great idea, and $I$ would very much appreciate the opportunity to participate.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Coppes.
And $I$ guess $I$ would emphasize that this is not about any specific case, and we would not be talking about specific cases, and in fact make an effort to avoid talking about specific cases. This is a general examination of the program, and the issues that it brings to us.

MR. COPPES: Understood. And I just feel like -- I understand DEQ would present, and there may be $I$ guess a different perspective on how this process works as a whole from members of the public that $I$ would be happy to share.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, thank you. And again, this is a public hearing, open to public comment. I anticipate it would take the better part of a day at least.

As far as the process for developing this, I guess I'm pretty much at the mercy of the Department as to how we would organize it. I think -- I'm not really sure what process we need to go through to come up with an agenda and to
schedule the hearing, that is, whether it ought to be at a regular meeting, or whether we ought to have a special meeting.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chair Simpson, are you anticipating this being an in-person hearing or hybrid, so the public has a better ability to participate? I mean the cost of going to Helena is going to be borne on DEQ for us. So just trying to --

CHAIR SIMPSON: What $I$ have in mind is a hybrid meeting, where we would -- I would plan to convene in Helena, and folks could participate in person or remotely.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. Thank you. I do think it's a great idea. Thanks.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Julia. I think probably where we ought to start is $I$ will make a motion that the Board proceed with a hearing to review the opencut review process, permit review process, and that we move forward with developing an agenda, and to schedule a hearing either at our next regular meeting or at a separate meeting. What we might want to do is have a two day meeting in Helena.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, and
then public notice. I'm not sure if it's 30 or 60 days, so keep that in mind if you're thinking it's going to be a June BER meeting, if that would be enough --

CHAIR SIMPSON: That is a good question.
I mean our Board meetings only have a one week notice, but for a hearing, a public hearing of this nature, $I$ guess I'd have to ask Terisa if there is a different notice requirement that we would need to follow. I presume there is.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: There is for
sure.
MS. OOMENS: I don't know what it is off the top of my head, what those requirements are, but we'll make sure that we figure that out before we schedule anything. Thank you for bringing that up.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: I think the month of June $I$ will be out almost every Friday. I could do a remote on a Friday, but I'll be traveling every Friday in June.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'm not sure you're going to get this together by the June meeting.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Very possibly not, so
let's leave the scheduling out, and just proceed with the planning. To restate, the motion is to proceed with planning a public meeting on the opencut review process.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded. Further discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

The next item on the agenda is general public comment on matters within the jurisdiction and purview of the Board, but not on today's agenda.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, I have nothing further on the Board Chair update. We did talk about the DEQ versus BER, etc., litigation, and also the review of powers, authorities, and
responsibilities. That's what $I$ had on my list. Any further comments, observations before we adjourn?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Just another thank you, Chairman Simpson, for leading us. I appreciate you very much.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate that, Vice Chair Aguirre.

Hearing no further discussion, is there a motion to adjourn?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll motion to adjourn.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded to adjourn. Before we go forward with that vote, Board Member Rankosky noted availability issues for her on Fridays. Before we schedule our hearing on opencut, we'll be sure and contact the Board members to be sure that we have maximum availability for that meeting.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: Thank you.
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor of the motion, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much,
everyone. Very productive meeting.
(The proceedings were concluded at 11:41 a.m. )

*     *         *             *                 * 
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