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WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

CHAIR SIMPSON: The next item, I don't think this one is going to be dealt with so quickly. In the matter of the Appeal and Request for Hearing by Protect the Clearwater regarding issuance of Opencut Mining Permit No. 3473.

I assume that there are representatives of the parties here to present their positions on this to the Board. Just a reminder, this is not a rehearing of the case. This is a summary of the status of the parties with the information to the Board before moving forward to a vote. Is there a representative of Protect the Clearwater here?

I guess before we move forward, $I$ would say that I'd ask you to limit your comments to 15 minutes, and then we'll have another opportunity for rebuttal once both parties have made their presentations.

MR. COPPES: Good morning. This is Graham Coppes, and I'm an attorney on behalf of Protect the Clearwater. So I'm here appearing. I don't think you all can see me, though, can you?

CHAIR SIMPSON: No, I can't.

MR. COPPES: I don't have the ability to turn my video on here, like normally you can on Zoom. Is that a function that the Board can do on its end?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: So I'm sorry, I can't.

MR. COPPES: Well, no problem. We'll just do it through audio then. Are you all ready to proceed then?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes. Please proceed.
MR. COPPES: Good morning, members of the Board, Chairman. My name is Graham Coppes, and I'm an attorney representing the Appellants, the Petitioners and the Objectors here, Protect the Clearwater.

As the Board is likely aware, this case arises from a challenge to a new opencut mining permit which was issued on public land immediately adjacent to the Clearwater River, Elbow Lake, and Montana Fish, Wildife and Parks flagship Blackfoot-Clearwater Game Range.

> I'm not sure how many of you are
familiar with this corner of Montana, but it is about 45 minutes outside of Missoula, in a remarkably beautiful and pristine area.

The Appellants own homes nearby and adjacent to the mine, and they draw their drinking water from shallow groundwater wells in close proximity to the site. They enjoy the quiet solitude that this area provides, and they enjoy the natural resources that are abundant and protected by the state of Montana by and through Fish, Wildife and Parks in this area.

And in fact, several of the Appellants and members of Protect the Clearwater here were sold homes by the state of Montana through its cabin leasing and sales program for top market value dollars, shortly before DEQ turned around and permitted this mine immediately adjacent to their homes. So in 2022 and 2023, they're paying top dollar to the State of Montana based on the evaluation without a mine, and then the very next year the State of Montana, by and through DEQ, permits this mine directly next to their house.

So when they first found out about this, their initial instinct was to hire a hydrologist, which is what they did. And they hired a hydrologist to look at the permit application, review DEQ's analysis of how this mine might affect the nearby stream and lake where they live,
as well as the groundwater where they source their drinking water and domestic use water.

So in this case, the Applicant, who is LHC, Inc., applied for and was granted a dryland opencut mining permit. As the Board may or may not be aware, that term is not specifically used in the statute, but it is used colloquially amongst $D E Q$ and the legislators who drafted this bill, due to the Bill Sponsor's intent that these permits only be applied for and granted in those areas in Montana that are far away from water sources.

In the briefing that was submitted to the Hearing Examiner, there was extensive testimony that was given by the Bill Sponsor, Representative Gunderson, that this entire process is not to be used anywhere near water resources. That is why it's called a dryland permit.

So in the statute, there are two separate requirements that apply to this demarcation, and the statute that's relevant, as the Board is aware, is 82-4-432. And there Montana law disconnects dryland permits from standard permits, which are those that could be near water.

And the law requires $D E Q$ to answer two questions there as a part of that statutory bifurcation of these processes. Question No. 1, "Will the mine being applied for have any effect on ground or surface water?" And then if that answer is no, then two, DEQ is to answer, "Are there more than ten occupied homes within a half mile of the mine?"

And that's the other component of this dryland process, is that it's not supposed to be used in residential areas, so away from water and not in residential areas.

Most importantly here the Opencut Act requires that DEQ fulfill its duty, and that is the word that's used in the statute, to issue permits only when the information set forth in the application actually supports DEQ's evaluation that the proposed operation meets those two requirements.

So DEQ has an affirmative obligation under the statute to make sure that the information being submitted to it by the applicant is in fact true and correct, that the mine will not affect ground or surface water, and there are not ten homes nearby, within a half a mile.

But in this case, DEQ has testified under oath. The record before the Board includes sworn testimony of $D E Q$ 's own staff members that it did not do anything to fulfill those duties as the statute says.

Instead $D E Q$ in its briefing to the Hearing Examiner -- and if you look at the Hearing Examiner's findings and conclusions on these issues -- is that $D E Q$ is allowed to rely wholly on the promises of the applicant, or the word that they're using is "certifications." DEQ argues to the Hearing Examiner and to this Board that because the Applicant checked a box certifying that information was true, and that it did certain things, that the requirements for the dryland permit were met.

But as the Board knows, the Montana Supreme Court has held that an agency decision is unlawful if it does not comply with the governing laws and administrative rules. So an agency decision is thus arbitrary and capricious if it's made without consideration of the relevant factors or based on a clearly erroneous judgment.

And you'll see in the briefing on the exceptions from DEQ and from the parties that
there's a disagreement about the burden of proof and the standard of review relevant to this burden of proof. DEQ argues that the Petitioners have put forward an improper standard to the Board, and that essentially $D E Q$ is not required to take this affirmative obligation to look at this information.

My clients and PTC urges the Board to recognize that Montana law does not require that we prove all of the affirmative facts are not true. So we don't have to prove that there are ten occupied dwelling units within a half a mile, we don't have to prove that water will be conclusively affected, because my clients aren't the ones that are applying for a permit to mine. That makes sense logically when the Board thinks about it, because the company is the one asking for the entitlement from the state of Montana to do something, and so it has the burden of proof. It's well established in Montana law that applicants for a permit always have the burden of proof, and they maintain that burden throughout the permitting process.

Those cases in the law that established that, and what can be called well-settled
precedent, is in the briefing on the exceptions before the Board. We encourage you to look at that.

But Montana law is clear about what Petitioners needed to show to be entitled to judgment as a matter of law here. In this case, Petitioners were required to show that LHC did not provide, the Applicant did not provide DEQ with sufficient data and evidence to meet its burden for the permit, so if they didn't provide sufficient evidence, then the permit cannot be issued; and/or --- either one -- DEQ relied on deficient or missing information to reach its decision that the threshold for issuance of the permit was met.

So if DEQ doesn't fulfill its affirmative obligation to go out and fact check this information, is then relying on either omitted or deficient information where it's not included in the record, which is very well undisputed here, because DEQ admits in certain circumstances, especially in regards to the effect on water sources, that that will in fact happen.

So we really encourage the Board to consider that the burden of proof issue is one of the main reasons it should reject the Hearing Examiner's findings here. The Hearing Examiner's findings of fact and conclusions to the Board are quite short. They're truncated. There are several inaccuracies there which lead to an arbitrary and capricious decision that we ask this Board to reverse.

The Hearing Examiner took no evidence, she heard from no witnesses in reaching her conclusion. So the contrast there with the Fourth Judicial District, who reached the opposite conclusion about the propriety of the dryland permit, is stark.

Judge Larson in the Fourth Judicial District who heard this case on a preliminary injunction, heard from all of the DEQ's witnesses, heard from LHC's witnesses, reviewed the evidence, and reached an opposite conclusion. He said the questions on the merits before the Court and the BER is whether the proposed pit will affect groundwater or surface water in any way.

He then found it is patently clear - and this is a quote from his opinion -- "it is patently clear that neither DEQ nor the Permittee LHC know the answer to this question."

And why did he reach that conclusion?
And that relates directly to the Hearing Examiner's errors here, because she relied on Judge Larson's opinion as well. You'll see that in her findings and conclusions. So in reaching her conclusion, the Hearing Examiner, as to the meaning of the word "affect," the Hearing Examiner joined Judge Larson. She found exactly as he did, that the Fourth Judicial District defined affect as "to influence in some way."

And while Judge Larson relied on
Webster's Dictionary to reach that conclusion, the Hearing Examiner relied on Black's Law Dictionary, but both dictionaries provided the same result that "affect" means to "influence in some way." And again, this goes to the first question relevant to the dryland permitting process, which is: Is this mine going to affect ground or surface water in some way? That's what the Hearing Examiner found, that's what the Fourth Judicial District found.

But DEQ asks the Board to disregard this clear and plain language. It asks to look at the legislative history, that the Legislature meant something totally different, that it actually
meant to define this much more narrowly than the basic dictionary definitions.

But the case law doesn't give the Board or the Hearing Examiner authority to look at legislative history, where the plain language is clear. And that's exactly what happened here. The Hearing Examiner applied that law correctly, but --

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I think we lost the sound.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, we did.
MR. COPPES: Now I'm here on video. Can you all see me? Okay. We're back. I'm not sure what happened.

So the plain language is simple. The Hearing Examiner found correctly that the word "affect" as used in the Opencut Act means to affect in any way.

But where the Hearing Examiner went wrong is that she failed to apply the meaning that she found, that plain language meaning of the word, to the actual facts in this case and the record, and that created a legal error on her part, which this Board should reverse.

As argued by PTC in its exceptions, it
is the party that is entitled to judgment here as a matter of law because DEQ acknowledges in its own exceptions and arguments to this Board that the Clearwater River and Elbow Lake at minimum will in fact be affected. There's no evidence in the record related to groundwater not being affected, but they do admit that the surface water will be affected by dust that is coming off of this immediately adjacent mine and going into the water.

This water is home to endangered species, including bull trout. It's entitled to protection by Montana Species of Special Concern for Westslope Cutthroat. And DEQ admits that this is going to happen, but they argue in essence that the Opencut Act is not designed to protect water quality, and therefore none of that matters.

And that $I$ guess is a separate question I'd like to address, but importantly, $D E Q$ does admit that there will be some effect on the nearby Clearwater River and Elbow Lake, and as a result, that means that this type of permit, the dryland permit, is insufficient. It's not the correct permit, and this Board should reverse the decision that the Hearing Examiner used to uphold that.

This also relates to the independent duty to verify information as required. Within the statute of the Opencut Act, DEQ is commanded to verify information in relation to all aspects of the permit. DEQ says that that's not true, and that's a question this Board should consider.

In the exceptions and in the briefing, we provide the exact plain language that says that DEQ must fulfill its duty to make investigations necessary to ensure compliance with the law, so DEQ is required to look at whether there will be effect from these mines on both surface and groundwater, but also whether the second criteria is met, whether there are ten homes within a half mile, and it did not do that in this.

And the Fourth Judicial District also found that in its review of the evidence, and this Board should look at the Fourth Judicial District's review as a part of its analysis here, especially because the Hearing Examiner relied on it as well.

What Judge Larson said is that the evidence in the record goes beyond the omission of proof. The evidence in the record reveals that the proposed gravel mine is in fact likely to have
an influence on ground and surface water first.
He then says, "If neither the applicant for a mining permit, nor the DEQ tasked with reviewing that application, conduct the due diligence necessary to determine the legal threshold for applicability of the standard or dryland permit, then the permitting decision must fail as arbitrary and capricious."

That's what we're asking this Board to consider today. The Hearing Examiner misconstrued that both in relation to the effect on water quality, but also in relation to the effect on occupied dwelling units. The Hearing Examiner in Finding of Fact 55 said, "Even if LHC does not consider occupied dwelling units on leaseholds, Clearwater has not presented any evidence that the lack of consideration caused its certification or promise to be incorrect." That's Finding of Fact 55 from the Hearing Examiner.

Yet the Hearing Examiner, so what we see here is that they're faulting Protect the Clearwater, my client, for not putting forward the affirmative obligation that $D E Q$ was required to actually do itself. As the Hearing Examiner noted, "Occupied dwelling units based on land
ownership adjacent to the proposed mining activity does not have any relevance as to whether it meets this criteria for an occupied dwelling unit or not."

So what we see in the record is that because there are DNRC State Trust Lands on which all of the homes nearby are located -- well, there's a few fee -- but most of them are leased properties. None of those properties were considered as a part of whether they meet this obligation as an occupied dwelling unit for consideration within the half mile.

The Hearing Examiner and the Applicant both just promised that that was going to happen; DEQ relied on that promise; and nobody checked whether these lease lands had occupied dwelling units on them or not. And this is an error that, according to the HE's own analysis, this Board should reverse.

And I think $I$ have gone a little bit over my time here, so I'd like to remain a few minutes and reserve a few minutes left for a rebuttal.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Coppes. Is there a representative from the Department to
address the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I'm not getting any response. Is there an attorney from the Department who would like to address this issue? (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, $I$ do have a question, Mr. Coppes. How does the District Court proceeding intersect with the Board's deliberations on this matter?

MS. OOMENS: I'm sorry. I don't mean to cut you off, Chair Simpson, but there is a third party that would probably like to argue before the Board gets into questions. The mining company, LHC, is --

CHAIR SIMPSON: I wanted to ask that one as well.

MS. OOMENS: Go ahead.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let me proceed. I'll
reserve that question. The reason $I$ ask it is $I$ have a good memory, but it's short, and I wanted to be sure $I$ asked it while it was on my mind.

MR. COPPES: I'm happy to answer, but I'm happy if you want me to wait. I'm happy to do that as well.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Let's defer. I'm satisfied to have raised it. I'm sure you'll remember it.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson, this is Sandy. DEQ is having technical difficulties. They are on the call.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Stermitz?
MR. STERMITZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Well, I was just wanting to indicate that I'm here on behalf of LHC, but $I$ hear now that maybe we can hear from DEQ, and if so, that probably would be the appropriate order. If not, I will be happy to weigh in.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much. DEQ.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Still nobody to speak on behalf of DEQ?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, They're having -- there's a chat that they're having technical difficulties, and that Kaitlin Whitfield is on the call for DEQ. But for some reason they're having technical difficulties getting connected. Can somebody maybe speak on behalf of DEQ on where they're at with the
technical difficulties?
CHAIR SIMPSON: While they're sorting that out, Mr. Stermitz, why don't you proceed, please.

MR. STERMITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We didn't file a summary judgment brief. We did not want to burden the Board with basically an agreement with DEQ's position, which of course we do agree with, but I'd be happy to comment on Mr. Coppes' statements here this morning.

First of all, I'll just go right to your question about the relationship, if any, between the District Court's proceedings and the Board decision here.

Our position, to put it simply and directly, is that the District Court went far beyond its jurisdiction; that its ruling was burdened with a ton of error. And the injunction that it issued is on appeal to the Montana Supreme Court now. It's been $I$ think fully briefed, and we're awaiting a decision.

Part of the problem there, just to let you know jurisdictionally, is that the Plaintiffs here used a blend of MEPA, which would be District Court jurisdiction argument, and direct challenge
to DEQ's decision to issue the permit in its efforts, among other problems that we saw. I'm sure Mr. Coppes disagrees with that, and all of that is on appeal to the Montana Supreme Court.

I don't understand the argument that the Hearing Examiner relied on what the District Court did, which will be kind of the last thing i'll say about the District Court, other than $I$ know there's a difference of opinion between $D E Q$ and Plaintiffs about the affect, the word "affect," and the statute, and that was referenced in the Hearing Examiner's findings. But beyond that, if she had relied on the District Court, she would have come to a different conclusion ultimately. The statements that this is in a residential area, and that it's adjacent to the Clark Fork River, and that there's a concession by DEQ that water quality is going to be affected, those are not borne out by the record. They're not consistent with the Hearing Examiner's findings that were based on the record materials and the information submitted by DEQ.

There was a deficiency letter issued by DEQ during the process of LHC's application concerning the extent of notice, and determination
of the ten residences within one half mile requirement that's statutory, and LHC addressed that. And so that's -- You know, we talk about the burden of proof, but however you look at the burden of proof, the fact is that there's nothing in the record indicating that that statutory requirement was not met.

In a big picture sense here, members of the Board, this challenge was clearly brought in part not to diminish the feelings of the individual Plaintiffs here, but because this was the first, as near as we can tell, application, at least one that's getting litigated for this so-called dryland opencut permit.

And it does have a different statutory process than the traditional, if you will, opencut permit, but this is not a radical or unique regulatory scheme in which the applicant certifies that information is accurate and true, and certifies that it has complied with the statutory criteria, and DEQ has varying obligations to confirm that information. And here, DEQ followed the statute.

In a way, what I'm trying to say is that this is really a challenge to the statute itself,
although not styled as such, because DEQ followed the statute, we followed the statute, and Plaintiffs' complaints are largely about items that either aren't required by the statute, or would be if it was a traditional opencut permit site, but it's not.

So there is something new here that probably hasn't been seen at the Board previously. But this construct that $D E Q$ relies on is to some extent, or to a great extent, is not, like $I$ say, it's not a radical concept. We have serious consequences for not complying with the statute, and those go with our application to DEQ when we certify this information.

I would like to say lastly, because I really think that the Hearing Examiner's findings were thorough, and reflect what was in the record, and reflect the information that $D E Q$ submitted, that there's a certain amount of rhetoric and -how would $I$ put it -- exaggeration frankly in Plaintiffs' arguments, and you hear them in statements like, "DEQ did nothing," "DEQ did nothing to verify this information." And that's simply not true, and you can look at the Hearing Examiner's findings for confirmation of that.

We did not weigh in on the distinction or the specific definition about the effect that was addressed in the parties' exceptions, or in DEQ and the Plaintiffs' exceptions, because either way, we're confident that we don't have a problem. I think DEQ is looking at a broader context for its regulation of these dryland permits and in this disagreement over that part of the Hearing Examiner's findings. And that's not of concern to us in particular here, because we're in compliance either way.

We urge you to uphold the Hearing Examiner's findings and approve this permit. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Stermitz. Ms. Armstrong.

MS. WHITFIELD: Good morning, Chairman Simpson, and members of the Board. Can you hear me?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.
MS. WHITFIELD: Sorry about that. We're having some technical difficulties here at DEQ.

My name is Kaitlin Whitfield, and I'm representing DEQ in this matter. DEQ is here today to urge the Board of Environmental Review to
adopt the Hearing Examiner's overall determination that DEQ properly issued Permit No. 3473 to Intervenor Defendant LHC, Incorporated.

In addition, DEQ is here to urge the Board to adopt DEQ's proposed exceptions to Conclusions of Law $9,10,11,15,16,29,55$, and 52, as stated in our exceptions brief submitted on March 22 nd. While you just heard quite a bit of background of this, I'm going to briefly restate what we're focusing on today, which is:

The briefs supporting motions for
summary judgment were submitted by both Protect the Clearwater, or PTC, and DEQ on December 1st of 2023. Response briefs were filed by all parties on December $22 n d, 2023$, and finally reply briefs were filed on January 12 th, 2024 , and this matter was then deemed submitted for decision.

It should be noted for the Board that the Hearing Examiner, in her prehearing order dated June 15 th, 2023 , specifically required the parties to file separate statements of disputed facts if any facts were in dispute. If a party failed to do so, as PTC did here, the facts submitted by the moving party or DEQ would be deemed undisputed.

After reviewing the briefs and evidence submitted pursuant to summary judgment, the Hearing Examiner in this matter granted summary judgment in favor of $D E Q$, and issued her proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law on March 8 th.

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 on competent substantial evidence.

As we just heard from Protect the Clearwater's Counsel Mr. Coppes, he would like you guys to review this under an arbitrary and capricious standard. However, that's not the standard here. That's the standard for judicial review. The standard here is competent substantial evidence.

Today's oral argument is not meant to be
a new bite at the apple. Today's oral argument is meant to give the parties the opportunity to be heard on their exceptions briefs that were filed at the end of March and beginning of April.

Finally, while the Applicant had the initial burden to prove to $D E Q$ permit issuers that its application complied with the Opencut Act, the burden then shifted to the Petitioners when they challenged the permit. As such, in this contested case proceeding the Petitioners bear the burden of proving each of their claims by a preponderance of the evidence.

As the Board is aware, in the 2021 legislative session, changes were made to Title 82 Chapter 4 of the Montana Code Annotated, or the Opencut Act. Specifically House Bill 599 was passed, and created an alternative avenue for obtaining an opencut permit as a dry site. As such, Section 82-4-332(1) (c) and (14) is referred to as a dryland permit application.

The goal of the bill as stated by a proponent before the Montana Natural Resources Committee in February of 2021 is to make very low impact gravel pits an easier application process. Permit No. 3473 was reviewed and issued under

House Bill 599 as a dryland application.
DEQ makes these modification and removal requests because the aforementioned conclusions of law are inconsistent with governing law, inconsistent with legislative intent, or inconsistent with evidence in the record.

In regard to Conclusions of Law 9, 10, and $11, D E Q ' s$ interpretation of the term "affect" to mean "opencut operations intersecting or touching surface and groundwater" is consistent with the plain language of 82-4-432(1)(b) of the MCA. As stated in our exceptions brief, the Hearing Examiner has defined "affect" as to influence in some way, as it is defined in Black's Law Dictionary.

However, simply because a term exists in the dictionary does not mean that its plain language is clear. This is amplified by the District Court order from the preliminary injunction hearing regarding this permit in July of 2023. There District Court Judge Larson cited two other definitions of affect, showing that the same word may have varying definitions in different dictionaries. As such, other factors must be considered to determine the plain
language, the plain meaning of affect.
Pursuant to Section 1-2-101 of the MCA, a Court cannot insert language that has been omitted from statutory language when determining its meaning. However, the Hearing Examiner did just that. Instead, statutes must be interpreted as a whole, giving meaning and effect to all provisions if possible.

If the term "affect" is read broadly, it would be impossible to obtain a dryland permit under the Opencut Act, because all Opencut Act permits marginally affect ground and surface water. For example, virtually all dryland operations generate a small amount of sediment that may end up in surface water due to precipitation because rainfall falls on nearly every site in Montana. Such a definition of "affect" leaves dryland permits out of the Opencut Act, and goes against legislative intent.

While PTC's Counsel cited that the Representative of this bill has stated that the intent was for high and dry places not near people, the comments they have cited to were made in newspaper articles over a year after the bill was passed, and cannot count as legislative
history.
Instead the legislative intent for the term "affect" supports DEQ's definition of "intersect or touch." As stated in Montana Contractors Association versus Department of Highways, as cited in our brief on Page 9, a Court may look to a legislative history of the statute, and give great deference and respect to the interpretations given to the statute by officers and agencies charged with its administration.

Here, as cited in our briefing, the two initial drafts of House Bill 599 defined standard permits as operations that intercept groundwater or surface water. Upon its second reading on the Senate floor, "intercept" was changed to "affect." The purpose of the change, as stated by Senator Brown, was to ensure that water conveyance facilities, like irrigation pipelines, were provided the same protection as ground and surface water. Thus "affect" was added to the bill to ensure projects that affect water conveyance facilities are addressed by standard permits.

Essentially while the Legislature changed the term from "intercept" to "affect," the Legislature did not intend for this amendment to
increase the applicability of standard permits to anything beyond projects that intercept ground or surface water.

For the foregoing reasons, $D E Q$ is requesting this Board to modify Conclusions of Law 9, 10,11 , and 16 in accordance with its modifications submitted in briefing.

Next, regarding Conclusion of Law 15, the Opencut Act does not require field verification of proposed opencut operations to evaluate a permit. Section 82-4-432 of the MCA requires $D E Q$ to evaluate the information provided to it by the applicant. It does not require $D E Q$ to field verify the information contained within the application.

Here, the Hearing Examiner correctly determined in Conclusion of Law 13 that field verification is not required under the Opencut Act. However, she muddies the water in Conclusion of Law 15 by arguably placing a requirement on DEQ to field verify a permit application.

Instead of the current language of Conclusion of Law 15 , $D E Q$ requests that this Board modify the language to reflect DEQ's suggested language in briefing to ensure that additional
requirements not in statute are not inadvertently imposed on DEQ by the Board.

Additionally, regarding Conclusion of Law 29, the Opencut Act does not regulate impacts to water. As addressed previously, the Opencut Act provides a substantive requirement of an opencut application where the Montana Environmental Policy Act, or MEPA, governs the substantive requirements of an environmental analysis.

The BER has jurisdiction over matters that arise under the Opencut Act, but not under MEPA. In Conclusion of Law 29, the Hearing Examiner confuses these standards by interchangeably using the terms "impacts" and "affects." The term "impacts" falls under MEPA, where "affects" falls under the Opencut Act.

It's important for the Board not to conflate the terms, as the standards they are assessed under are different. As such, DEQ's proposed modification of Conclusion of Law No. 29 should be adopted by the Board to aid in clarifying what is required of applicants and DEQ under the Opencut Act.

Finally, regarding Conclusions of Law 52
and 55 , the record does not show that $L H C$ excluded leaseholders of DNRC-owned land from its consideration of occupied dwelling units. Section 82-4-432(14)(a)(ix) requires certification from the Applicant that fewer than ten occupied dwelling units exist within one half mile of the proposed opencut permit boundary.

And occupied dwelling unit is defined under the Opencut Act as a structure with permanent water and sewer facilities that is used as a primary sleeping place by at least one person who maintains a household that is lived in as a primary residence.

The Hearing Examiner made a mistake in Conclusion of Law 52 when she stated that LHC determined occupied dwelling units based on land ownership adjacent to the proposed mining boundary area.

Instead, the evidence in the record shows that LHC separated the private property ownership from the leased sites; observed that none of the privately owned lots had Elbow Lake addresses; at several opportunities checked to see if there was anyone to talk to; and consulted with the local DNRC contact to determine that there
were no full-time residents present.
As such, the Hearing Examiner's
Conclusion of Law 52 is incorrect, and should be removed from the Board's final findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Additionally, because the evidence in the record does not support a conclusion that LHC did not consider leasehold interests in determining occupied dwelling units, Conclusion of Law 55 should be modified in accordance with DEQ's suggestion and briefing to support the evidence in the record.

In conclusion, while DEQ agrees with the Hearing Examiner's determination that Permit No. 3473 was properly issued, and that the Petitioners failed to carry their burden in this MAPA contested case proceeding, DEQ requests that this Board incorporate our modifications of Conclusions of Law 9, 10, $11,15,16,29,55$ and 52 into the Board's final findings of fact and conclusions of law. Thank you for your time today.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Let's proceed with questions before taking a break. Are there questions from the Board for any of the representatives that we've just heard from?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, I have a question on Conclusion of Law 12 for Ms. Whitfield. You don't include that in the modifications. I guess I'm asking you to confirm you don't include that in the modifications if the Board agrees with DEQ's interpretation of a fact; is that correct?

MS. WHITFIELD: That is correct.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thanks for
confirming that.
MS. WHITFIELD: Of course.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Other questions from the Board?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: One other clarification. In modifying, modifying also includes like deleting and replacing text, correct?

MS. WHITFIELD: Correct.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thank you for that confirmation.

MS. WHITFIELD: Of course.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Further questions?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I have a question for
DEQ. This gravel pit, is it -- What's the purpose
of this gravel pit? Is it associated with highway construction which $I$ had the privilege of driving through about a week ago, or is it a commercial gravel pit?

MS. WHITFIELD: Thank you, Chair
Simpson. To the best of our knowledge, it is. However, Mr. Stermitz is also on the call, who is the representative for $L H C$, and he may be better suited to answer that question.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Mr. Stermitz.

MR. STERMITZ: Mark Stermitz on behalf of LHC. It was created to serve the work that was done on that highway up there through the Swan, and due to the injunction, $L H C$ had to go to an alternate site to provide that gravel. So originally that was its purpose, but that project I think is completely concluded now, so if permitted, it will go somewhere else. I think it's undetermined at this point.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Any other questions?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I have a follow up question on that. So Mr. Stermitz, you said they had to go to another pit for the project?

MR. STERMITZ: Yes. They had a site over in the Ovando area, as $I$ understand it, that they went to after the injunction was entered.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: So in other words, they had to go farther --

MR. STERMITZ: Yes, it was further.
Correct.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Okay.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Another question for Mr. Stermitz. The material to be mined here, is it typical river gravel or bedrock material to be crushed into gravel?

MR. STERMITZ: I am not 100 percent sure about that, so $I$ should hedge my bets here. But my understanding was that it wouldn't need to be crushed.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, gravel in general needs to be crushed to size.

MR. STERMITZ: I mean it's not in -Yes, as river -- it's river material, in other words.

CHAIR SIMPSON: The reason I'm asking is from the standpoint of hydrology.

MR. STERMITZ: Well, I mean there was work done to test the elevation between
groundwater and the bottom of the pit, if that's what you're asking, and $I$ don't remember -- What I'm saying is $I$ don't remember that being influenced by the type of material that was involved.

CHAIR SIMPSON: We'll get into this a little bit later, but of course gravel is porous, and typically groundwater in a gravel deposit is unconfined, and has a shallow gradient, just because water can move through it very easily. Behaves differently than bedrock where aquifers can be confined.

MR. STERMITZ: I understand what you're saying. I just don't know that $I$ am in a position to answer. I can tell you that the material that will come out of that will not be commercial. It won't be a commercial pit. It will be used for projects.

MS. WHITFIELD: Chair Simpson, if I may.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
Yes.
MS. WHITFIELD: The answer to your question is that, yes, it is the rounded river rock that is being dug.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Ms.

Whitfield.
MS. WHITFIELD: Of course.
MR. COPPES: Chair, I'd also like to address that at some point in my rebuttal.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Are there any further questions at this point from the Board? (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Let's take a five minute break. It's eight minutes after. Let's say come back at 10:15 for rebuttal, and then consideration by the Board.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's 10:16. Let's
reconvene the meeting. Sandy, would you take the roll, please.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Yes, sir. Chair Simpson.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Here.
MS . MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: 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. Let's proceed with rebuttal. Is Mr. Coppes -- I don't see Mr. Coppes here. Oh, yes, there he is. If you would proceed, please.

MR. COPPES: Thank you, Chair Simpson.
And you had asked a question early on which $I$ just want to address while it's fresh in my mind here, which is what was the relationship or the impact of the District Court's order and findings of fact, and -- Well, what was the impact of those findings of fact on the Examiner's findings of fact, is what $I$ thought $I$ understood you to ask. And it is purely --

CHAIR SIMPSON: Excuse me, Mr. Coppes. That really wasn't my question. My question was we seem to have parallel proceedings going on here with the -- As $I$ understand it right now, the

District Court has enjoined work on this gravel pit, and that's gone to the Supreme Court; is that correct?

MR. COPPES: That is correct.
CHAIR SIMPSON: So my question was at the time how do these two proceedings intersect with each other? And it appears that they don't, because if $I$ understand correctly, the injunction had to do specifically with stopping work until these questions could be resolved. Is that your view, or do you take a different view?

MR. COPPES: Well, I guess I take a slightly different view, sir. They do interact and intersect directly in the sense that the very first criteria that is looked at by any Court in determining whether a preliminary injunction is appropriate is to look at the question of whether the party asking for the injunction is likely to succeed on the merits of the case. So that's the very first. And then there's a balancing of equities amongst the parties, and then there's a public interest analysis.

So in reaching its decision that a preliminary injunction was correctly applied here, the Fourth Judicial District found in very clear
findings that PTC is likely to prevail on the merits of this case as a matter of law, because of the reasons it set out. One of those that was very much highlighted by the District Court was the potential for affect of the ground or surface water.

The interaction is also shown by the fact that the Hearing Examiner relied quite extensively on the record that was developed by the Fourth Judicial District Court, and that's because that is the only evidentiary record of testimony that exists before this Board, that existed before the Hearing Examiner.

So in that District Court record, we had the testimony of all DEQ witnesses about this permit, about what happened, the process that was used, the evidence that was reviewed, and the original submission of the permit. We heard from LHC's witnesses about what it did, the due diligence it did and what it did not do in relation to the submission of this permit.

And then we heard from the only expert hydrologic testimony in this entire record was from PTC's expert, a senior hydrogeologist David Donohue, and he spoke directly in his testimony,
both in the comments that were submitted to the DEQ, but also in the testimony he gave to the District Court, about that question that you raised, Chairman, which was about the porosity of the soil, that is that issue here, and how the removal of surface top soil, which is inherent in any part of an opencut mining process, is going to expose this more porous and more transmissive soil that's directly being mined, and that gives rise to infiltration and increased speed in rate at which infiltration of both precipitation, as $D E Q$ acknowledges, but also chemicals.

He talks about heavy hydrocarbons that are stored and known to be stored on site, asphalt production chemicals that are used, all of which are more likely to be infiltrated into groundwater and shallow groundwater as a result of the mining process.

And nobody looked at that in relation to this word "affect," and whether this high and dry expedited permit type was the appropriate permit for a mine situated directly on the banks and adjacent to the Clearwater River and Elbow Lake.

And that relates to the exceptions that both parties take with the Hearing Examiner's
application of the statutory language "affect," and $I$ think it's important for the Board to consider that both parties, $D E Q$ and my clients Protect the Clearwater, are here telling the Board that the Hearing Examiner got it wrong in relation to her application of this statutory threshold.

So DEQ is saying, and as you just heard DEQ's lawyer argue, that the Hearing Examiner was too broad, that she found that applying the plain language of the word "affect" would render too broad of a conclusion that's going to -- I think she said read dryland opencut mines out of existence.

And obviously that's simply not the case, as the Hearing Examiner affirmed this decision in the proposed findings and conclusions here, but it is just simply not true that there are not plenty of areas in Montana that are far away from groundwater and surface water where this issue that we're describing for the Board here simply would not exist.

This is the opposite of a high and dry site. It is immediately adjacent to both shallow groundwater and a surface water river, which is directly connected to blue ribbon streams in

Montana. We're immediately upstream of the Blackfoot River. We have endangered species present. This is the exact opposite location where a high and dry permit is appropriate.

But DEQ and PTC again take issue with the findings. They want exceptions made to the Hearing Examiner's findings. And so DEQ said Conclusions of Law 9 and 10 , and $I$ think what $I$ want to draw the Board's attention to those -because we think those are correct -- it's just the application of those that was incorrect.

So nine says, the Hearing Examiner concluded, "The common definition of 'affect' is to influence in some way." She cites to Black's Law Dictionary. That is the exact same definition that the District Court reached in its findings of fact and conclusions, it just relied on Webster's Dictionary. So Webster's Dictionary and Black's Law Dictionary are lining up exactly here, and both the Hearing Examiner and Judge Larson reached the same conclusion as to what that word means.

And DEQ is essentially attempting to convince the Board that the word "affect" doesn't mean "affect" in the context of the Opencut Act. Instead essentially $D E Q$ is arguing that it means
something totally different, to intercept. And in doing so, DEQ has defined that the foundational rule of statutory interpretation which is apply the plain language meaning first.

And it instead asks you to go past the plain language, and look at legislative history, which the Montana Supreme Court has been very clear is inappropriate unless the word is or the statutory language is ambiguous. And both the Hearing Examiner and the District Court found that the word "affect" is not ambiguous, that it is very easily ascertainable by non-lawyers in relation to what the dictionary says that it means.

The Legislature is presumed to know what the words mean that it writes in statutes, and here it meant to create a high and dry category of permits that are far away from water sources. And as we said, this is just not that.

But because of that, because they used this high and dry permit right next to a river, there was a truncated analysis. There was a much, much significantly reduced permitting process here as a result of that.

And when we look at the statement of
undisputed facts that are put forward by DEQ, it is admitted in the record, it's undisputed in the record before this Board, that there will at least be some effect to the nearby Clearwater River and/or groundwater.

And so DEQ's statements of fact from its motions of summary judgment -- and these are statements of undisputed fact -- Paragraph 46, it states that Ruby Hopkins, who is DEQ's opencut expert here, stated that, "During the beginning stages of mining, surface water may leave the site during a heavy storm event, and could carry sediment."

Statement of undisputed fact continues, DEQ says, "Ms. Hopkins explained that while the 14 foot test holes were not deep enough to show that groundwater would be present at the 20 foot level below groundwater, which is where mining is going to occur."

So the only information that was available in relation to whether there's going to be an interception of very shallow groundwater are the bore holes that were used in conjunction with this soil test as a part of the opencut soil requirements, and those didn't show groundwater
being intercepted in those soil profiles, but they weren't even to the depth of the bottom of the mining, let alone looking at whether there is a separation between the floor of the mine and those porous soils that you described, Chairman, and whether these porous soils are going to be transmissive of water into groundwater.

Your question was very astute. It was very right on point.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Coppes, excuse me. Could you wrap up in a minute or two, please.

MR. COPPES: Yes. And so your point was right on, sir. There is no expert testimony and there is no evidence in the record that shows that this will not impact groundwater, and DEQ's exception briefing to this Board actually indicates that it admits that dust will land on the Clearwater River, and affect the Clearwater River.

That's also shown in the testimony from the District Court record by eye witness John Watson, who saw it happening prior to the preliminary injunction being issued.

So in conclusion, members of the Board, I represent citizens who are here as an
organization, Protect the Clearwater, who find themselves in a situation where their constitutionally protected interest in their real property on the ground, and their interest in their clean and healthful environment, are being jeopardized by a process that essentially created a void of information.

The high and dry permitting process did not have the requisite information in it by design to show whether there will be an effect on ground and surface water, and this is categorically the wrong place for it, as shown by DEQ's admissions.

The undisputed facts here in the application, and the plain language of the law, should convince the Board that $D E Q$ acknowledges in its own documentation that there will be some effect to the water; and because at the time the permit was granted, no one checked to make sure that that was true, there is no record to support the Hearing Examiner's conclusions.

And she faults Protect the Clearwater for not affirmatively proving that there will be an effect, but again, it wasn't my clients who applied for the permit here. It was LHC. It was their burden to prove, and it was DEQ's obligation
to make sure that in fact there would not be an effect to ground or surface water.

And I guess at the end, in conclusion, we'd ask the Court to apply the Hearing Examiner's language of the word "affect" as she defined it.

So we're saying that she found that the word means what -- we agree about what it means, but we're asking this Board to apply her definition in the way that the statute requires her to apply it, that there be evidence to support that this is high and dry, that there is no connection to groundwater at the site, and that there is not going to be effect on nearby surface waters; and then finally that there are not ten homes within a half a mile.

And I believe that if the Board reviews this record, they will see that there is not evidence to support those conclusions, and that the Hearing Examiner should be reversed. So thank you very much.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Stermitz, you had your hand up.

MR. STERMITZ: I did. I wanted to give you a little better information to your question you asked and my response previously about the
type of gravel here. I'm told that this is commonly referred to as bench gravel.

And $I$ will add, if $I$ can, that the statements about the depth to groundwater and the way that test pits were dug don't comport with the sworn testimony that was given at the District Court or this part of the record. I mean my client dug test pits at the lowest part of the lowest elevations it could find to get the most conservative result, and that showed a minimum of 20 feet to groundwater.

The river and the nearest surface water is a pond that's about 600 feet away. The river is farther than that. The nearest well is about 1,000 feet away. So $I$ just take serious issue with these descriptions as this being next to the river, in close proximity to groundwater.

The site was chosen for this upland permit application for a reason, and that is because it is a high and dry site. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: If I could ask one more question, please. Where is this pit located? Is it east of the highway?

MR. STERMITZ: It is.
MR. COPPES: It's west of the highway.

CHAIR SIMPSON: HOW far from Clearwater Junction?

MR. COPPES: It's probably a few miles north of the Clearwater Junction, if you're driving on the highway where the river comes right next to the highway, and then right before you get to Salmon Lake, when you come around, it's on that piece of DNRC State Trust land that is right there sandwiched between the river, the lake, and the highway.

CHAIR SIMPSON: So it's west of the highway.

MR. COPPES: Correct.
MR. STERMITZ: The site is west of the highway. That is correct. The highway is east of the site. I think that was the way --

CHAIR SIMPSON: It would really help to have a map. We'll get back to that in a few minutes. Thank you very much, Mr. Stermitz. While you have the floor, anything further before we move on?

MR. STERMITZ: No. Thank You, sir.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank You. Ms.
Whitfield.
MS. WHITFIELD: Thank You, Chairman. I just want to -- I'll be pretty short and sweet. The Hearing Examiner granted summary judgment in favor of $D E Q$, meaning that there are no facts in dispute, which means that Protect the Clearwater has agreed with DEQ's statements of facts. There's no evidence that has been presented through summary judgment motions to support Protect the Clearwater's assertion that this is not a high and dry location.

And then $I$ did hear Mr. Coppes there at the end state some constitutional issues, and the BER is not here to determine any sort of constitutionality of a statute.

And then finally in regards to the term "affect" and what definition to use, the Supreme Court has determined that they construe a statute by reading and interpreting the statute as a whole, without isolating specific terms from the context in which they are used by the Legislature.

So they do look to legislative intent, and that is partially how DEQ has interpreted "intercept" is from the legislative history and legislative intent of the statute. And $I$ will leave the Board with that.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.

Are there any further questions from the Board? (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, we'll move forward to the Board discussion. Normally what I would do at this point is to ask for a motion, but I'm going to make the motion to start out, and that is we remand this back to the Hearing Examiner for more clarification. And I'll get into the details as we go through discussion. But is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Julia.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: And Chairman Simpson, I'm sorry. I didn't unmute fast enought. Maybe somebody said this, but how far away is this permit, would the site be from the water body exactly?

MR. COPPES: Less than one quarter of a mile.

CHAIR SIMPSON: That's one of the -BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Other comments or discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Let me get on my soap
box for a few minutes, and then we can perhaps discuss it a little further.

This Board has the responsibility to examine whether or not the Department followed the law in issuing the permit. That's our primary function, but it's not limited to that. We also have the responsibility to look at the substance of the decision that's being made here under -our responsibility under the Constitution.

And $I$ just can't understand why we're in a position of being asked to make a decision when we have virtually no information. Example: The issue that's been debated back and forth here is whether or not there are less than ten occupied homes within a half a mile of this project. Nowhere does it say how many there are. How many are there? Are there any at all? Is there one? Are there nine? Where are they? That's where a map would be helpful.

Second, hydrology. We've been debating back and forth whether or not groundwater will be affected here, or surface water directly, but groundwater seems to be the main subject of discussion.

So what is the elevation of the
groundwater? And what is the elevation of the bottom of the pit? Maybe I'm talking like an engineer, but they seem like very simple questions. When we talk about depth to water, depth to water is a useful piece of information, but not necessarily definitive because the topography varies over the area of the project.

So what really matters is the elevation of the groundwater table or the piezometric surface, if you will, and the depth to which gravel is going to be removed under this project. Those are to me fairly obvious questions, and what I'm trying to do here is inject a little common sense into our decision making.

Also we're being asked to approve a -as always, the legal jargon won't come to me but anyway, are the parties in agreement on the facts? It sounds to me like there's substantial disagreement on the facts. Summary judgment, to support a summary judgment. That's the term I'm looking for.

So I think that's something that bears some re-examination, and whether summary judgment is even appropriate here, and whether this needs to go to hearing. Those are my primary comments.

Any other thoughts from the Board?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you. I had a difficult time thinking about this because of the same reasons, being a hydrologist, not -- Why didn't they just simply state the water table elevation or something like that?

And $I$ think all of this is real
critical. And the number of dwellings has got to be easily obtained. And $I$ had a real problem with this because of the lack of that information.

And the thoughts that $I$ have on the terminology, definition of "affect," to me what DEQ is using is they're using it as a direct effect, and actually the interception of the water table to be more like a direct effect, rather than just a general effect.

Anyway, those are just -- I'm just agreeing with your comments, and I think that they're very critical to figuring out what the issues are here.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Reiten. VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I feel like I need
to respectfully disagree. I feel, I believe we have the information in front of us that keeps us within the scope of our decision making power in order to hear these arguments, and determine how to proceed. Reading through it prior, I didn't have the same thoughts about the extra information needed in order to make this decision. I feel like it's a more straight forward decision that we have to make.

And $I$ feel that $D E Q$ did their work for this permit according to how they need to approach it. And that it's being objected to, $I$ understand that, but that in my mind, $I$ don't see where they did not do their job. And again, I didn't feel like $I$ needed additional information to make that decision.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Vice Chair Aguirre.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Chairman Simpson, may I?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Ms. Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I do agree with your position at this point. I'm also very concerned about the dwelling units, because if you look at the statute, it's real clear what
constitutes a dwelling unit, and I'm not sure that that was really identified very well. So I do agree with that issue.

And $I$ think the hydrology is important, and the fact that it's so close to a water body. So it is very convoluted. If the case is before the Supreme Court, it went through District Court, and now we're asked to try to reconcile two points of view that are vastly different.

I honestly think $I$ need more time to
look at the issues between the two because I'm not going to take what they say at face value, so $I$ really feel like $I$ need more time, even though we've had this before us now for a couple weeks. But it's pretty complicated. So that's my opinion. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll speak up, too. I think I'm somewhere in between Chair Simpson and Board Member Aguirre.

I think with the residences, the reason
I see it as being complicated here is the definition of a primary residence, because there's multiple homes in the area, but they're not necessarily permanently occupied or a primary residence. So $I$ think that's where that is a
little convoluted.
On the groundwater in particular, $I$ would really like to see for the drylands exemption what's been approved in the past. Are there any thresholds that have been adopted as far as distance from groundwater, effects on groundwater. That's the part I'm still a little confused on is what thresholds have been adopted there in the past, because this does kind of seem to be quite on the edge, and I'm not quite sure how to interpret that.

I mean there are references to groundwater wells and GWIC logs and stuff that have been used here to determine that, but we don't have any of that data in front of us. So I'm probably going to side with the motion with Chair Simpson.

BOARD MEMBER RANKOSKY: I would agree that the groundwater is my biggest concern. When we do septics and those types of things, that is one of the kind of golden rules that we abide by. And for you to have a gravel pit, $I$ would like more information before we move forward with that. CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Board Member Rankosky.

Board Member Smith, $I$ believe early in the testimony the point was made that this is the first gravel pit to come to the Board under the new rules that talk about dryland gravel pits, but there may be others out there, so $I$ think it's a pertinent question -- others that have not been challenged, that is. Anything further from the Board?

> (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: I guess I'd circle back, and the question of the meaning of "affect" is something that has drawn a lot of comment here, and it's kind of tough to wrap one's hands around. It's not necessarily ambiguous, it's just vague, because this was addressed by the Hearing Examiner. Effects can be significant or non-significant, material or non-material.

And as you all know, my background is in coal mining, and in coal mining we have a standard called material damage, that is, the operator must demonstrate that the operation is being planned to prevent material damage to ground and surface water. And material damage assessment is based on changes in quality or quality that would have an adverse effect on water users. I'm paraphrasing
here, but that's essentially what it means. So whether that -- it's a different statute, so it doesn't provide any direct guidance here, but $I$ think it does provide a side board at least to what we might consider as a significant or material impact on water.

And the question of impact, $I$ know it goes to the EIS, which is something that really isn't within our realm of responsibility, but we do have a general responsibility under the Constitution to consider the requirements for a clean and healthful environment balanced against the need of the people and the citizens of Montana to be able to make a living. So --

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman, in DEQ's response, they did address that, and also offered a replacement. If we did not agree with the DEQ's interpretation of "affect," they did offer a newly drafted conclusions of law for No. 12. So I mean that is a possibility. After reading through it, $I$ believe that $I$ agree there with DEQ's interpretation of "affect" and how Conclusion of Law 12 was written.

> CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Vice Chair

Aguirre. Anything else?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, I'll restate my motion with a little bit of elaboration, and that is to remand this to the Hearing Examiner, with specific attention to several points. One is whether or not this issue is sufficiently -whether there's agreement on the facts to support summary judgment, that's Item No. 1.

Item No. 2 is with respect to
residences, that we be given a number, and also a map showing the location of the proposed gravel pit relative to other features, including the river, water bodies, and dwellings.

Third is definitive information on the water table, and how it relates to the depth of the pit, that is, the elevation to -- difference in elevation between the groundwater surface and the bottom of the pit; and also a re-examination of the word "affect" and how we deal with it in this context.

Then I'll state separately that my inclination right now, based on what $I$ know, is to support the recommendation that's been made by the Hearing Examiner, but $I$ think we need more information particularly to support the Board's
position in the event the decision we make, whatever it is, is appealed. Any further discussion?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, signify by
saying aye. Let's take a roll call, please.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: AYe.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Nay.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Altemus.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: 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.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: The vote is five to one.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you. The motion carries by a vote of five to one. Shall we move forward? Thank you.
(The proceedings were concluded
at 10:54 a.m.)

*     *         *             *                 * 
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