BEFORE THE BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

BOARD MEETING )
June 21, 2024 )
$\qquad$
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS (VIA ZOOM)

June 21, 2024
9:00 a.m.

BEFORE CHAIRMAN DAVID SIMPSON, BOARD MEMBERS JON REITEN, JOSEPH SMITH, JULIA ALTEMUS, STACY AGUIRRE,
and AMANDA KNUTESON

PREPARED BY: LAURIE CRUTCHER, RPR
COURT REPORTER, NOTARY PUBLIC
lauriecrutcher@gmail.com

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:
(PRESENT: Terisa Oomens, Board Counsel. DEQ Personnel Present: Board Secretary: Sandy Moisey Scherer. Board Liaison: Deputy Director James

Fehr; DEQ Communications: Mae Vader; DEQ Enforcement: Chad Anderson; DEQ Legal: Catherine Armstrong, Sarah Christopherson, Loryn Johnson, Sam King, Jeremiah Langston, Kurt Moser, Aaron Pettis, and Abby Sherwood; DEQ Air, Energy and Mining: Zach Ashauer, Whitney Bausch, Ruby Hopkins, Emily Lodman, Sonja Nowakowski, Anne Spezia, Madeline VerWey; DEQ Water: Joe Vanderwall.

Other Parties Present:
Laurie Crutcher, Crutcher Court Reporting; Elena Hagen, Montana DOJ Agency Legal Services Bureau; Samuel Yemington, Holland \& Hart; Frank Tabish, LHC MT; Russell Batie; Todd Briggs;

Bob Smith - Westmoreland; David Smith, MT
Contractors Association; Ken Stoeber
TMC-Belgrade; Barbara Chillcott, Western Environmental Law Center; Cale Fisher, Riverside Contracting; Roger Noble;

Representative Steve Gunderson) * * * * *

CHAIR SIMPSON: Good morning, everyone.
It looks like most of us are ready to rock.
Welcome everybody to the meeting on coincidentally the first full day of summer, and also the date of the strawberry full moon, which I'm sure we're all looking forward to this evening if the clouds part.

First, before we -- let's go ahead and take the roll, if you would do that, please, Sandy.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: 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
Knuteson.
BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Rankosky.
(No response)

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Here.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: We have a quorum, sir.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much. Before proceeding, $I$ would like to welcome the newest member of the Board, Amanda Knuteson. Thank you so much for joining us, and look forward to working with you as we go forward.

BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: Thank you so much. I'm really glad to be here.

CHAIR SIMPSON: The first item of business is to review the minutes from the April 21 meeting. Are there any comments or changes to the minutes?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion?
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Move to approve.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the April 21 meeting. All in favor, say aye.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries.
Briefing items. Rather than go through these one at a time, $I$ have read through them. I don't really have any questions or comments. I guess I would ask the Board if there are any clarifications or questions that we might want to discuss before moving on with the briefing items. (No response)

CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, let's move along to the action items. The first is in the matter of Sidney Sugars, Incorporated's appeal of Montana Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit No. MT0000248. I assume the parties are represented. Could we have a brief review of where we stand, and the action to be taken, please. Anybody prepared to do that?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Jeremiah Langston Of DEQ has raised his hand.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Langston.
MR. LANGSTON: Can you hear me?
CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.
MR. LANGSTON: Okay. I'm pinch hitting for Kirsten Bowers who is out of the office today. On April 26 th, 2024, Sidney Sugars filed
an unopposed motion to dismiss this appeal without prejudice. DEQ and Sidney Sugars entered an Administrative Order and Consent on April 25 th, 2024 related to the closure of the plant.

Because of the closure of the plant, Sidney Sugars no longer needs to maintain the MPDES permit at issue in this appeal. However Sidney Sugars will sell the property and transfer the permit to a new owner/operator or permittee.

Any permit transfer will terminate the AOC between DEQ and Sidney Sugars, and the transfer of the permit must occur in accordance with relevant administrative laws, and Sidney Sugars must give DEQ at least thirty days notice of the transfer, and DEQ may accept, modify, or revoke, or reissue the permit.

The Hearing Examiner in this case granted SSI's unopposed motion to dismiss on April $29 t h$, and the Board now has to decide whether or not to adopt the Hearings Examiner's order.

My understanding is that Counsel for Sidney Sugars is unavailable for this action item, but given all the filings in this case, they of course support the dismissal of the appeal.
I'm happy to answer any additional
questions the Board might have.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Are there any questions from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Just to be sure we're clear on this, the permit will remain in place; is that correct?

MR. LANGSTON: Chair Simpson, the permit will not be in place anymore because the project is ending. The facility will close. However, they may be able to transfer the permit to a new applicant or a new owner, so $I$ think maybe it's fair to say it kind of exists in the strange in-between position where it's no longer active. Sidney Sugars cannot benefit from the permit any more, but the permit may come into existence again in the future if there's a future purchaser, and if that were to happen, then $D E Q$ would have to decide whether or not a transfer of the permit was appropriate.

Does that answer your question? I apologize if $I$ 'm not being abundantly clear. CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, I think so. So if the plant changes ownership, essentially the permit will become inactive for the time being,
but can be reactivated in the event there's an application for a transfer, that is, the new owner would not have to start from zero to apply for a new MPDES permit; do $I$ understand that correctly? MR. LANGSTON: That's correct, Chairman Simpson.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any other questions?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: I'll make a motion
to adopt the Hearing Examiner's order on the unopposed motion to dismiss appeal.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to accept the Hearing Examiner's recommendation for dismissal of this appeal. Is there any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you.

Let's move along to the next item. This has to do with the renewal of MPDES permit No. MTOOO0264 issued to CHS, Inc., for discharges from the Laurel Refinery. There's an awful lot of paper in our packet having to do with this case, and $I$ think I've finally sorted through it and have a little bit of an understanding of what's happening here. But is there anyone from the Department or CHS who would like to review this and clarify for the benefit of the Board?

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Kurt Moser has his hand raised, Chairman.

MR. MOSER: Good morning.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MR. MOSER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. I believe that Ms. Vicki Marquis should also be on the call this morning representing CHS .

What CHS and DEQ have submitted for the Board's consideration, a stipulation and a proposed order. Effectively if the Board chooses to adopt the order and the attached modified permit which is attached as Exhibit A to that order, and it's included in your packet of
materials, then basically the Board would then be adopting that version of the permit as the final agency decision.

The explanation or the reasons for the changes to the permit or the withdrawal of certain appeal items are explained within the stipulation that's included in the packet. I think that starts on, basically that starts on Page 3 of the stipulation.

Basically as pertinent to the appeal issue, there are three appeal issues in the case. As pertinent to appeal issue one, CHS is withdrawing its appeal of that issue. As pertinent to appeal -- and that is the issue regarding technology based effluent limitations in a permit.

As pertinent to its appeal issue two, the parties are agreeing that the compliance schedule for hydrogen sulfide will be removed from the permit, and CHS also then will agree to withdraw its appeal of the related hydrogen sulfide limitations.

And then final as to appeal issue number three, we will be removing from the permit the requirement to sample and report certain levels of
beta-emitters in millirems per liter, and instead require data to be recorded in picocuries per liter, and the explanation for that is contained within that stipulation, that's paragraph No. 12 .

And so should the Board decide to adopt this final order in the case, then the permit will be final, and then the case is essentially over.

And if Ms. Marquis would like to speak, please, she should do so.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is Ms. Marquis on the call? She's not on my screen.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: She's not on the call, sir.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Any
questions from the Board for Mr. Moser?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: No questions?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: I have a question. As I recall, there was an intervenor in this case. I guess $I$ don't understand what, if any, implications there may be for this settlement agreement if there's an intervenor involved.

MR. MOSER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. I'm not sure if Barbara Chillcott is on
the line. She represented the intervenors. And I don't want to speak for anybody. So $I$ know that the Hearing Examiner did recommend Board approval of the stipulation and the final order.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Barbara Chillcott has raised her hand.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Please go ahead. My screen must be incomplete. I don't have all of the participants on here. Please go ahead. I'm sorry. Thank you.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Good morning.
Apologies. I got disconnected when $I$ tried to raise my hand. Sorry for the technical difficulties.

My name is Barbara Chillcott, and I did not catch the last bit that Kurt Moser offered. I represent the intervening parties in this contested case, the Montana Environmental Information Center and Earthworks.

We did not participate in the settlement discussions related to the stipulation in front of you today. We are not opposed to the settlement as agreed to between CHS and DEQ. And we were not appearing in the case to discuss the issues with the technology based effluent limits or the other
issue that was resolved by the stipulation, and so while we're not opposed to the stipulation, we did not participate in the discussion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
Any questions from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Sounds pretty straight
forward. Is there a motion?
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman, I'll make a motion that the Board adopt the recommendation, and issue a final agency decision on the agreement and stipulations. I might need an assist if I didn't word that quite properly.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second? BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. It's been moved and seconded to approve the settlement agreement and the order to settle this matter.

Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, all in
favor, say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries unanimously.

The last action item has to do with the matter of appeal and request for hearing by the Dairy Subdivision, Missoula County, EQ No. 23-1751. I guess first of all, is the Dairy Subdivision represented by anyone here at the meeting?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Apparently not. Ms. Oomens, could you review for us what this is about, please.

MS. OOMENS: Mr. Pettis from DEQ represents $D E Q$ in this matter, so he may have some insight as well. But essentially the petitioner -- I believe Tai Tam is how you say that -- has ceased participation. They haven't been in contact with me. They haven't responded to any of my order deadlines.

And so $I$ issued a show cause telling them that they have to come forward and tell me why they haven't participated, and why their petition shouldn't be dismissed. Again, they never participated in that, never reached out to
me, and so I've dismissed their appeal.
Again, if Mr. Pettis has anything to add, that would be good, too.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Mr. Pettis.
MR. PETTIS: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
members of the Board. I know that Tai Tam did not file their preliminary statement, and the last couple emails that $I$ sent to opposing Counsel went unanswered, so -- And opposing Counsel, Tai Tam was represented by Alan McCormick. I don't know if he's elsewhere on the line.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Apparently not.
MS. OOMENS: I will also just mention this is dismissed without prejudice, so theoretically if Tai Tam comes forward later on and says, "Hey, this is what happened," or something like that, they can always bring their petition again if need be.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Ms. Oomens.
Any questions from the Board?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a motion?
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I'll move that we adopt the Hearing Examiner's position on this. CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I'll second. CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Any further discussion?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries.
Before we move on, Sandy, I neglected to
ask for a list of people on the call. I have a few on my screen, but $I$ was wondering if you could please review the people who are on the call.

MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I sure will. Sandy Moisey-Scherer, I'm the Board secretary; Aaron Pettis of DEQ; Barbara Chillcott; Deputy Director James Fehr; Kurt Moser, DEQ; Laurie Crutcher, Court Reporter; Terisa Oomens, Montana Department of Justice; Jeremiah Langston, DEQ; Sam King, DEQ; Abigail Sherwood, DEQ; Anne Spezia, DEQ, Catherine Armstrong, DEQ; Bob Smith; Cale Fisher; Chad Anderson, DEQ; David Smith, Montana Contractors Association; Elena Hagen, Department of Justice, Agency Legal Services; Emily Lodman, DEQ; guest; Joe Vanderwall; Ken Stoeber; Madeline VerWey, DEQ;

Ruby Hopkins, DEQ; Russell Batie; Samuel
Yemington; Sonja Nowakowski, DEQ; Todd; Whitney Bausch, DEQ; and Zach Ashauer.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
What $I$ wanted to do was to alter our order of items on the agenda a little bit, and do the Board Chair update before the general public comment. It's now 9:24, and we have gone through our agenda items pretty quickly. I was anticipating that we wouldn't finish with this until nearly ten.

So under the Board Chair update, one of the items listed there is a follow up discussion of opencut issues as a follow up to the last meeting. In the packet there was included a stack of documents having to do with background on open cut statute, rules, regulations, etc., including a couple of items from Legislative Services, one having to do with House Bill 599 and the changes it brought about; another having to do with the history of the last twenty years of changes to the opencut statute. There were a couple of items from the DEQ website that $I$ thought were rather instructive and useful, and also some excerpts from the statute and from the rules.

So what $I$ had intended to do today, if
you recall, at the last meeting we had approved a motion to hold an informational hearing on the opencut program just for the benefit of the Board to understand a little better what the nature of the program is, and what some of the requirements are, and the procedures.

DEQ has declined to participate in such a hearing, and so that's the reason for all of these documents, is to provide some background to the Board on opencut.

Of course, the reason, the matter that triggered this was the item we had at the agenda on our last meeting having to do with the gravel pit up in the Clearwater area, proposed gravel pit; also the fact that we have a number of other opencut cases on our docket that are working through the process right now.

So my question to the Board members is: Having had a chance to review this opencut material, what is your view on whether or not this material is sufficient from your standpoint to provide at least a general understanding of the opencut program? And I'd like to poll the Board members on this. I'll start with Vice Chair Stacy Aguirre. Your thoughts, please.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Thanks, Chairman Simpson. When $I$ conducted my review of this, $I$ did from the standpoint of being the regulated community, and so I looked at it from the standpoint if $I$ was going to submit one of these permit applications, is it clear, do $I$ understand what the requirements are, do $I$ understand the drylands part.

One thing that $I$ first thought about is in our role in looking at these contested cases, the regulated community needs regulatory certainty, and so $I$ introduced that also into my review to make sure that $I$ understood as the regulated community what $I$ need to do; and $I$ also reviewed what others could do as far as concerns about impact to water or different elements of the process as well.

And based on my review, and reading through the statutes and the materials, $I$ feel that $I$ don't need more information. I feel like it is very straight forward on what I'm required to do in order to have a complete application, an application that can work its way through the review process, and become an approved permit.

So that's kind of $I$ guess what $I$ would
say is a high level summary of how I looked at this, and what my thoughts are about the information that's available, the guidance that is there, and if $I$ had regulatory certainty kind of going through the process in order to get approval from Montana $D E Q$ to have this permit to operate essentially.

I know that there's a lot of -- I feel there's enough guidance in here about if there's concerns about water quality from a third party, if there's concerns, $I$ think that it's very straight forward on how they can get involved. And in my mind, if they do have concerns, then they need to get involved, and it's clear how they do that, who they call.

It's also clear to me what the opencut program does versus what other permits may or may not be required as part of the process. I also felt like that was clear guidance to both the regulated community and to any third party that possibly have concerns.

So that's $I$ guess maybe a high level and maybe some detail review thoughts from my review.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you very much. There were $I$ guess two items $I$ wanted to
highlight there. The first was just the adequacy of the material. The second has to do with the question of dryland permits, but I'd like to reserve that until later. Let's just deal with the first half of the question here.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: One thing I'll say before $I$ forget, Chairman Simpson, is on the second point in my review -- and $I$ want everybody to kind of have an insight into my mind on how $I$ thought about this.

I tried to, again, look at it from a regulated community, and not say, "Oh, this rule is good or not good." It's a rule. And so if you're going to proceed, say, with the dryland permitting process then you -- in my mind it was clear. It wasn't a matter of debating whether it was a good rule or a bad rule in my review, it was was it clear?

CHAIR SIMPSON: And that's really the question, $I$ believe. And if you recall back to our last meeting, the issue with the dryland was not whether it's a good idea or a bad idea, it was a question of -- in a case like we had with the Clearwater, when it comes to the Board, is there sufficient information to resolve a dispute as to
whether or not it is in fact a dryland site.
And I guess I'd like to acknowledge the fact that that was not a unanimous vote. And anyway, we can revisit that here in a little bit. I'd like to work through just the general question of whether there is sufficient information here for the Board to decide essentially whether or not we need to proceed with a hearing, but $I$ think it's an exercise we need to go through before taking that next step. Anything further, Stacy? VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Not at this time.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Board Member Altemus. Julia.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. First, thank you for pulling all this information together -- I know it's hard to slog through all the rules and where they're at because they're everywhere -- and also providing what the bill did and didn't do. So I certainly appreciate having that all here.

I love information, but $I$ also work with the regulated community, so $I$ kind of went through it the same way that Vice Chair Aguirre did. And I believe, for me, there's enough information here, but $I$ also know $I$ have the ability if I'm
missing something to search it out. So to make it short, I don't need additional information at this time. And $I$ can address the dry cut later when you get to that question, but thank you for polling us and pulling the information together.
(Representative Steve Gunderson present) CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Julia. Board Member Reiten.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Yes. I agree for the most part that as a regulated community person, you should have enough information, and we have enough information to make decisions on this based on this information.

I kind of looked at it both as if $I$ was being regulated, as part of the regulated community, and if $I$ had some concerns. And I think my opinion is that there's enough information for both cases, for both sides to be looking at this to know what they need to do.

So I think I liked the information. It would have been -- I still would have preferred to have someone from DEQ present some of this for us, but $I$ think what we have is adequate. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Jon. Board

Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Yes. I'll echo the others. Thank you so much for pulling together the information. I think it was really helpful.

I would say yes, it's clear to me what's needed for these permits. I was looking at it more from what question would $I$ have in reviewing one of these, like the Clearwater one, for example, that we've already gone through, and where it's clear, and where it's a little fuzzy, like the gray areas.

For me I think $I$ have the information $I$ need to feel like $I$ can make a decision. I think where it's a little gray is what we consider the burden of proof on each of these required items to be provided by both the applicant and the appellants in case of these appeal. But $I$ would say yes, I've got what $I$ need to $I$ think make that decision.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Joe. Board Member Knuteson, recognizing you didn't have the pleasure of working through the last meeting with us.

BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: Chair Simpson, members of the Board. Thank you. So I'm going to do my utmost not to bog down our meeting with newby questions, but $I$ just had a couple of questions before comments.

The first one, Chair Simpson, is the purpose of our review of the information you provided. Is that to decide if we are qualified to hear these contested cases on these permits, for us to make the determination instead of the Hearing Examiner, or what is the -- do we have enough information to do what? If you don't mind just clarifying that for me. And I'm sorry again if I've messed up.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, in my mind -- and if anybody else had a different understanding. Again, going back, this was triggered by the case that we had at the last meeting where we had motions for summary judgment from both the permit holder and from the State, from DEQ, with regard to a permit, a gravel pit permit, existing permit along the Clearwater River south of Seeley Lake.

And it seemed that, at least with regard to the issue in that particular case, there really wasn't enough information in my mind for the Board to make a decision. Recognizing that at that time we had five additional appeals having to do with gravel pits, it was my thought, and the Board agreed, that it would be helpful if we had an informational hearing -- in quotes -- where the Department could review with the Board the essential elements of the regulatory program. It wasn't a matter of, quote, "being qualified." I think what we need to do is, when we hear these cases, rely on the testimony as it comes from the permit holder and the Department with regard to the specific elements of the contested case, and then the Board is tasked with making the final decision.

So it was just a matter of familiarity. It wasn't a matter of being qualified or not qualified to make the decision. I mean the decision ultimately has to be made on the record in the case, but $I$ think it is helpful, particularly in a matter where we have such a line-up of cases coming down the pike, that it would be useful for the Board to have a little background knowledge of what the regulatory program entails. That was the only purpose. BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: I appreciate that. "Qualified" might have been the wrong term. I meant prepared and informed enough to
competently manage these contested cases.
I guess from my perspective, I'm not wearing my attorney hat when $I$ remark as part of this Board. We have our attorney. But $I$ think that one of the questions $I$ had, too, was how does this Board make determinations about which contested cases the Board will decide versus which will be assigned to a Hearing Examiner in the context of these opencut permits in particular.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, that's a good question, because by and large the Board has assigned virtually all the cases that have come before us to hearing examiners. At the last meeting we had three petitions challenging a permit decision near Gallatin Gateway, and in that case, the Board voted to take the lead rather than assign it to a Hearing Examiner.

And $I$ can only speak for myself. I felt it was important for the Board to take the lead on that because it's a highly controversial case, and we had multiple -- at the time we had multiple appellants. As has happened two of those have dropped out since that meeting, so there is only one petitioner at this point. I guess the petitioner is a better word than appellant.

So I think it's something -- to try and answer your question, it's something that's decided on a case-by-case basis. And $I$ don't know. Does anybody else, any of the other Board members have any thoughts on that?
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chairman Simpson, Representative Gunderson has joined the call and he has raised his hand.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Representative
Gunderson. Welcome.
REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Sorry about that. A little rusty on Zoom. Thank you, Chair. Is there anything that $I$ can add or answer questions? Maybe just to kind of make sure everybody knows who $I$ am, I'm a fourth term legislator in the House; two terms, two last terms as the House Natural Resources Standing Committee Chairman, and I'm also the current Chair of the Environmental Quality Council.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Representative
Gunderson, $I$ appreciate your joining us this morning. I guess what $I$ would like to do is complete the discussion we're involved in, and then $I$ would like to ask you to review, to give us
a review of your view of this, and particularly your experience with House Bill 599 and the importance thereof, if that would be all right with you.

REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: I'm at your beck and call, sir. I'll just mute myself, and lower my hand, and wait until called upon.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
We'll be back with you shortly.
REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Sounds good. Thank you, sir.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Board Member Knuteson, did we answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: You did, and I just had one more question, before $I$ had remarks, for Terisa Oomens, please, our Counsel.

MS. OOMENS: Sure. Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: So again, I hate to put my ignorance on full display, but to what extent is this Board -- are we informed by the Supreme Court decisions on the rules that we're reviewing here?

Because I noticed that the Clearwater case has been submitted for a decision, which hopefully will be forthcoming this summer. And I
didn't know if we -- Well, I'll let you answer that. I would just like to know to what extent that we would take into account decisions by the Montana Supreme Court on these regulations, these rules and regulations.

Because as a member, I mean I appreciate the perspective of we review these as members of the regulated community potentially, but $I$ think that members of the regulated community certainly will be watching that case, and taking into the account what the Court decision will be.

And that also leads to Director Dorrington declining to provide us with the informational meeting that we requested. In my effort to try to fill in that very big gap that that leaves, $I$ went to that case in order to read DEQ's briefs, $I$ read the Amicus brief from the Contractors Association.

And one of the things that stood out to me from the Contractors brief was the statement that the Opencut Act is not an all encompassing act. Obviously it works in tandem with other substantive regulations, Montana Water Quality Act, Clean Water Act, Montana Water Use Act, as well as applicable local zoning laws.

And with that in mind, $I$ just, from my perspective, $I$ think I'm leaning towards $I$ would want more information. I wouldn't want to -- Even if we have to get it elsewhere, if we need to go to EQC or -- I would like this Board to have more information than just what's in this packet today.

But again, $I$ would like to request from Terisa her input on to what extent we would even factor in or discuss any Court decisions that relate to these rules.

MS. OOMENS: So the Board operates similar to a lower level District Court, and so we are bound by merit decisions of the Montana Supreme Court specifically, especially regarding these rules.

I will say that -- I don't want to get into Clearwater specifically just because I don't think that's appropriate in this discussion, but the way that it typically works is BER is the final internal decision, and then if there are further things that need to be decided, the BER decision will be appealed to a District Court or the Supreme Court. Does that answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: It does. I
understand that that's the way it works procedurally. I'm trying to figure out substantively what we're able to factor in, or what we should be factoring in. Should we only be looking at these rules? Should we read through all of these acts, and just look at the rules, or do we need to be briefed on some of the pertinent cases that allow us to get a glimpse into how the Courts interpret them? What's maybe not been implemented the way that the rule might read, or what's been deemed ambiguous, where the agency gets more deference, that kind of discussion.

Is that something that we could benefit from, or is that outside the scope of where we need to be? Do we just need to be looking at the rules and the acts?
mS. OOMENS: I think Court
interpretation would be great. This new House Bill doesn't have a whole lot of Court interpretation at this point unfortunately. But if the parties brief that, that would be awesome. If the Board wants to request that, that would be great. I think it's definitely relevant to our decision. We can't look at the rule on its own if it's been interpreted further. So does that
answer your question?
BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: It does. Thank you. And $I$ think that would lead me to $I$ guess respectfully disagree with my colleagues on the Board who feel that we have sufficient information before us. I would really like, if possible, to have the educational session, whatever format that would take. I would really like the gap filled that DEQ has left. I think that we need more education. That would be my vote if we were voting. Is that an answer to your poll question, Chair Simpson?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes, it is. Thank you very much, Ms. Knuteson.

From my own standpoint in a general sense, $I$ think the information that's been assembled gives us a good background on -- At least from my standpoint having read through it all, $I$ understand a lot better how the process works.

And of course I've got the benefit of a background in mining myself, so it's something where $I$ could apply some experience and knowledge from the work that I've done in the past.

I did have a number of my questions
answered that $I$ had on my mind at the last meeting. I guess $I$ would emphasize that as we are called on to make the ultimate decision on each of these cases as it comes before us, we are to some extent -- and correct me if I'm wrong, please, Terisa -- but we are bound by the facts as brought forward in the findings of fact and conclusions of law presented to us by the Hearing Examiner.

However, the makeup of this Board by law consists of various backgrounds, and the reason for that $I$ believe -- I don't know that it's stated in statute -- but it stands to reason that as a citizen board, we're called on to bring our background and knowledge as well into the process of making these decisions under the Administrative Procedure Act.

And as far as the question having to do with opencut, I'm not really sure that we need I guess what I'd call a full blown informational review in a formal hearing setting, given the information that is available to us.

However, there is the question that came before us at the last meeting having to do with the dryland permit, which was a new concept to me. I don't know if there have been -- It's the first
one that's come to the Board on that basis, that is, is this a dryland -- given the criteria, is this a dryland permit or not.

And so I guess I've got the question of whether the Department, the applicant, and ultimately the Board would be better served if the applicant were required to provide something more definitive than a certification with respect to the number of residences, and the presence or absence of hydrologic features than what we've seen in the one case that we've looked at.

Again, it was mentioned by Ms. Oomens that discussing that case specifically is not appropriate, and as we talk about this further, I think we have to avoid talking about cases that are pending before us. However, the matters that have come up so far are all public information flowing from the last meeting, so $I$ don't know that there's a problem there. I don't believe there is.

So with that, I'd then ask the second question is: Specifically with regard to the information that is supplied by the applicant with regard to the criteria for a dryland site, f fully understand the reasoning behind the dryland
classification. What concerned me was that if there is a petition challenging a permit that comes to the Board, that the Board have sufficient information to make a decision.

In this case, that case has not gone to hearing yet, so that may be one reason why the specifics weren't included in the findings of fact and conclusions of law. It was strictly a consideration for a motion for summary judgment.

But $I$ guess $I$ would raise the second question then with my fellow Board members is: What are your thoughts, having read through the rules, and the background, and also the discussion at the last meeting, as to whether the requirements for the dryland permit are sufficient, and in particular, recognizing that the law is -- it's stated clearly in the law what's required.

The question in my mind is whether the regulation then that is based on the law is sufficient, and whether there is an opportunity to provide more information consistent with what's required in the law, but not in excess, which of course isn't permitted.
So with that, I guess I'd like to poll
the Board one more time, but $I$ see it is two minutes until ten. Rather than start down that road, why don't we take a break, reconvene at ten minutes after ten, and then we will -- What I'd like to do then is to bounce this question off the Board members, and then we'll move into public comment. Thank you.
(Recess taken)
CHAIR SIMPSON: We will bring the meeting back to order. Sandy, would you call 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

Knuteson.
BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: 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. Okay. To pick up where we left off, I'd just like to have a brief statement from the point of view from each of the Board members on this question of the dryland permits.

The requirements, as I recall, are that there be -- make sure $I$ get it right -- be less than ten residences within a half mile; that the operation not intersect any hydrologic features, including streams, ponds, or groundwater.

So the question is whether -- And all we have to base this on is the one project that's come before us. But having read through the law, and having read through the statute and the rules that implements, the implementing rules, what's your view on whether there is sufficient information there for, number one, the Department to make an evaluation.

And secondly -- and this is why $I$
suggested we pursue this a little bit -- is if there's enough information there for the Board to
make a determination if the permit is appealed. Once again, Vice Chair Aguirre.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, I
feel like $I$ addressed that with my earlier comments, and wrap that dryland opencut mining permit application into my overall comments. Like I stated, $I$ went through all those requirements, and they're prescriptive as far as my review of them. And so an applicant needs to follow them, and Montana DEQ will evaluate on those. So they're prescriptive requirements.

I feel like my comments really characterize the process $I$ went through to look at this, and my thoughts about there being enough information, or the requirement being adequate to provide the information Montana DEQ needs, has requested and needs to make a decision on a permit.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: Does that spark a question from you?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, $I$ just want to get each Board member's view of this before we move to the next stage, and so you've answered my question. So thank you. Board Member Altemus. BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you, Chair Simpson. So setting aside the case that brings all this together -- I'm trying to not bleed over into that -- and just looking at the bill, House Bill 599, looking at the rules that came out of that bill, and then the law, to me $I$ would agree with Vice Chair that there is sufficient information.

I think what happens is there's always subject to interpretation of the rules, and this is why these cases come before us, because there's different interpretations of the rules. But if you go back to the underlying bill, House Bill 599, it's really clear.

What isn't in House Bill 599, though, is the actual term "dryland cut," whatever you want to call it. That's not in there. So opencut, that word, that terminology appears in the rules, and it's never defined in the bill. It's defined later.

But all those requirements to do this, whether it's the less than ten dwelling units, that's really well defined; how far from a water body, that's really well defined; the fact that the permitter has to provide a Cadastral or ground
truthing certificate, really defined.
So I think the information is there, but is it sufficient going forward? I guess time will tell, as all these interpretations come before us. So $I$ guess I'll just leave it at that.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
Board Member Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: I think it's -- I see $a$ bit of $a$ problem in the fact that just by calling something dryland, if you're the operator, doesn't necessarily mean that it's dryland. You have to have evidence, you have to have data, you have to have information to prove that. And I think in that last case we had some issues with that.

But the main things is that we need that information. A person just can't call it that, it's got to be shown that that's the case. And I felt that, the only one we looked at, $I$ felt we were a little bit shorted on some of that.

And as well as the opinion on what's an occupied residence, or whatever the property, occupied property, $I$ think that appears to have different opinions of different size. So I think there needs to be very good clarity on that before we can even think about ruling that. So that's my opinion.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Jon. Board Member Smith.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I would agree with the other Board members so far, all of them, in that $I$ feel like the information presented here in statute is clear enough for us and DEQ to make a recommendation.

I think where maybe we're breaking down a little bit, because we're talking about two different things, do we have the information here, versus did we have the information in that last case that we saw to make a determination, and I think those are two different things.

I would say yes, I feel like the statutes are clear, but as we go to review the next case, we might request a lot more information on that case, just like a burden of proof. I look at it from the attorney standpoint, but Board Member Knuteson might look at it from a Court decision standpoint. And so $I$ would say yes, I feel like House Bill 599 and the statutes are clear.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Joe. Board

Member Knuteson.
BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: Thank You, Chair Simpson. I actually agree with Member Reiten, his remarks. Again, I'm a newby here, but how are applicants determining that it's dryland in the first place? What information is submitted to determine that it's dryland?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, can $I$ interject a thought that $I$ feel is relevant to Board Member Knuteson's question, and also some of the other input.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Please do.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: So one of the opportunities when you do opencut mining permitting in Montana is to request a preapplication meeting with Montana DEQ. And in my experience as part of the regulated community, those preapplication meetings are extremely valuable to guide the regulatory community through the permitting process and the requirements of the permitting process.

So I think that somewhat speaks to your question about how does somebody arrive at that point where they're going to apply for a dryland opencut mining permit. One, the requirements are
stated in there about what the permit application for the dryland, you know, the proximity to water, and the proximity to occupied dwellings, but also that opportunity for that preapplication meeting, and that compliance assistance is there, too.

And $I$ don't know. You know, $I$ can't characterize how often that opportunity is acted on. And as the regulated community, probably you're going about your business in the right way, that's an opportunity that might be missed, but that would assist us with our work.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you. Board Member Knuteson.

BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: Thank you, Vice Chair Aguirre. That is helpful. I think that $I$ would reserve taking a position on this just until I do a little bit more research on my own beyond just what $I$ read in the packet today.

And I really appreciated that
Representative Gunderson is here today, so I think maybe his input will be valuable as well, because I know that I've read -- and obviously $I$ don't -this doesn't govern us, but $I$ can't escape living in a universe of reading newspaper articles.

And I know Representative Gunderson had
mentioned potentially refining this rule in the next legislative session. I don't know if he can speak to that. But $I$ would be interested to know if he can, in what ways he might augment this or change this, or thread that needle.

But I'm going to reserve taking a firm position either way. I need more information personally. That might not mean that you-all, the rest of you do. So thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.
Well, $I$ guess my view on this is that the requirements are clearly stated in the statute. I don't think, certainly don't think there's an issue there. The question is the manner in which it's presented to the Department and to the Board.

With respect to the dryland permit, my understanding is less than ten occupied residences, that the site does not -- I'm not sure if this word is actually used -- but does not intersect hydrologic resources -- streams, ponds, or groundwater.

And $I$ guess I'm relying on my own experience, having dealt for years with the process of permitting coal mines. We rely heavily on maps, and all maps that were submitted with
those applications needed to be certified, some just by someone with the authority, others by a registered professional engineer.

But what $I$ 'm going to suggest is -actually it's more of a question -- is would it be consistent with the statute for the Department to state either in the rules or otherwise that a map could be either required or requested that would show the proposed, the location of the proposed operation, that is the pit, the permit area; the residences within a half mile; hydrologic features; and also a simplified cross section showing ground elevation, elevation of the pit floor, and elevation of the groundwater surface.

That would provide a documented record of what the situation is, much more so than a written certification that none of these features are -- that all these features are in compliance.

So that's my thought. It's a question as to what form the information is provided, and with that, $I$ would ask Representative Gunderson -again, thank you for joining us today -- and if you could enlighten the Board on some of the questions that have been raised, and also just some background on House Bill 599, it would be
greatly appreciated.
REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. And if you could indulge me for a minute, $I$ 've got something that $I$ would like to read as a comment. And again, to give you a background, I've worked with opencut specifically for the past three sessions, and the goal of all of those efforts have been to streamline the permitting process. And if you actually go back through all of the laws that we've written and the bills we've written, they've been specifically to do that, and $I$ think we've accomplished it.

599 was one to actually separate out certain pits that would meet that dryland rural permit status, and would require even less permitting. I think if we start getting into this certification and tearing it apart, one of the things we've done is we've actually gutted 599 and a lot of the laws that we've written in the attempt to streamline the process.

But if you'd indulge me, like $I$ say, $I$ do have a comment I'd like to read.

Chair Simpson, Board members, thank you for the ability to comment today as the sponsor of HB 599.

Opencut was, is, and continues to be a reclamation law, how to return the land back to as close to its original use and contours as possible. Opencut sites supply the very foundations for our homes, roads, and highways. Bipartisan amendments to the opencut laws have been made over the past twenty plus years.

Since the passage of $H B 599$ in 2021, the world has not come to a fiery end. I believe we, the people of Montana, have benefit from not seeing a huge increased price from the critical minerals and products that are produced by opencut projects.

Opencut is not a property rights law, nor should it be bastardized into a weapon to be used that to end. Property rights dictate the property owner's right to develop his or her property as they see fit. Using the might, maybe, or possible "create environmental damage" mantra bastardizes our well laid out and proven environmental law.

The "not in my back yard" thinking has some validity, but to bastardize our well-intended and proven environmental law to use for their own ends is unconscionable. To question our
permitting agencies, who for almost 40 years have been gaining experience, is just plainly wrong.

The NGO's have questioned the permitting agencies' abilities and the findings produced to permit a project, and they've developed that process into a tool to slow or stop development in mining and timber projects. That tool was used quite extensively over the last many decades to use liberal Judges to stop good, badly needed projects. We're now seeing a retooling of that tool to be used against opencut projects.

The Clearwater opencut case should be a clear visual representation of the use of that tool. The Clearwater pit has two, mind you, two EA's, Environmental Assessments, written by two separate agencies, $D E Q$ and DNRC.

Clearly all of the information to stop and end this litigation lies in those two documents and their findings. How can two separate EA's get it wrong? How can two separate agencies that utilize pure proven science to find the Clearwater opencut project would do no environmental harm?

Which do we believe and trust, the NGO's and the non-educated public, and the opinions of
"not in my back yard" folks, or the proven scientific studies and findings of these agencies with decades of proven decisions? Do we allow the weaponization of the opencut law?

I believe that we, the people of
Montana, will see huge price increases in the many critical opencut minerals that these projects, as they're slowed, stymied, or completely stopped. An opencut project moved many, many miles further and further into rural area will not only monetarily increase prices, but increase the very impacts to our environment the NGO's are telling us they want to protect us from.

Longer delivery routes will not only increase our use of fossil fuels to transport further, but increase the release of the pollutants these folks are asking you to help curb, by denying permits where the materials are found to exist, and the property owner wishes to develop.

Your findings today should answer the questions raised on all the other projects. Don't allow the use of a bastardized interpretation of the law to be used to cloud the great work of our agencies. Again, thank you for the opportunity to
testify.
One of the things that $I$ would like to say, maybe answering Board Member Knuteson's question, and $I$ can paraphrase a little bit. The information that the agencies glean from these permit applications, it isn't written on a bar napkin. There's a lot of information out there available that would help an operator certify a permit.

And again, we're talking about known areas that do not have an impact to water, and are far enough from populations of people to not be a big issue. And the thing is if the operator does not follow that permit, and enforcement takes over, and he's got to, he or she has got to bring that project into compliance or he loses the permit. So again, it's not just a wholesale dig it, dump it high, and leave it.

And again, anything that starts not using that certification basically cuts 599 and the reasoning for bringing that amendment to opencut. I guess are there any other questions that $I$ can specifically answer?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Any questions from the Board?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, this is Julia Altemus. If $I$ may ask a question real quick?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Please.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thanks for being here, Representative Gunderson. Board Member Knuteson mentioned that there might be, or you might be thinking of an amendment to 599 in the next session. Do you have a response to that? Are you thinking that there needs to be some tweaking of this piece of legislation?

REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Mr. Chair, Board Member Altemus. I'm a little torn by that. I believe Board Member Altemus said it's pretty well cut and dried of what is needed, and rulemaking that $I$ actually was a part of as the sponsor $I$ think answered all the questions that are out there.

There are actually comments being made on opencut projects that are standard projects, and the nay sayers, and NGO's, and people that have a problem with it are actually using 599 to justify that problem or questioning the permit. And they aren't even under that jurisdiction of HB599.

So tweaking of it, I'm open to it. In fact what $I$ would probably offer, if somebody can come up with a way to tighten up those rules, I'd be more than happy to bring it to EQC, and actually have us come up with a committee bill that would either, one, put that into MCA; or to ask DEQ Opencut and the Mining administrator to rulemake to add that further into rules.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Thank you.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Any other questions for Representative Gunderson?

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Chairman Simpson, members of the Board, and Representative Gunderson. I don't really have a question, but my comment is: I do agree that it's clear what the rules are. They are clear. But $I$ think it depends on who defines those. And for us to evaluate any contentious or a concern about it, we need to have that information.

And that's all I -- I think we need to be able to evaluate it real easily. I liked Chair Simpson's idea of a map, and a couple of like figures describing the area. That would make it a lot easier to visualize and understand what the problems are, if any, or at least to be able to
evaluate it.
So that's mainly a comment I've got, but I'd be open for discussion if anyone has any more.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair, may I make another comment, ask a question?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: So I do like your idea of the additional information, I guess. The question $I$ have is: I think we as a Board have a right, obligation, if we think we're missing information, to ask that of the petitioner for sure, or the permittee.

I guess $I$ worry that if we ask the DEQ to open $u p$ rules, lots of crazy stuff can happen when you open up rules, because then it goes up to public comment. So then I'm a little concerned about that, because you really could lose the basis of House Bill 599.

Maybe you involve EQC to direct somebody to do something. But $I$ guess my question is: Is it sufficient for the Board just to ask questions or for more information for these projects instead of opening up the law or the rules?

REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Mr. Chair, if I could maybe respond to that? going to ask if you had a response.

REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Mr. Chair,
and $I$ guess this is basically pointed toward all the Board members, not anyone specifically.

Last session one of the Representatives brought HB581. And Board Member Altemus, you're spot on. When you try to open up something to make minor tiny changes, there's always someone there to come in, and to actually gut what is there already, and to insert their thinking on how it should be, experience or not.

And again, the Representative that brought 581 had no experience in natural resources, let alone opencut, and was attempting to change all of the public comment periods, and even add additional public comment periods, to where they would bog down the process to not only a slow crawl, but in some cases paralyze it.

So again, I agree. We have to be careful in how we approach this. Actually the more $I$ think about it, it's probably -- A very simple fix would be to have EQC bring a bill that specifically addresses the current predicament I think you feel you're in, in lack of information,
that if there is a contentious project, and once it's been challenged, that the operator supply that information, and maybe have DEQ or DNRC, whichever agency would be applicable, to quickly review that, and just make sure that it does jive with reality, what's on the ground. Mr. Chair.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, can I --

CHAIR SIMPSON: Please.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: -- address that. So in my review of the regulation, there is a requirement for a public notice by the operator. They have to submit public notice. And in there is a requirement for a location map that meets requirements that are spelled out in 17.24.221.

And in that, there is a big laundry list of items that would be provided on the site map, and there is a specific reference to the location map in the application, but in the public notice and the information that has to be provided, the information that you have stated you're seeking is in that laundry list.

So again, as several of -- I think Board Member Altemus said it well, and that there's an interpretation issue here. But the reality is
that the rule provides that requirement or that opportunity already to request that information. And the way that the rule references back to the plan of operation maps gives DEQ already the ability to -- or $I$ should say it in the reverse -the permittee being required to provide that information.

So $I$ kind of think that speaks to
several comments made by Representative Gunderson, and all of the other Board members. So I guess my point there is that there's already that detail in the rule.

REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Mr. Chair, if I could request Board Member Aguirre to say that MCA again. I think $I$ wrote it down wrong.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: It was 17.24.221, and --

CHAIR SIMPSON: That's the rule.
VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: -- it's No. 3. And it talks to, "Site maps must show and identify the following existing and proposed features as applicable."

The reference that $I$ was going from, Representative Gunderson, was from 17.24.228, and it is (c) (ii), and it's part of the public notice
process, and it references back to that plan of operation map section. Did I make that clear or did $I$ confuse it more?

CHAIR SIMPSON: If $I$ could interrupt for just a moment, Board Member Aguirre, or Vice Chair Aguirre. I don't believe that a dryland permit requires a plan of operation.

BOARD MEMBER AGUIRRE: It does not, you're correct, but it still requires a location map.

CHAIR SIMPSON: It does require a location map.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Yes, it does, it requires a location map. And there is extra language in the rule already to request those kinds of details. So there's already a regulatory mechanism in place that doesn't, in my mind, need to be tweaked in any way. But it's in the dryland opencut mining permit application, it's Item (e), a location map is required.

The level of detail for a dryland opencut mining permit is as Representative Gunderson reviewed and stated. It's a streamlining of the process, but the regulation itself provides opportunity for information.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you.
Representative Gunderson. Oh, Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: It seems like we're all talking about the same thing here, but we're kind of talking in circles a little bit. I mean $I$ think when it comes down to it, we were presented a case, and we saw two more cases coming down the pipe on the same thing that was based on statutes from a new bill, and $I$ don't think we had the information to really make a determination, but $I$ think we do now.

But $I$ think part of the issue was, like Representative Gunderson mentioned, that it had two EA's. I'm looking at our Board materials from the last meeting, and we weren't presented any of that, and $I$ think that's where the disconnect is. It's not around the statutes per se, it's around the information that we had to make a decision on that case.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Joe, and I certainly agree. Representative Gunderson, anything further you'd like to add?

REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Mr. Chair, and specifically back to Board Member Smith. In my comments, that is the reason that $I$
specifically pointed out that the Clearwater pit has two EA's from two separate agencies, DNRC and DEQ, and that data is all within those EA's, not to even include the permit application.

At some point, $I$ think we have to all agree that this issue is being tooled up to just be a "not in my back yard," or "we feel it's going to be an environmental hazard." I guess the question would be, is maybe to ask DEQ Opencut how many opencut permits, since the opencut process was initiated, have been ecological disasters that are still brewing today, and $I$ believe that that number will be very, very close to zero. We're not working with open pit mining. We're not even working with underground mining. We're scratching the surface, and recontouring it, taking out gravel, and rocks, and making them into littler rocks.

So I think we have to look at the number of contentious litigation processes that have been brought forth, and when they've happened, how many opencut permits were questioned, let's say, ten years ago, twenty years ago, and $I$ think you'll find that number just keeps increasing.

The actual physical possibility of
environmental damage isn't there and never has been, and if something does happen, that's why the DEQ bonds all projects, is that they take into account mitigation to reclaim that ground, and they'll remove the permit flat out if there is damage.

So again, $I$ guess $I$ 'm just going back to are we bastardizing well-intended law to try to stop, slow or stop opencut mining, or where it's at. Mr. Chair.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you,
Representative Gunderson. I think I'd like to move along here. First $I$ would ask if there are any others on the call who would like to comment on this matter, any public comment.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, $I$ just have one other comment regarding all of this.

And to my knowledge, some of that material, like the EA's that Representative Gunderson talked about, should probably have been in our packet, or something referring to that that, "Here's the information you might need to evaluate this." That's all I'd say.

I think that $I$ agree with everyone's
statements, and especially Representative Gunderson's, that there's very, very little chance of environmental harm coming from some of these things, but for this dryland, if they're going call it dryland, you need to have the evidence to show that it truly is dryland. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you. CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Board Member Reiten.

Well, $I$ guess to wrap this up, I'll try to be brief here. As far as -- I have to agree that in terms of the potential for environmental harm, gravel pits are in my mind pretty innocuous compared to other kinds of development that might occur. It's just a matter of digging a hole in the ground, and as Representative Gunderson stated, turning big rocks into little rocks.

Gravel, except in rare instances, is not reserved as a mineral typically. It doesn't come under the definition of mineral, if my understanding is correct. So gravel ownership goes with the surface ownership, and so it is property rights, certainly a matter of property rights, if the landowner chooses to develop a gravel deposit.

My sole concern here is that in instances where permit issuance by the Department is petitioned to the Board, that the Board have sufficient information to be able to make a decision, a determination, and narrowing it down even further on the question of what documentation is necessary to support the decision that the project is in fact a dryland, quote, end quote, dryland pit under the statute and the rules.

I have no quarrel with the statute certainly, and no quarrel with the rules per se. It's just -- and $I$ believe the Department, based on the language of the statute, has the authority to ask for information on hydrologic resources and the number of residences that would be within a half mile or whatever distance is applicable.

So with that, I guess I have two questions for the Board. First is: At our last meeting we made the decision to proceed with the hearing opencut, which $I$ think as a practical matter we've just had. So is there a motion to proceed or not proceed with the further hearing on the opencut program in general?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion not to proceed with a
public, request for a public hearing.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Is there a second?
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded not to proceed with the public hearing that we contemplated at the last meeting. Is there any further discussion from the Board?

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chairman, I guess $I$ would like to say thank you for the opportunity to have this conversation/discussion. I mean I've learned a lot more than we had going into the last meeting, so $I$ feel very comfortable with Vice Chair Aguirre's motion. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you, Julia.
Further comment, discussion.
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: A motion has been made and seconded. All in favor say aye.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Opposed.
BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: Nay.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Roll call vote, please.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Chair Simpson.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Vice Chair Aguirre.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Altemus.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Knuteson.
BOARD MEMBER KNUTESON: Nay.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member
Reiten.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Aye.
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: Board Member Smith.
BOARD MEMBER SMITH: Aye.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

The next question is whether any more discussion, investigation, whatever you want to call it, with regard to this question of the information required to support a determination that a gravel operation meets the dryland classification. Is there a motion whether or not to proceed with the matter further?

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, I guess I feel confused by that question.

CHAIR SIMPSON: My question is there were two questions that $I$ had laid out for the

Board with respect to this. The first was the question of whether we needed to proceed with a full blown hearing on the regulatory program as it relates to opencut in general for the information of the Board, so that we could be a little better educated in cases going forward. I believe we've accomplished that with the package of information, and the Board has agreed with that.

And perhaps we don't need a further motion. The specific question that $I$ had raised is your analysis, and position, thoughts on the informational requirements. Based on the discussion and what we've heard, I guess $I$ would like to have a motion on whether or not -- yes or no -- should we or should we not proceed with any further discussion of the question of -specifically the question of criteria for dryland gravel operations.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Chairman Simpson, I guess my thought is that -- It's not a motion as much as what $I$ think $I$ heard, that we just want to be provided with -- for a contested case, we want to be provided with all of the information that we need to make a decision, because we possibly uncovered that we maybe -- and I don't think it is
a lack of desire, but --
CHAIR SIMPSON: Well, Vice Chair
Aguirre, that's my question exactly, is on this particular question, $I$ don't want to be put in a position, as we have been at our last meeting where we're asked to make a decision with information, inadequate information.

And there's argument that all of the information that was required under the rules was provided to us. I did not agree with that position. So my question is whether this Board needs to examine any further the discussion that we've had here today, the question of criteria, the question of the criteria to be provided to the Board, and by extension to the Department in their consideration of an application, specifically to the matter of the classification of whether an opencut gravel operation is a standard permit or a dryland permit.

Maybe I'm splitting hairs here. I don't know. But $I$ just want to be satisfied that we have, either have or have not answered that question.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chair -- go ahead, Jon. I'm sorry.

BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I think we should be -- We need that information, and maybe it's rather than going through a motion, we just need it on an individual case. If we say, if we see the packet, and see the information that was provided, and it doesn't tell us what we need to know, we need to ask for more. We can do it on a specific case, or $I$ would be happy to provide a motion to say that we need these specific items. I don't know. I'm not sure the best way to proceed on this, but $I$ think we do need to make sure we get it, and maybe it's supplied in other cases. I don't know if we can do it individually, or do we need to have a separate thing specifically asking for this information. We need it. Undoubtedly we need it.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment?

CHAIR SIMPSON: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I agree with
Board Member Reiten, but $I$ think what $I$ was going to say is $I$ think a motion right now, I'm a little hesitant, because $I$ don't want the Board to get boxed into a decision, because we might say that there's three or four things more that would be
helpful, but honestly there might be seven or eight things more that are helpful.

I think we learned where to find information, we've learned now what we need to ask for, and we have that ability to do so going forward. And $I$ think everybody is on notice that these need to have more information, the agencies are on notice as well as we are.

So $I$ would be hesitant to enter into a motion right now. I just think we have enough to move forward with these cases. Personally $I$ think we do. I guess that would be my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: My concern is that at our last meeting we did exactly as Jon stated, that is, the case came to us as a motion for summary judgment, and we remanded it because the information wasn't there to make the decision. As a result of that remand, rather than being decided, this case is now going to go forward to hearing, rather than being decided on the spot.

And so the Board of course isn't in the position of writing rules. I don't know the rule is necessary here. I think probably we have made our position clear to the Department, that there
needs to be some manner of documentation when it comes to classifying an opencut operation as dryland or not.

I guess my question was: Do we need to pursue the matter further, or do we put it to bed right now? And if we don't, the consensus seems to be that we probably don't need a motion based on the discussion. Is that a fair assessment?
(Nods heads)
CHAIR SIMPSON: How does the rest of the Board feel about that?

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: I agree. I don't think we need to make a motion right now. I think we need to continue with the cases before us through the normal review process, and if we need more information, we'll request it at that time.

VICE CHAIR AGUIRRE: Agreed.
BOARD MEMBER REITEN: Mr. Chairman, I see your point that this could potentially extend the time period that we review this. That's the only negative part of it. I do in general agree, but I'm concerned that we might have been able to deal with it right away if the right information would have been there.

So it's hard to put a specific -- like

Julia Altemus mentioned -- like there might be other things that come up, too. So I don't know. But $I$ think we can probably deal with it on an individual basis just as well as through an overall motion right now. Thank you.

CHAIR SIMPSON: The consensus -- and again, $I$ 'm not convinced that we need a motion. So I believe we have beat this dead horse sufficiently. Let's put it that way. Is there any disagreement with that position?
(No response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Apparently not. Okay. Well, in that case, we have made the decision not to pursue the public hearing on opencut in general any further.

So with that, let's move on. All we have left is -- Under Board Chair update, I didn't have anything further than the question of the opencut. I did want to work through that, and I'm pleased that we were able to do that. Again, I'd like to thank Representative Gunderson for joining us. Your comments have been very helpful in the Board's deliberations. I see you have your hand up, Representative Gunderson. Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE GUNDERSON: Thank you,

Mr. Chair, and Board members, and thank you for the opportunity to help educate you on HB599 and the opencut process. And $I$ would like to extend that if you do ever have any questions or need clarifications from the legislative side, that I'm always available. Mr. Chair.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you very much for your help once again. Thanks for joining us this morning, and your time.

Proceeding forward, the only remaining item on the agenda other than adjournment is general public comment on matters within the jurisdiction of the Board that were on today's agenda and are not related to any contested cases. Is there any general public comment?
(No response)
MS. MOISEY-SCHERER: I'm not seeing any hands, sir.

CHAIR SIMPSON: Hearing none, is there a motion to adjourn.

BOARD MEMBER SMITH: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: I'll second.
CHAIR SIMPSON: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn this meeting of the Board of Environmental Review. Thank you very much,
everyone. I appreciate all of your participation and comment today. We'll see you in a couple months.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Do we need a motion to adjourn? We did. I'm sorry.

CHAIR SIMPSON: We have a motion, but we need a vote. All in favor say aye.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Oh, that's what we need. Thank you. Sorry.
(Response)
CHAIR SIMPSON: Sorry. I got off track as usual.

BOARD MEMBER ALTEMUS: Me, too.
CHAIR SIMPSON: Thank you again, everyone.
(The proceedings were concluded at 11:12 a.m. )
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