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CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, first of all, I want to welcome everyone. We do have a quorum, so I will call the April the 10 th, 2024 meeting of the Indiana Environmental Rules Board to order.

I'm going to ask members to -- we'll just start down here at the end and go around the room and introduce yourselves and say who you represent. We have five members on-line, and so then after -- after the in-person people introduce themselves, then I'll ask the people on-line to introduce themselves. So, we'll start down here at the left.

MR. WHITNEY: I'm Aidan Whitney.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Good afternoon. All participants will be muted when they join the meeting, but participants will be able to address the Board during open forum portions of the meeting. We do not -- or we do ask that you identify yourself when speaking. Participants must only send
shout-outs just to the host.
And for those joining via Teams, if you
have any questions or technical issues during the meeting, please use the raised-hand feature or chat feature. To access the raised-hand and chat feature, go to the top of your screen, depending on your device. You'll see a menu bar. You may have to touch your screen for the menu bar to pop up on mobile devices.

In the beginning of the menu, use -- or there is a chat icon which you can click -- which you can click on to show the chat dialogue. You should address -- or you should also see the raised-hand option. Please utilize the raised-hand or chat feature if you have any questions or comments, and if -- you will be called upon during the appropriate time.

If any members of the media have joined us via Teams, please utilize the feature or e-mail media@idem.in.gov if you have any questions.

I will now return the meeting back over to you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any

```
questions before we move on?
                    (No response.)
            CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
```

        Go ahead.
            MR. ZEHR: Good afternoon. I'm Ric
    Zehr, and I represent the construction industry.
MS. BROWN: Hello. Jaime Brown, and
I represent manufacturing.
MS. KOZYRSKI: Good afternoon.
Carrie Kozyrski, and I'm a utility
representative.
MR. DAVIDSON: Calvin Davidson, the
solid waste industry.
MR. ETZLER: Bill Etzler, small
business.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Beverly Gard, general
public.
MR. KETZENBERGER: John Ketzenberger,
conservation and the environment.
MS. NELSON: Katie Nelson, and I
represent the Lieutenant Governor's Office.
MR. JAWOROWSKI: Matt Jaworowski,
Indiana Economic Development Corporation.

MR. BORTNER: Dan Bortner, Director of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Brian

Rockensuess, Commissioner of IDEM.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you all.
Okay. Those of you on-line?
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: I'll start.
Joanne Alexandrovich, local government.
MR. HORN: Chris Horn, labor.
MR. RULON: Ken Rulon, agriculture.
DR. NIEMIEC: Ted Niemiec, health
care.

MR. GREEN: R. T. Green, citizen of the State of Indiana.

CHAIRMAN GARD: I think that $--\quad$ I think that's all. Thank you all.

Our first order of business today is the approval of the summary of the August the $9 t h$, 2023 Board meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes as presented?

MR. ETZLER: Move to approve.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second?
DR. NIEMIEC: Second. This is Ted

Niemiec.
CHAIRMAN GARD: All in favor, say aye.
(Board members responded, "Aye.")
CHAIRMAN GARD: Any opposed, nay.
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you all. The minutes for August 9 th are approved.

Comm. Rockensuess, report, please.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Good afternoon,
everybody. Welcome. Thanks for joining us, all
of those in the crowd and on-line. I hope everybody got to enjoy the eclipse on Monday and wore your glasses. It was a phenomenal event, drew in lots of different crowds, especially at my partner, DNR's parks, they were full.

We've had, from a staffing perspective, quite a few leadership changes over the last couple of months. In particular to this Board, and she'll be getting up to introduce herself in a minute, Billie Franklin has joined us, replacing Chris Pedersen.

Many of you know Peggy Dorsey. She is,
until April 30th, my Assistant Commissioner for Land Quality. She's retiring. She has spent 25-plus years at IDEM in different capacities, so I'm super thankful for her time.

As -- in an effort to make sure that
leadership shifts don't really affect the agency business, we have hired Brian Wolff to replace Peggy. Brian most recently was the Branch Chief over Wetlands Operations and Stormwater in the Office of Water Quality.

We also in Land Quality had a Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Corey Webb. He left the agency for another agency, and so, we have filled that position and recently hired Andrew Pappas to fill that role. Andrew has a wealth of experience both at Department of -- mainly with Department of Health. He helped with logistics in running many of their COVID operations, and so, a welcome member to our team and our leadership team.

We have a new Northwest Regional Office Director, Michele Murday Pariso. We promoted her in March to run the Northwest Office, and now we
have -- her deputy is -- that position is open for hiring right now as well.

And then the position that Brian Wolff vacated, Amari Farren is taking over that role as Branch Chief, and she has been with the agency for a number of years in a variety inspector or enforcement roles.

Now, with different things going on -there's been a lot of federal things going on that many of the states are dealing with, and I'll -- I have a whole list. I'm going to go through these rather quickly.

The PFAS Rule for drinking water just came out this morning. The standard is going to be -and we all kind of knew this -- four parts per trillion for PFOA and PFAS. It's going to be phased in over five years, and the first three years are going to be focussed on testing and notification, with the goal of compliance within five years.

The nice thing about Indiana is that we have been proactively testing all of the different drinking water utilities across the
state, just to see where they were. And when they started talking four parts per trillion, we started -- the ones that we had that were above that, we started working with those utilities already to see, "How could we take that well off?" or "Could we provide -- help them provide a treatment for that well?" So, we're already ahead of the curve, which is good.

This is the first of PFAS rules that are coming down. They're also considering rules on whether it's going to be a CERCLA or RCRA hazardous waste. They're considering potential air rules for admissions, PFAS and PFOA, so there's more to come.

EPA just dropped a new $P_{2.5}$ standard. That's one of our national ambient air quality standards. The -- it will become effective in June. They're dropping the standard from 12 to nine. That is going to have a rather large impact on Indiana. Today, at 12 , we do not have really any areas that are out of attainment. At nine, we will have eight areas, representing about 30 ish counties, that would or could be
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nonattainment.

So, we're working on communicating with
industry, communicating with the Governor and Congressional leadership, on what this means for Indiana. It will be very hard to permit anybody that is a major source in those areas that could be nonattainment, because we simply could not. So, it has huge implications on economic development, and we've been working with the Economic Development Corporation so they know that as well.

Recently, as well, the U.S. EPA Office of Water came out with a combined sewer overflow letter that really called out Indiana for -- and the things that we did, not in a positive way. And so, we have responded to that memo, and we can get you a copy of that if you'd like, suggesting that they're trying to, you know, regulate based on memo, rather than changing a law or going through the proper process with the consent decrees.

And so, we have $C D^{\prime}$ s or agreed judgments with every single -- all 109 communities that we
have in Indiana, and so, we're going to continue going down those paths, because we have to and EPA has to, and we'll be working with communities to make sure we're that buffer between them and EPA moving forward.

Legislatively -- and $I$ was just talking to Mr. Zehr about that -- we had a pretty productive session. There was the Wetland Bill, 1583, that was the agency's bill, and it was a compromise between industry and some of the wetland consultants. It wasn't the most popular bill, but it was a place where we all agreed to move forward with on that bill, and that was signed into law in February. It will become effective July 1 .

We had our own agency bill, senate Bill 206, and that allows us to post notices and send communications electronically. It also puts a 90 -day time frame for permitting on biodigesters.

And then there's a couple of other bills that had, you know, periphery -- something to do with us, whether it was the Administrative Law

Judge Bill that moved the Office of Environmental Adjudication under the bigger Administrative Law Proceedings agency. That was one that we were watching.

And we were also watching House Enrolled Act 1276, which stated that if we're going to host a public hearing, we have to make a decision to do that within ten days after the public comment period has ended, which $I$ was fine with. We get requests for public hearings now, and within two or three days, typically, they're out the door, because I've signed off on them. So, that was not a big deal for us.

We are starting budget development,
working with our teams internally. This budget session's going to be different than most because there's going to be a new governor coming in, and so, we do our best based on what today is, and then we'll see what the next governor will want us to shift or do.

And then $I$ talked about, $I$ think, last time how we did a legislative road show last summer, and that was hugely beneficial for
relationship-building with different legislators across the state. We're going to pick that back up this summer, after the primary's over, because it's important that the elected officials know who we are, what we do, why we do it, and who to come for -- to when there's an issue that comes up.

A couple of other quick things. We just submitted the Climate Pollution Reduction Grant application to EPA that was due -- we did it last week, it was due April 1st. There's 4.6 billion dollars of funding available in this pot that 45 states and, I think, another 25 to 30 cities and towns across the country are vying for.

Some states are doing regulatory things. We took the approach of everything should be voluntary, and so, we submitted a plan with projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions across the state, and we're aiming for -- they have different buckets within this grant -- we're aiming for the hundred-to-two-hundred-milliondollar bucket, and if we get that, then we will start rolling those out.

They're hoping to have the money out by October, or the decisions out, so as soon as we start getting that money, we'll start rolling it out to the people that we put in that grant application.

And then finally, our metrics, our -- you know, we're -- all agencies are judged based on their metrics and how they're doing with them. The air quality, the drinking water, and the compliance metrics are all doing phenomenal, as they always have been. Permitting, we had a little snafu in Land Quality permitting in that we developed a little bit of a backlog, but we are going to be done with that backlog by May 1 . So, we will be back down to the zero backlog status.

Air Quality and Water Quality, they're fine. It's mainly Land Quality that we're addressing this issue with, so it has little bit of work to do there. Overall, agency-wide, our permitting metric is still, I think, 60 percent of time allowed, and our goal is 75 percent, so we're still doing a great job, but on a micro
level, we need to make sure we're hitting on every facet of that and doing well.

And that is my report.
CHAIRMAN GARD: I have a question:
What's your staffing level now?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: We're at 812 as of yesterday, which is probably around the right number.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Uh-huh.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: We might add a person here or there based on a particular need, but we're getting all of our work done and we're doing it well, and so -- and even on things like the land permitting thing where we need to catch up a little bit, we're putting -- we have the people and time to get it done. So, unless there's some shift in programing that we need to add another section or group, I think we'll probably be around this number for the future.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you. Questions from the Board? Yes.

MR. ETZLER: I'd be interested in
seeing the CSO memo.

| 1 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: We'll make -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | we'll -- Nancy, can you make sure? |
| 3 | MS. KING: (Nodded head yes.) |
| 4 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: We'll -- Nancy |
| 5 | will make sure to get it up to the Board. |
| 6 | MR. ETZLER: Thank you. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Other questions from |
| 8 | the Board that's in person? |
| 9 | (No response.) |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GARD: On-line? |
| 11 | MR. Whitney: Yeah, on-line, Joanne |
| 12 | asked if the organizational chart could be |
| 13 | e-mailed as well as the CSO memo. |
| 14 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Definitely, we |
| 15 | will get that to you. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GARD: That's good, yes. |
| 17 | Thank you. |
| 18 | DR. ALEXANDROVICH: I do have one |
| 19 | other question. At the last meeting, you talked |
| 20 | about changes in the rulemaking process that |
| 21 | might affect the Board, and you're working |
| 22 | through that. Do you have any update on that? |
| 23 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: We -- I think |

that's going to be part of this presentation we're doing today, because the Civil Penalty Rules are the first ones we're doing through that new process. So, Nancy could give you a better explanation of how we're doing this.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
Dr. Alexandrovich, Nancy's going to be on
in just a few minutes. Can she answer that?
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yeah, that's
fine.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you,
Commissioner.

Nancy? Nancy King?
MS. KING: I didn't know I was going
to get a pop quiz, but okay.
(Laughter.)
MS. KING: For those of you who don't
know me, I'm Nancy King. I'm the General Counsel
over the Office of Legal Counsel. Our rulemaking process is also housed within the Office of Legal Counsel.

So, first of all, to answer Joanne's question, yes, we now are required to get our rules done within a year, like everyone else was under. And for those of you who have been around for a while, you know that's -- that's going to be a tough one for us, because we usually allow for $a$ lot of time for the work groups and discussions and everything else.

But the fact of the matter is, under the new process, we have to -- we have a year to start -- from the day that we start rulemaking to get those rules complete. We can, however -under the existing law, we can put a date certain beyond that time frame within which we can get those rules done, so there is a little bit of leeway on most of them.

That is not the case for the rules that you're looking at today, and I'll mention that in a minute, but yes, if we were to say, you know, "We need 14 months to get something done," and we
give them -- we have to give them a date certain, and if we miss that date, the whole rule goes away and we have to start over. Just a little aside, it doesn't seem to be particularly efficient, but $I$ didn't write it.

As far as the rules that we have before us today, our -- $\quad$ won't steal everyone's thunder on this -- these are our civil penalty policies. There was a stat -- the statute requires that we put those into -- any agency that has them in guidances, or the way we did, those need to be codified as a rule, and so, that's what you'll see before you today.

Under that particular aspect of the statute, we have to have those rules done by the end of this year, and if you ask me what happens if we don't, $I$ cannot tell you that, because the statute does not specifically speak to that.

What $I$ do know is that if we don't have them done, $I$ don't believe we can actually assess civil penalties, and if we can't, then we are violating our various things that we are required to do to EPA, which means then we might have to
send all of our -- worst-case scenario; I'm not putting -- you know, I'm not making -- not twisting any arms here, I'm just saying this is what's going to happen. We have to have them done so that we can meet the requirements of the statute.

So, that -- Joanne, $I$ don't know if you had specific questions about the rulemaking process. I'm happy to try to answer them. We are -- you know, we really -- we haven't -- we don't have that many rules going right now, and we don't have a lot that we're thinking of starting right at the moment, so $I$ don't have a broad spectrum of how things are working so far, but that's basically the system that we're now working under.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: No, that's fine.
I was just -- you indicated there were changes that might affect us, and $I$ was wondering what those would be. Nancy, could I ask one more thing while you're up there?

MS. KING: Well, of course.
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: In our summary
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from the last meeting, you were going to work on a draft on the citizen's petitions. Is that kind of in limbo, or --

MS. KING: Well, to be honest with
you, I -- I have not worked on that draft,
because I -- frankly, I had forgot that I was going to get it to you. So, that being the case, you know, as far as what the citizen's petitions look like and how we've moved through them in the past, I don't see -- nothing has changed as far as that goes.

But I will -- I will make sure someone reminds me to get that to you so that we at least have a document that we can discuss and maybe clarify it, because, as you know, and as we've had conversations with folks before this Board before, it's not -- the statute, as it currently is written, it's not -- it's not very step by step, it's pretty much -- you know, it's kind of general, and we've sort of the put together how we've done it in the past, but, you know, how that looks and what the Board would like to see based on the issues we've had, we can certainly
work on that.
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Thank you.
MS. KING: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, I think one thing important for this Board to remember, if you get questions or concerns from the general public about the shortened time frame with which we have to do rules, which obviously allows for far less time for the public -- for public input and, like Nancy said, work groups and so forth, I -- just remember: We didn't pass that statute. That's the legislature. It's not our choice in particular. So, I think that's important, in case you all do get questions.

MS. KING: Well, I think it will be kind of a change for us. I mean -- and it's kind of a good time, to a certain extent, because we don't have a lot of big rules going, but by the same token, we're very used to having these conversations in our work groups and things like that.

Now, I mean what changes in terms of that and what we're looking at as far as how that would -- before we actually officially start a rule, we can have those meetings ahead of time, before we start. So, we can get some of that done so that we're not under a timeline.

You know, so as things -- you know, occasionally we have the minorly controversial rule, and that being the case, we can have those conversations before we kind of, you know, hit the starting line, so $I$ think that's one way for us to approach it. So, it's not -- it's not all, you know, doom and gloom. It just sort of changes the way we're going to move forward with rulemaking.

But that said, I actually didn't get up here to talk to you guys. I actually got up here to introduce our new Rules Section Chief. Chris Pederson, who you've worked with for many years, retired, rudely retired.

And so, we very -- we were very fortunate to get Billie Franklin, and I would like to thank Mr. Bortner for allowing her to come over. She
came over from DNR, and they kindly let her, and we appreciate it. So Billie has worked in rulemaking and understands the new process as well, and so, she is going to give you the rule report, so $I$ will let her get up and speak.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you, Nancy.
Welcome, Billie. We're glad to have you.
MS. FRANKLIN: Thank you.
Good afternoon. My name is Billie Franklin, in the Rules Development Section of the Office the Legal Counsel.

Currently, our next Board meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 10th, 2024. At that meeting we anticipate presenting three rules for final adoption, which are the civil penalties which will be presented today, and we will also have a rule ready for preliminary adoption for Kaiser Aluminum.

That is all $I$ have today, but I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any questions?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any questions from on-line people?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Welcome. Thank you, Billie.

MS. FRANKLIN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Your report won't always be that short.
(Laughter.)
MS. FRANKLIN: I figured.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: She's used to longer reports with DNR.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Today we have hearings for the following regular rule Board actions: Preliminary adoptions of Titles 326, 327, and 329, Civil Penalties. Since the Civil Penalty Rules are almost identical, there will be a single presentation for all three rules, and then separate votes on each of them. There will be a presentation on the Air Permitting Report, there will be a presentation on the 2024 List of Impaired Waters and Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology
under Section $303(\mathrm{~d})$ of the Clean Water Act. As a reminder, if you wish to testify in any of today's hearings, please fill out a comment card and give it to Karla at the sign-in table.

The rules being considered at today's meeting were included in the Board packets and are available for public inspection at the Office of Legal Counsel, 13th Floor, Indiana Government Center North. The entire Board packet is also available on IDEM's Web site at least one week prior to each Board meeting.

A written transcript of today's meeting
will be made. The transcript and any written submissions will be open for public inspection at the Office of Legal Counsel. A copy of the transcript will be posted on the rules page of the agency Web site when it becomes available.

Will the official reporter for the cause please stand, raise your right hand, and state your name?
(Reporter sworn.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you very much.
This is a public hearing before the

Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana concerning preliminary adoption of the Title 326 Civil Penalties Rule.

I will now introduce Exhibit A, the
preliminary adopt --
MS. KING: Pardon me. Bev, can I
interrupt?
CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes.
MS. KING: I apologize. Here I am
again. We actually -- I believe probably your
script is missing part of what was in the script.
We are supposed to first have the Air Permitting
Report and the -- then the $303(d)$ List report.
CHAIRMAN GARD: That's not here.
MS. KING: I know. I just realized
that as you were speaking. So, I don't mean to interrupt, but we had intended to have those reports prior to the hearings.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Good.
MS. KING: So, I'm sorry to interrupt
again, but -- so, the first thing would be probably the Air Permitting Report, and then the Impaired Waters one.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
Air Permitting Report?
MS. ACKER: Good afternoon. My name's Jenny Acker, and I'm the Air Permits Branch Chief. I'm here today to present the Report on Air Permitting for Fiscal Year ' 23.

A brief overview. Pages 2 and 3 -- and you should all have this -- provide background information regarding the types of permits and programs that are covered in the report. In FY 23 we received a total of 1178 permit applications. This is a 2.8 percent decrease from the prior fiscal year. Pages 8--5 through 8 contained detailed information on the types of applications received and issued during Fiscal Year '23. We conducted two public meetings. We did not hold any public hearings.

As you are aware, we do have a Title V
funding grant that grants -- funds our program, and we did begin dip into a range insufficient to support our program. We requested, this Board approved, and Senate Bill 155 passed during the 2023 legislative session. This bill allowed
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us to increase our annual base fee for the Title $V$ and FESOP sources from $\$ 1,875$ to $\$ 6100$. Our Title $V$ Fee Fund is currently sufficient to fund our program.

At the end of $F Y$ 23, we had an unobligated balance in our fund less than the surplus cap of three million dollars, and additionally, we did not have to refund any permit fees, as all permits were -- there were no late decisions. Page 12 of your report provides an overview of the fund during Fiscal Year ' 23 .

Metrics. We continue to issue permits below the Governor's metric of 75 percent of the allowable days. Our monthly metrics for fiscal Year '23 range from 53 percent to 62 percent. We also submit a renewal issuance permit metric twice a year to EPA. Their metric is: No more than ten percent of the Title $V$ renewals are allowed to be administratively extended or, as we call them, backlogged.

For the December 22 report, our metric for backlogs was 0.36 , and the metric for the June '23 report was 1.26. These reports, these
backlogged ones, were mostly due to very large permits: BP, Cleveland Cliffs, Carmeuse Lime. These are permits that are really large but also have a lot of public interest, so when we do go out to public notice, we have public hearings, we have extensive comments to respond to. The comment response period is what is driving these permits into those levels of being backlogged. We took on some projects this year that were kind of fun during this year. We developed a new SharePoint site. It's the location where we store our documents. We provide tasks to draft. Things go back and forth. It's where documents are grabbed and sent to our Web sites, where permits are issued, off of this site.

We had a very antiquated site. It didn't have a lot of features to it, Microsoft was working its way out of supporting it, and more importantly, $I$ was terrified it was going to go down and we were going to be back to e-mailing things back and forth.

We asked IT for a new modern site, one of the first branches in IDEM to tackle a modern
site. We now have a very nice navigable site. It runs seamlessly. We've been able to take advantage of some of the built-in macros and programs in this new site, and we've automated tasks.

So, rather than people entering data
multiple times to create a doc set or to create a new task, it gets entered once, and we can run a little program off of it. It does a lot of the work that we were doing manually, so that's been a real nice feature. And we're continuing to explore the functionality of this site.

We also developed a permit writer onboarding manual. So, something that bothered me was walking down a corridor and seeing my senior environmental manager sitting with a permit writer, a new one, many times walking them through something.

And this manual that we developed really just walks them through the procedures, how to set up a shortcut on your desktop, and "Here's the shortcuts that you need, where to access them," how to function in SharePoint, a manual on
how to use the new site.

Silly little things. They get a Post-It note when they start, "Here's who you're sitting next to," because you get up to go to the restroom on the 11 th floor, you may not find your way back to your seat, and the first thing someone's going to ask you is, "Well, where are you sitting?"

They have a Post-It note. They can now say who they sit next to so they can get back. Just trying to take into account talking to permit writers and what did they stumble across when they started, what would be helpful to them to put into this manual.

And we do consider it a living document.

I have one permit writer who, ten percent of her time is dedicated to taking feedback and keeping this updated and keeping it maintained. So, hopefully this is something that will just grow and continue to meet the needs of our staff.

Meeting the needs of not just my staff but the public. Our forms are very outdated. They're cumbersome to get through, they're
cumbersome for us to get information out of. So, we took on what is probably going to be a several-year project of updating our forms.

And we've started with the initial chunk, which is the DSD -- GSDO -- GSD forms. There's about 15 of them. We've consolidated three of them into one. We've taken five and consolidated them down to three. We've made the information requests clear.

As soon as we get that block done, we're going to go public with the new forms on that, and then just continually grabbing new chunks of forms and updating them. Hopefully this is going to help us get better information, but more importantly, I think it's going to help the public understand what we need and make the forms easier for them to fill out.

So, with that, any questions?
CHAIRMAN GARD: With your -- with the updated forms and some of the other things you're doing, are you having to contract out computer services to bring your system up compatible?

MS. ACKER: No. I'm really lucky and
fortunate. One of my little things is a spreadsheet. When we hire somebody, I track when they start, when they promoted. I also keep track of some of their interests, including their background.

And when $I$ knew we needed this new
SharePoint site, $I$ went through there, and $I$ found a couple of permit writers that are working on Master's degrees in Information Sciences. And fortunately, we are efficient enough that they could spend some of their time working on this site with me. So, we've been able to locate internal sources.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Good.

Any other questions?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any questions from on-line people?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you so much.

## MS. ACKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Now, Nancy, you
wanted the Consolidated Waters now, or what did --

MS. KING: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
MR. MCMURRAY: Good afternoon, Madam Chairman and Board. My name is Paul McMurray, and I am the Integrated Report Coordinator for the IDEM Office of Water Quality, and today I'm presenting the Indiana 2024 List of Impaired Water Bodies.

Next slide, please.
So, Clean Water Act Section 303 (d)
requires all states to produce a list of water bodies within the state that are not supporting one or more designated uses. For Indiana, the designated uses that we are assessing include the aquatic life use, you know, just make sure that fish and bugs and everything have a good environment to live in; public water supply use; fish consumption and recreational, for, you know, E. Coli and algae in water.

So, the $303(\mathrm{~d})$ list is submitted to
U.S. EPA every two years, in even years, as part
of Indiana's Integrated Water Monitoring and Assessment Report. As part of this process, there is a 45-day public comment period, where a draft version of the list and the Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology, which is basically the methods we use to assess water bodies, are put onto the IDEM web site for any public comments, and comments from U.S. EPA as well.

Part of the -- part of the -- well, one of the documents included is the notice of comment period, which is just kind of a summary of changes that have been made to the list since the last cycle.

Next slide.

So, all of the water bodies in Indiana are assessed and placed into one of five categories. The $303(d)$ list itself are the Category 5 waters. Those are impaired, and a TMDL, or a Total Maximum Daily Load Report, is required for those water bodies.

Category 4 water bodies are impaired, but a TMDL is either already completed or is not
required for a different reason. You know, if it's like natural conditions are leading to the impairment, for instance.

Category 2 waters are those that we have sampled and assessed and the designated uses are fully supporting, so those are the ones we like to see.

And Category 3 are those that we have either not visited or we just don't have enough information to make an accurate assessment of the status of the water.

Next slide, please.
So, this is the fourth cycle in which IDEM has submitted our Integrated Report and the $303(d)$ list to the EPA ATTAINS database, and it's a lot easier than it used to be, I guess, just upload our documents and they are able to take the data, put it into the database, and then use it for various purposes.

One of those is a Web site called "How's My Waterway," which allows anyone in the general public to search on -- you know, on a map for the stream or lake or water body closest to them, if
they want to, and see what the current condition is of that water body. And it just overall makes it a lot easier to track and report on not only high-quality waters, but also impairments that we might see.

Next slide.
So, just very quickly, looking at some of the numbers that are on the Category 5 list, we have -- so, streams are kind of broken up into different segments, depending on the size, like we won't have, you know, like a 50-mile stretch of river or anything. We're not looking at the entire Wabash River as one water body. We have it broken up into many smaller segments. And we call those -- those are reaches.

So, looking at streams, we have almost 15,000 reaches within the state, and about -- a little over 4,000 of those have at least one impairment, or sometimes two or more. Out of the 63,000 miles of streams in the state, there's about 21,000 that have some form of impairment associated with them. Lakes, we have about -- a little over 1500 lakes that we could -- can
assess, I guess, and currently about 136 of those are impaired for at least one designated use.

Next slide, please.
So, looking at the top causes of stream impairments, the top cause is E. Coli in the water body. That affects the recreational designated use. We have about -- about 12,000 miles of streams are impaired for E. Coli.

The next most common one is biological integrity, and that is covering the aquatic communities in water, the fish, the insects that are in the water. If they're not meeting a certain level of quality of health, then, you know, the water body will be impaired for biological integrity.

The next few are PCB's in fish tissue, and dissolved oxygen, nutrients, and mercury in fish tissue.

Next slide, please.
So, overall, not any really big changes since the 2022 list, but we seem to be going in the right direction. We had fewer impairments and fewer impaired water bodies than in the last
list. Of course, you know, we continue to look at our list and our methodology, and if we find errors, we fix those, and that will usually help to reduce the number of impairments. Our
continued TMDL development also helps to remove impairments off of the Category 5 and into 4a, so that's, you know, usually a step in the right direction.

Next slide, please.
As far as any changes, or large changes, I guess, in our listing methodology, the -probably the biggest change we've had is the addition of New Selenium Criteria, which were adopted into Indiana's water quality standards in 2022, and these are based on selenium criteria developed by EPA in 2016.

This is a little bit different in that it's a criteria designed for aquatic life use, so we're looking at protecting the fish communities, but it's using fish tissue samples over water quality data. So, we don't -- I don't think we have any other criteria in the water quality standards that are quite like that. So, it's

```
just a little different.
    And the criteria can differ depending on
```

    where you are in the state and whether the water
    bodies are -- could be, you know, home to
    sturgeon or paddlefish. Those are, you know,
types of fish that are a little bit more
sensitive to the effects of selenium.
Next slide, please.
This is not completely new, but we have
been working on developing conversion formulas
for several different dissolved metals that we
see, and we're looking at using this as a
screening tool to figure out, based on samples
where we collect total metals concentrations,
where we might also see a dissolved metal
constant -- dissolved metal impairment, excuse
me -- potentially, and, you know, can go back and
actually do dissolved sampling, and the idea is
that this will hopefully result in fewer
additions to the $303(d)$ list.
Next slide.
Here we have a couple of maps showing the
distribution of the Category 5 and 4 a water
bodies in the state. Category 5 are those that are impaired without a TMDL, and Category 4 a are those that are impaired, but we have written a TMDL for that impairment.

Next slide.

The Key Take-Aways. We're not really
seeing any major changes in the types of impairments we're seeing. They've been pretty consistent, I think, for the past few cycles. We continue monitoring at about 250 to 300 sites a year.

This map is showing the number of sites we've sampled in the past nine years, which is how long it takes us to cover the entire state with our probabilistic sampling program. And we continue, you know, writing and making new TMDL's for those water bodies that are impaired.

And the next slide.
And if you'd like more information or to see a copy of the $303(\mathrm{~d})$ list, there's a Web site there, or you can just contact me and I'll be happy to send it to you.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN GARD: I have a question. MR. MCMURRAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Do you monitor blue-green algae at all? I know that's really a result of another contaminant.

MR. MCMURRAY: We have a blue-green algae beach monitoring program, where we will go to DNR beaches across the state. We do this during the recreational season, May through September.

MS. MEILS: Memorial Day through
Labor Day.
MR. MCMURRAY: Memorial Day through Labor Day; okay.

So, we will go there weekly and take a water sample to bring it back to our labs in the IDEM offices on -- off of Shadeland Avenue, and we have staff that will count the number of blue-green algae, and also run tests to determine the amount of toxins that are in the water sample as well, and that information is then put onto an IDEM Web site, and I think it goes onto the DNR Web site as well, I think.

It's like a public notice, you know, so people -- if you're wanting to go to a certain DNR, you know, lake or something, or park, you can get onto there and see if -- see what the current algae concentration is.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Have you had any luck in getting the residents that border those water bodies to change the way they fertilize their lawns and so forth?

MR. MCMURRAY: I do not know --
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
MR. MCMURRAY: -- actually.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Some have, and
there's a project going on up near Lake wawasee right now in Northeast Indiana where they're having -- they've had some substantial blue-green-algae issues. And so, they're looking upstream, downstream, "Where is this coming from?" We have a good idea.

When there are permitting conditions, we can take action, and EPA can help us take action, where it's -- you know, whether it's failing septics or, you know, lawn runoff. It's usually

```
a combination of all of it.
    On the septic piece, if it's, you know,
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bad enough for that area, we start working down
the regional sewer district path, and also
consulting with the Indiana Finance Authority to
see if they have pathway towards connecting to
the sewers.

So, there's a -- there's a large swath of options that we work towards when we have larger blue-green algae issues.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yeah. Thank you. It's just something $I$ used to hear about all of the time.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: The number of incidents have gone down --

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: -- which is good.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Uh-huh.

MR. BORTNER: And there are some
natural components, too, like the Indiana Dunes is a natural part of the process. So --

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Right.
MR. BORTNER: -- not all of it is. A
lot of it is, but not all of it.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Right.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions?
MR. JAWOROWSKI: I have a question.
With regards to like watershed assessment and water quality, we've been seeing an uptick in projects that are taking on a corporate responsibility when they are entering communities that they're looking into. Is there best practices that would be beneficial for them to be understanding of, that we can advise on participating in the community and being a part of solutions for restoration of our watersheds? This might be an inappropriate forum, but -- and we can take it off-line if it is.

MR. MCMURRAY: Yes, we have -- in our
branch, we have a Watershed Planning and Restoration Branch, and with our -- I'm sorry -Watershed Planning Group, and they work with different watershed groups around the state, you know, who are concerned about, you know, the quality of the local river, stream or something. They work with them to, you know, give
grant money to them to help implement best management practices, you know, to help make those kinds of changes. I can get you more information about them, if you would like to contact --

MR. JAWOROWSKI: That would be
helpful. I appreciate it.
MR. MCMURRAY: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Other questions?
MR. WHITNEY: Yeah, there's a
question on-line. Joanne asked if you received many public comments.

MR. MCMURRAY: Yes, we had, you know, our normal comments from EPA, they usually have a few every cycle, and a few general comments from the public, nothing that was like too hard to answer. There were some public comments regarding the selenium criteria as well.

Those are all -- all of the public comments are included in an appendix in the final $303(d)$ list, which hopefully will be up on the IDEM Web site very soon, $I$ think, so the comments and our responses to them are included in that --
in that section of the report.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other comments or
questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you.

MR. MCMURRAY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Very informative.
Now we'll move on to the public hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the state of Indiana concerning preliminary adoption of the Title 326 Civil Penalties Rule.

I will now introduce Exhibit $A$, the preliminarily adopted Title 326 Civil Penalties Rule, into the record of the hearing.

Seth Engdahl will present the information for all three rules.

MR. ENGDAHL: Members of the Board, good afternoon. My name is Seth Engdahl, and I am a Rule Writer within the Rules Development Section within IDEM's Office the Legal Counsel.

As mentioned, the Board is considering three nearly identical rulemakings concerning civil penalties.

As many of you are aware, Indiana statutes on administrative rulemaking changed in 2023 . One of the new requirements of this change is that any fee, fine, or civil penalty imposed by an agency must be included in the agency's rules. Agencies that were assessing fines, fees, or civil penalties that were not already in rules at the time of the law's enactment were given until December 31st of this year to amend their rules accordingly.

IDEM has two nonrule policies for assessing civil penalties for violations of the state's pollution control laws and for assessing civil penalties for violations of the state's underground storage tank laws and rules. These civil penalties are statutorily authorized and are statutorily capped at $\$ 25,000$ per violation per day for general violations and $\$ 10,000$ per violation per day for general violations for underground storage tanks.

However, the method that IDEM uses to assess the exact fee amount is determined by using a civil penalty nonrule civil policy -- or
nonrule policy document. These policies have been in effect for over 25 years, but due to the new statutory requirements, these policies must now be incorporated into IDEM's rules.

If these policies are not amended into the Indiana Administrative Code and effective before December 31st, 2024 , IDEM will be unable to assess and collect civil penalties until a civil penalty policy is amended into rules. If IDEM is unable to assess and collect civil penalties, U.S. EPA will likely take over our delegated programs because IDEM will be unable to enforce those programs.

Given the time constraint, and the consequences, and the stakeholder familiarity with the existing nonrule civil penalty policy, IDEM sought to transpose the existing civil penalty policy into rules with no substantive changes. Due to the nature of nonrule policy documents and the structure, language, and formatting requirements of rules, an exact cut-and-paste of the existing policy was not possible.

However, the essential elements and structure of the existing civil penalty policy remain intact within the rule, and it is the agency's intention to implement the rules in the exact same way it implements the nonrule policy document. IDEM received several comments on the proposed rule language and made changes to reduce ambiguity and tailor each civil penalty rule to its respective title.

In general, IDEM assesses civil penalties using the following formula: The civil penalty equals the base civil penalty, plus or minus adjustment factors, plus any economic benefit gained through the violation. The base civil penalty is determined using a matrix that examines the potential for harm to human health or the environment, or to a regulatory program, along with the extent of deviation from the regulatory requirements.

This base penalty may then be adjusted based on the following factors: Actions before and after the violation; the violator's history of noncompliance; the violator's ability to pay;
unanticipated circumstances, such as additional evidence that leads to a significant re-evaluation of the facts surrounding the violation; and costs incurred by IDEM for enforcement.

The amount of economic benefit the violator achieved is then added to this civil penalty. This could be an economic benefit that arose from delayed or avoided costs, or profits from a period of startup prior to obtaining a permit. And this ensures that violations are not profitable; however, IDEM may disregard the economic benefit if it cannot be ascertained, or if it is less than $\$ 1,000$.

So, that is a general overview of the civil penal -- of the general civil penalty policy. The underground storage tank civil penalty policy is very similar. There is a gravity-based portion, which, like the general civil penalty policy, is based on a matrix.

Once the matrix penalty is determined, the penalty is multiplied by the number of underground storage tanks in violation, and then
there is a multiplier based on the number of days in violation. And then like the general civil penalty policy, there is also an economic benefit portion as well.

If you would like, I'm happy to go into -generally, over -- between FY 2014 and FY 2023, the mean annual average of civil penalties that was collected by IDEM under the generally policy was about 2.4 million dollars per year. This varies quite a bit, it goes up and down.

During that same time period, the mean annual average that was collected under the UST civil penalty policy, the underground storage tank civil penalty policy, was about $\$ 210,000$ annually.

IDEM requests that the Board approve this rule as written, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have. CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any questions?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: And just keep in mind that Seth presented essentially for all three
rules, so your questions can cover any of the three.

And I do have a question: Do the fines go back to the general fund, or does IDEM keep them? MR. ENGDAHL: They're -- they go to the -- for the UST's, it goes to the Excess Liability Trust Fund, and then for the general policy, it goes to the Environmental Management Special Fund.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
So, any questions on any of the three rules?

MR. WHITNEY: There's an on-line
question. Joanne asks, "Where do the UST's fall under the rules we're considering today?"

MR. ENGDAHL: Those go under the Title 3 -- or Title 329 rules, so they go in Title -- or 329 IAC 9 is where those will go.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any more questions?
MS. KOZYRSKI: I did have one
question.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes.
MS. KOZYRSKI: The comments -- the
comments that you included in the packet include a discussion of definitions, such as "substantial likelihood" and "cooperation."

MR. ENGDAHL: Yeah.
MS. KOZYRSKI: And IDEM responded
that you had not intended to include additional definitions, but -- and $I$ guess the question raised is: Your note that cooperation, in quotes, with a small entity may look different than cooperation with a large entity, and the same is true for "substantial likelihood." Could IDEM give an example of how that might look different depending on the size of the entity that is --

MR. ENGDAHL: Sure. So, I mean
that's one of the reasons why we decided not to adopt those definitions is, say you have a small entity where it's, you know, ten employees, having one employee there working with IDEM, providing information and whatnot, is different than if you had a large manufacturing facility -UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- required to regulate the entire proposed activity, not just
the discharge, and to determine whether --
MR. ENGDAHL: -- if you had a large facility who, you know, offered up the exact same stuff, knowing that they have the resources to be more useful and helpful, and IDEM would know that and then take that into account.

MS. KOZYRSKI: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Other questions?
Yes, Cal.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thanks, Madam Chair.

Just in general, it's obvious you're getting your money's worth out of the Board members this month reading all of these comments. (Laughter.)

MR. DAVIDSON: So, thanks for giving us a little more challenging homework. It's obvious it's tough. It's a broader issue, and I think it's a compliment, because all of this -all of the comments that you're getting back are because -- and the Commissioner referenced relationships earlier, how important it is to have a relationship with the legislature.

And I think it's good to also emphasize
and not lose sight of the relationships we have with the regulated community, because a lot of them are -- "fearful" is probably a strong word, but what's up for grabs is the uncertainty of the agency that we sing about around the campfire. It's been good, it feels good, and we hear the intent is to keep doing business as we've done business.

The -- it's that relationship factor, where is it going? We trust you. We're worried about your successor, because if you put this in writing, how is somebody else going to read it? And how does it boil down to the working-class side of the agency that the regulated community deals with?

And that's a real broad stroke, and I wanted to -- $I$ kind of compared it when $I$ was going through some mental notes about marriage. Most of us in here are of age to be married, whether you chose to do that or not. This is -the regulated community is married to you. They don't have a choice; right? They do certain things. They're married.

And look at all of the books that are written about how to have a happy marriage. It's not easy to take something -- even though they crossed the street and told us, "You've got to do this, you've got to boil it all down to something simple," it's very complicated. It's not like, "Look at the --" if you write a rule that flips a switch on, which you haven't, you could, and they won't get what they desire across the street. That's not what they had in mind either.

So, just keep that in mind as you go down this road. You're trying to create something that -- I think everybody still wants that warm, fuzzy relationship. They don't want to lose hope they can work with.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: So, a few
comments on that. The -- as Seth mentioned, we've been using the same policy, and it hasn't changed in 25 years; right? Now, the implementation of that policy, I'm sure, has changed off and on in that 25 years. And policies are very easy to change. We haven't, but $I$ can change a policy tomorrow, and it's
done.
This at least -- and $I$ know there were some comments back and forth on the "Can we update?" and all of that, and there will be a time that we probably could, but given our time constraints, we need to get this in and get it in now.

It is absolutely going to be, as long as I'm around, that we're going to implement the way we've always implemented, and that's going to be the way we go, but with any rules, and anybody coming after me, they can interpret it how they want; right? And so, that's always going to be the case, whether it's a rule, statute, nonrule policy document.

And it is very much about those relationships, and it has always been -- I mean you can ask all of my AC's. It's in every one of their performance appraisals, that we communicate and we communicate well. Nobody should be shocked about what we're doing and why we're doing it.

So, I get what you're saying. We're doing
this because we have to. I would rather not rock the boat and just continue living life the way we were, but we are where we are.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Other questions?
MR. KETZENBERGER: I have a quick comment to build off of that as well, and $I$ concur that, you know, the effort that's been done is not just imposed, but also been done well. I think the agency has managed this well, and $I$ take into account the comments that have been made before, but in addition to the relationship with the regulated community, we have relationships with every person who lives in the state.

So, I would also just continue to urge that the agency make its outreach and that it include the general public, and be as transparent as possible as violations occur, judgments are made, and actions are taken. And I think that we create the virtuous cycle that we're all trying to enjoy. And that's not meant as a criticism either. I'm just --

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah.
MR. KETZENBERGER: -- bringing that up in the context of the discussion today. So, thank you.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Thank you.
MR. BORTNER: And if I may, Madam
Chair, just -- you know, this -- this new way of doing business, which affects all of the agencies, and the time constraints we have in order to complete this, there are going to be mistakes made, and my hope is that people don't get their toes stepped on or think there's something intentional.

The Department of Natural Resources, our fees, fines and penalties is over 150 pages, and trying to pull that all together, it's the same thing that you folks are facing. Some things are going to get missed. So, bear with the agencies as we try to get through this. It's going to be a work in progress.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: I can't wait for that rule.

MR. BORTNER: Yeah.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yes.

MS. BROWN: I do have a question,
though, to follow up on your comment. So, several of the comments that were submitted, and I think it goes back to what you were saying, were around the sufficient certainty that is part of the new requirement. And I really appreciate that we've got to get it done and we've got to get it done fast. Can you tell us how you feel? Because $I$ think the concern is: Is the language specific enough where we are consistent and we have that certainty?

MR. ENGDAHL: Right.

MS. BROWN: I think the response
that's been there was, "We hear you, but we want to stay the course now that this is going into a policy rule." How are you meeting that requirement?

MR. ENGDAHL: Right. And that's the struggle is finding that balance; right? Because you don't want to pin down the language so much that you can't apply -- at IDEM, we regulate such
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a wide swath of sources, individuals, entities, and if -- you know, $I$ hate to quote Star Wars, but, you know, the tighter you grip your fist, the more things slip through your fingers. And so, you know, that's kind of the balance that we try to strike here with this particular language. And, you know, if we do feel that we come into view -- we've certainly kicked it around the office about potentially coming up with guidance, future, on down the line, if we do find that there's issues with inconsistency.

And, of course, this can be amended at a later point as well. So -- and also, one of the benefits of having a policy in place for 25 years is we can go back and look at the history and see how similar violations played out.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: And I would add, too, the stricter you make the policy, the less workability that we have as an agency to work through situations that, while there are violations made but out of your control, or there's extenuating circumstances, whatever; right?

And so, copying and pasting what we have today still allows us to have the flexibility to work with everybody, whether it is communities or, you know, industry, to work towards getting to a solution for everyone.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions?
MS. BROWN: Yeah, another question; sorry.

So, based on the number of comments that you receive, will this require a second public notice? Because $I$ believe the rule is that if you have substantive comments. Is that considered -- like what is the definition of that and --

MR. ENGDAHL: Well, with our
rulemaking process -- so, there's the Title IV rulemaking process, which was amended, and then there's also the Title XIII, which is IDEM specific. We have to have a second hearing anyway.

MS. BROWN: Okay.
MR. ENGDAHL: So, it doesn't really
matter.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, I do want to thank the agency and all of the staff that worked through this. I know it's been difficult. Previously, over the 25 years that $I$ was involved in working on rulemaking legislation, it came a little more slowly.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN GARD: It didn't come all in one big bundle, so you all have done a good job. Thank you.

I have two speaker cards. Adri -Adrianna Moehle?

MS. MOEHLE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GARD: I don't think I
pronounced your last name correctly.
MS. MOEHLE: That's okay.
CHAIRMAN GARD: And I assume you're
going to be speaking on all three of the rules.
MS. MOEHLE: Yes, I will be.
Good afternoon. My name is Andrianna
Moehle, with the Indiana Manufacturers
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Association, and thank you for providing us the opportunity to speak today. I've got some copies of my testimony that $I$ can give out afterwards, which also has additional specific comments that I won't run through, just in the interest of time.

We submitted formal comments, and we thank IDEM for their responses. However, we do still have a quite a few concerns with all aspects of the rules. So, first, to begin, I'd like to say this: The IMA believes that simply adopting the existing penalty policy as a rule dues not comport with the General Assembly's directive in adopting House Enrolled Act 1623 .

IDEM should adopt civil penalty language that fits within its statutory authority and complies with the statutory requirement to provide sufficient certainty, as Jaime mentioned, on what penalties may be imposed and for what conduct.

We also believe that the proposed rules will not allow IDEM to continue assessing civil penalties using same methods that have been used
for the previous 25 years. These rulemakings will have a negative impact on our members and regulated entities.

For example, all three rulemakings ignore the IDEM self-disclosure policy, which is an extremely successful program that precludes issuance of or significantly reduces a penalty for disclosure of certain violations under specific conditions. This oversight could lead to those increased penalties.

IDEM's response to comments did state that this rulemaking will not overrule the self-disclosure policy when the policy does apply, but this rule will have the force of law, whereas an agency nonrule policy document is guidance and nonbinding. So, we believe this self-disclosure policy should be codified along with these rules.

We also believe the rulemakings introduce some unclear and maybe some arbitrary terms. For example, it's not clear how harm to a regulatory program can be determined. We believe that the potential for harm factors are the same as in
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IDEM's policy.
However, the statute requires IDEM to consider whether the violation has a major or minor impact. IDEM's practice of looking at potential as opposed to actual harm arguably violates the new statute. Any reference to "potential," we believe, should be removed from the new rule.

IDEM's response to comments states that IDEM disagrees with this sentiment because it would deviate from IDEM's existing civil penalty policy, which the agency is seeking to transition into rules. The statute states that a rule adopted under this article must comply with this section, but the inclusion of "potential" is inconsistent with the statute's requirement, which only focuses on whether the violation actually has an impact.

I'm almost done. The draft rule also includes the current policy's days of violation multiplier, but IDEM typically does not use the policy in this manner. The proposed rule states that IDEM shall multiply the base penalty by the
days of violation, which, when adopted into a rule, suggests that IDEM must now start doing that.

This would exponentially increase the amount of civil penalties IDEM is collecting for the same violations. The language should not be directly adopted into rule as is and should potential -- should specifically address the ability for IDEM to be able to use their discretion to reduce these civil penalties.

IDEM did respond to these comments, saying that the rule includes several provisions that allow for civil penalties to be adjusted, but we believe that they should revise Section 3(a) to specifically include the reference-based civil penalty adjustment in Section 4.

And lastly, with this being IDEM's attempt at codifying the civil penalty requirements into rule, the minor violation statute should also be addressed, since it limits IDEM's penalty amount for certain violations. IDEM did not specifically address this aspect that we had added into our comments, and just responded
saying that the statute has primacy over the proposed rule.

So, we would strongly appreciate the opportunity to continue working with them, understanding that this is under a very quick time constraint per the legislation, but has the potential to be a larger shift in policy that could impact our members.

So, I don't know if you want me to send the -- or who to hand these copies to. MS. KINDRICK: Me. MS. MOEHLE: Okay. CHAIRMAN GARD: You can hand them to her. MS. MOEHLE: There you go. CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any
questions for Adrianna?
(No response.) MS. MOEHLE: Thank you. CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you, Adrianna.

The next person that presented a card was Mike Zoeller, with the Conservation Law Center. MR. ZOELLER: Good afternoon. I'm

Mike Zoeller, with the Conservation Law Center in Bloomington.

I'm afraid I'm the guilty party for submitting a lot of these comments. And I - many of our comments received responses or modifications to the proposed rules by IDEM, so I want to start out by thanking their staff for carefully considering our comments and making adjustments that have resolved a lot of our concerns.

I -- our comments are based primarily on my experience working with the Department of Justice for 16 years, representing EPA in civil enforcement matters. The language of civil penalty policies, you know, can be confusing and complicated and can apply to a lot of different situations.

I've got the experience of negotiating civil penalties with industry, and a particular -- you know, some minor ambiguity or lack of clarity can really make a difference in how long a time -- how long it takes to negotiate a civil penalty, and what you end up with.

Civil penalties are really important for deterring noncompliance, and nobody has mentioned the importance of these civil penalties. This is what makes our markets fair, because if a company is gaining economic benefit from noncompliance, the company that's lawfully operating is at a disadvantage and may lose market share, may lose profits.

So, these civil penalties are really important, not just for our environment, but for our economy, and $I$ stressed that repeatedly when I was, you know, opposing industry, who were complaining about what impact this would have on their bottom line.

So, I stand here primarily today not -not to -- I've got a couple of minor points, but the main thrust of our argument was really much like what the Association of Manufacturers said. This is an opportunity to make the civil penalty policy better.

I would not have recommended that you put it in Code, it wouldn't have been my recommendation, but now that you have to do it --
and $I$ understand that you're under, you know, a tight timeline, and absolutely you should meet that timeline and get these penalties in force so you can apply them.

But IDEM has a lot of really good staff. They're really smart. I know people who have been in the Enforcement Office for years, and they have been applying these policies for a number of years -- hopefully none of them for 25 years, but maybe some of them -- and I'm sure they've got ideas about how to make improvements in language.

Almost all of our comments deal with clarity in the language, because that's where you're going to get both information to the regulated public about what their likely penalty will be, but also some certainty in the civil penalty.

Just three really minor things. We rewrote Section 3(c), which deals with the base civil penalty. IDEM made some changes that they felt were sufficiently clarifying. I would just ask the Board to compare the language that we
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proposed with what IDEM proposed and pick what you think is the clearest, you know, not just for the enforcement authority, but also the regulated community.

Secondly, the BEN model is currently in the rules, but it's an alternative, and IDEM said that they didn't want to just use the BEN -- the BEN model is a model created by U.S. EPA. It's free of charge, it's got a lot of -- it's easy to use, even $I$ can use it. They didn't want to just rely on that model in case there were alternatives, but they didn't identify any alternatives.

Removing the economic benefit from noncompliance is absolutely essential for deterrence, because otherwise, you make noncompliance profitable. So, understanding how you do that is really just math. This is not a theory. I mean it is a model that you have to plug in numbers, but it's essentially math.

And in Footnote 9 of our comments, we identified a couple of white papers. It was a consensus opinion of dozens of the nation's
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leading economists gathered by EPA to review the BEN model and make improvements on it. Now, the reason $I$ emphasize this is not that the BEN model is the be all and end all. I'm not an economist. There may be something else out there, but IDEM should say what it is, because if you don't, you'll have violators come and say, "Well, here's our view of economic benefit," and it'll be pennies, and you'll have to deal with all of that in negotiations and eventually negotiate something smaller.

If you say, "We're going to use the BEN model," or something else, or a model that has been, you know, reviewed by a peer-review study or something like that, you'd at least have a stronger argument in negotiations.

And then finally, $I$ asked about examples.

A number of people have asked, "What do you mean by this language?" Language in civil penalties has to be malleable, because it applies to so many different entities and circumstances. But without some examples, it's hard to understand how those terms will be applied. Now, the agency
knows, and they can go back and look at 25 years of experience, but the regulated public doesn't.

So, I would encourage IDEM to put together a guidance policy -- if they don't want to put it in the rules, put together a guidance document that shows examples of some of these provisions, how they apply, and put that out at the same time or shortly after these rules get developed. And I'm -- the Conservation Law Center is glad to help with that or make comments on any guidance documents they produce.

If anybody has any comments, I do appreciate being able to stand here and give you these.

CHAIRMAN GARD: I appreciate your comments.

Are there questions? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Anybody on-line have a question?
(No response.)
MR. ZOELLER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you very much.

Anyone else that didn't submit a speaker card?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. This hearing is concluded. The Board will now consider preliminary adoption of the Title 326 Civil Penalties Rule.

Board discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, I just want to
make one comment. I think the timing of moving this is really important. I think we have to get those civil penalties adopted within the time frame the legislature's given us, and so, I think it's very important to continue moving this rule along.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Dr. Alexandrovich has something.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: I'm just
wondering -- $I$ know IDEM has gone over the rules and stuff. Have you sent it to LSA or any other attorney in state government who could determine
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that you meet the statute?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: So, I had to go
in front of Budget Committee and submit these rules to Budget Committee for review, to move forward to this point, and so, that has happened. That happened, $I$ don't know, last year or at the beginning this year at some point, and so -- and the Budget Committee's made up of both legislators, your typical finance people in LSA, and there's attorneys involved there as well.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions
or comments from Board Members?

MR. DAVIDSON: Just one quick ask.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes.

MR. DAVIDSON: Sorry. I agree with you, it needs to stay on track. How much is there -- or are you guys already working on guidance that's suggested? I know that's been discussed, but is that something we're likely to see almost in parallel to address some of these issues that have been brought up? Is that something that's --

And $I$ guess a follow-up to that: Are we likely to see in the next adoption, final adoption, the same thing, or is there still some working in progress with some of these comments? MS. KING: Well, I'll speak from my perspective and what we've been working on in the rules process. The Commissioner may want to add something to that.

The concept of a guidance is something that we think would be useful. It sounds ironic. We're taking a guidance, putting it in a rule, and then doing a guidance, like we're addicted to guidances or something. But the reality is, you know, our thought was that people are comfortable with this. The 25 years of how we've done this, people are comfortable with it.

However, the comments we've received and the comments that you've seen, folks do have some issues and some things that they would like clarified. You know, we're a little paranoid about this rule, getting it done and everything else. But the concept of a guidance that can clarify some of this information, $I$ think, is
something that we -- we have been putting
together some notes on it. We have not -- we don't have anything formulated yet. If we do that, it prob -- it wouldn't be before this Board, by that time frame -- when we put together a guidance, we have to put it out for public comment as well.

And then once that -- once we go through that process, we bring it to the Board. And the Board, as you know, doesn't approve it, but we have the conversation so the Board can see it, and then it becomes effective 30 days after we present to the appropriate board. So, that would be the process for that.

As we're trying to move this as quickly as possible, $I$ don't think that it would be ready for the Board at our next meeting, but the concept of it is something that we are looking at, based on the comments we've received.

And also based on the comments we've received, and something that seth touched on, getting this in place now does not obviate the need to look at it after it's in rule. Again,
once it's in rule, it becomes something that we can reopen and look at in the regular rulemaking process. Yes, we have the one-year deadline, but again, we're not stuck with a specific date like we are now.

So, we have that ability, looking at
what -- how it might -- how it being in rule might impact it and change what people see and what they want, if the policy doesn't work, we have the ability to reopen that rule as well. So, it is certainly something that we're considering, based on the comments that we've received.

Thank you.
MR. DAVIDSON: The second part of that was: Do you see any potential change -- is it still a work in process between now and final, or should we pretty much plan to see this again?

MS. KING: I think that the document you have -- and again, this is my opinion, but that's not to say that -- the comments we're receiving today are also important for us in terms of moving this forward.

I think that, as a general rule, what you're seeing is pretty much what you're going to see. Some of the comments we've received might end up make -- we might make some suggested changes for that. We also might be able to explain how this issue that has been brought up, we can work on in guidance, such as the definitions or how things are applied.

To the extent that -- as it was pointed out earlier, we have the ability to look back at how we've done things over the years, and that informs what some kind of a document that is -that you have more ability to explain things, and the nonrule policy document might work. So, I kind of didn't answer your question, but --

MR. DAVIDSON: No, normally --

MS. KING: -- that kind of is --

MR. DAVIDSON: -- normally it is the same thing.

MS. KING: Yeah, it's --

MR. DAVIDSON: Normally we don't get this many comments.

MS. KING: Yeah. It's not -- it's
not like, "No, we're not changing a word in it." That's -- that's not it at all, because the regulated community has been very openly saying, "We're happy to work with you on these things," and we meet with them on issues like this all of the time.

So, having those kind of discussions
might -- you know, we might decide that -- what a policy would look like, or "What changes to the rule for final adoption would still allow us to meet the requirements and get this done in the time frame that we're required to?"

CHAIRMAN GARD: Do you have a --
MR. ETZLER: So, I have a question.
Right now, the deadline to get this adopted is December 31st; correct?

MS. KING: The deadline to have it -it's supposed to be effective by then.

MR. ETZLER: So, let's back up.
What's the last Rule Board -- Rules Board meeting date for final adoption that would allow us to meet that burden?

MS. KING: We are looking at July.

We could go as late as August, but then we have to get the transcript, we have to -- the Attorney General has 45 days to review it, the Governor's Office has 15 days to sign it, it becomes effective 30 days after it goes to LSA. So, that's what, two -- a couple of months.

MR. ETZLER: So, September could be the --

MS. KING: September would be the absolute drop-dead Board meeting.

MR. ETZLER: I understand that.
That's what $I$ was asking, though.
MS. KING: Yeah. I mean -- but that would be cutting it very close.

MR. ETZLER: Right. I understand.
MS. KING: So, that's why it -- we're saying that ideally we'd like to get it done in July or August so that we do have the time to put everything together.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Other questions?
MR. BORTNER: And I'd remind
everybody that what we're talking about is as the legislation is passed as of today. This may --
some things may be changed or tweaked as you move through this, because the amount of paper tsunami that's going to fall before the Assembly on some of these things may cause them to tweak some things. So, this is as we know it to be today. MS. KING: Oh, yes, let's hope.
(Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, $I$ think this
has been a learning process for the General Assembly, because there's not really any historical memory in the General Assembly to deal with rulemaking. And so, I think they're going to be surprised at some of the tweaks they have to make.

Any other questions before we move on? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Is there a motion to preliminarily adopt the rules as presented?

MR. ETZLER: So moved.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? DR. NIEMIEC: So moved. This is Ted

Niemiec.

| 1 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, wait a minute. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | This is a roll-call vote. |
| 3 | DR. NIEMIEC: Okay. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GARD: So, is -- is there a |
| 5 | second? |
| 6 | DR. NIEMIEC: Second. This is Ted |
| 7 | Niemiec. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. This is a |
| 9 | roll-call vote. |
| 10 | Mr. Davidson? |
| 11 | MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? |
| 13 | MR. ETZLER: Yes. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec? |
| 15 | DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? |
| 17 | MR. HORN: Yes. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 19 | (No response.) |
| 20 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: You're on mute. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 22 | MR. HORN: Am I on mute? |
| 23 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: No, you're good. |


| 1 | MR. RULON: Yes; sorry. Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. |
| 3 | Mr. Jaworowski? |
| 4 | MR. JAWOROWSKI: Yes. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN GARD: I'm sorry; I really |
| 6 | butchered that. |
| 7 | Mr. Green? |
| 8 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Bortner? |
| 10 | MR. BORTNER: Yes. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Brown? |
| 12 | MS. BROWN: Yes. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? |
| 14 | DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Koryoski [sic]? |
| 16 | MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Ketzenberger? |
| 18 | MR. KETZENBERGER: Yes. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Zehr? |
| 20 | MR. ZEHR: Yes. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson? |
| 22 | MS. NELSON: Yes. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye. |

Fifteen ayes, zero nays. The rule is preliminarily adopted.

This is a public hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana concerning preliminary adoption of the Title 327 Civil Penalties Rule.

I will now introduce Exhibit B, the preliminarily adopted rule, into the record of the hearing.

The rule has already been presented, and the speaker cards have addressed all three rules. The hearing is concluded. The Board will now consider preliminary adoption of Title 327, Civil Penalties Rule.

Is there any Board discussion?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Is there a
motion to preliminarily adopt the rules as presented?

MR. RULON: So moved, Ken Rulon.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second?

DR. NIEMIEC: This is Ted Niemiec.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Roll-call vote.

Mr. Davidson?
MR. DAVIDSON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler?
MR. ETZLER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec?
DR. NIEMIEC: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn?
MR. HORN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon?
MR. RULON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Jaworowski?
MR. JAWOROWSKI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Green?
MR. GREEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Bortner?
MR. BORTNER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Brown?
MS. BROWN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Koryoski [sic]?
MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Ketzenberger?

MR. KETZENBERGER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Zehr?
MR. ZEHR: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson?
MS. NELSON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye.
Fifteen ayes, zero nays. The rule is preliminarily adopted.

This is a public hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana concerning preliminary adoption for Title 329, Civil Penalties.

I will now introduce Exhibit C, the preliminarily adopted [sic] Title 329 Civil Penalties Rule, into the record of the hearing.

The rule has already been presented, and the speakers have already made their comments. This hearing is concluded. The Board will now consider preliminary adoption of Title 329, Civil Penalties Rule.

Is there any Board discussion? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: I need a motion to

| 1 | adopt the preliminarily adopted -- to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | preliminarily adopt the rule. |
| 3 | MR. DAVIDSON: So moved. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? |
| 5 | MR. ETZLER: Second. |
| 6 | DR. NIEMIEC: Second. This is Ted |
| 7 | Niemiec. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN GARD: This is a roll-call |
| 9 | vote. |
| 10 | Mr. Davidson? |
| 11 | MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? |
| 13 | MR. ETZLER: Yes. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec? |
| 15 | DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? |
| 17 | MR. HORN: Yes. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 19 | MR. RULON: Yes. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Jaworowski? |
| 21 | MR. JAWOROWSKI: Yes. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Green? |
| 23 | MR. GREEN: Yes. |

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Bortner?
MR. BORTNER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Brown?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Koryoski [sic]?

MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Ketzenberger?

MR. KETZENBERGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Zehr?

MR. ZEHR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson?

MS. NELSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye. Fifteen ayes, zero nays. That rule is preliminarily adopted.

Okay. This is an Open Forum. Is there anyone who wishes to address the Board today?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Before we adjourn, is there anything any IDEM person needs to say?

Commissioner?
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|  | cket $[2]-27: 9,56:$ | $7,78: 13,91: 12$ | PFOA [2] - 9:16, 10:13 phased [1]-9:17 | 52:16, 68:23, 69:5, |
|  | packets [1] - 27:6 <br> paddlefish [1] - 42 | 91:15 | phenomenal [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:7, 69:15, 70:8, } \\ & 71: 7,82: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | paddlefish [1] - 42:5 <br> page [2]-27:16, 30:10 | $P \mathrm{f}$ | $7: 14,15: 10$ | potentially [2] - 42:17, |
|  | ges [3]-29:7, |  | ck [2] - 14:2, 75:1 |  |
|  | 9:13, 62:1 | $\text { penalty }[36]-18: 2$ | ece [1] - 46:2 | practice [1] - 69:4 |
|  | paper [1] - 86:2 | 0:4, 50:2 | 1] - 63:22 | practices [2] - 47:10, |
|  | papers [1]-75:22 | $: 16,51: 1$ | 12.12 | 48:2 |
|  | Pappas [1]-8:14 <br> parallel [1] - 79:21 | $52: 2,52: 8,52: 11$ | 64:14, 81:22 <br> placed [1] - 37:17 | precludes [1] - 68:6 |


| ```49:13, 86:18, 89:2, 89:8, 89:18, 91:8, 91:14, 92:1, 92:2, 93:17 preliminary [10] - 25:18, 26:15, 28:2, 28:5, 49:10, 78:6, 89:5, 89:13, 91:11, 91:19 present [3]-29:5, 49:15, 81:13 presentation [4] - 18:1, 26:18, 26:20, 26:21 presented [8] - 6:20, 25:17, 54:23, 71:21, 86:19, 89:10, 89:19, 91:16 presenting [2]-25:15, 36:9 pretty [5] - 12:7, 22:19, 43:8, 82:18, 83:2 previous [1] - 68:1 previously [1] - 66:6 primacy [1]-71:1 primarily [2] - 72:11, 73:15 primary's [1] - 14:3 proactively [1] - 9:22 prob [1]-81:4 probabilistic [1] - 43:15 procedures [1] - 32:20 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 1:9 proceedings [3] - 13:3, 95:9, 96:6 process [17] - 11:20, 17:20, 18:4, 19:2, 19:13, 21:9, 25:3, 37:2, 46:21, 65:16, 65:17, 80:7, 81:9, 81:14, 82:3, 82:17, 86:9 produce [2] - 36:13, 77:11 productive [1]-12:7 profitable [2]-53:12, 75:17 profits [2]-53:9, 73:8 program [9]-29:19, 29:21, 30:4, 32:9, 43:15, 44:7, 52:17, 68:6, 68:22 programing [1] - 16:17 programs [4]-29:10, 32:4, 51:12, 51:13 progress [2] - 62:20,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:4 } \\ & \text { project }[2]-34: 3, \\ & \text { 45:14 } \\ & \text { projects [3] - 14:18, } \\ & 31: 9,47: 7 \\ & \text { promoted }[2]-8: 22, \\ & 35: 3 \\ & \text { pronounced }[1]- \\ & 66: 17 \\ & \text { proper }[1]-11: 20 \\ & \text { proposed }[8]-52: 7, \\ & 56: 23,67: 21,69: 22, \\ & 71: 2,72: 6,75: 1 \\ & \text { protecting }[1]-41: 19 \\ & \text { provide }[5]-10: 6, \\ & 29: 8,31: 12,67: 18 \\ & \text { provides }[1]-30: 10 \\ & \text { providing }[2]-56: 20, \\ & 67: 1 \\ & \text { provisions }[2]-70: 12, \\ & 77: 6 \\ & \text { Proxy }[3]-2: 8,2: 9, \\ & 2: 10 \\ & \text { public }[35]-5: 17, \\ & 13: 7,13: 8,13: 10, \\ & 23: 9,23: 11,27: 7, \\ & 27: 14,27: 23,29: 16, \\ & 29: 17,31: 4,31: 5, \\ & 33: 22,34: 11,34: 16, \\ & 36: 19,37: 3,37: 8, \\ & 38: 22,45: 1,48: 12, \\ & 48: 16,48: 17,48: 19, \\ & 49: 8,61: 18,65: 10, \\ & 74: 16,77: 2,81: 6, \\ & 89: 3,91: 9 \\ & \text { PuBLIC }[2]-1: 5,2: 19 \\ & \text { Public }[3]-1: 12,96: 3, \\ & 96: 12 \\ & \text { pull }[1]-62: 16 \\ & \text { purposes }[1]-38: 19 \\ & \text { put }[17]-15: 4,19: 16, \\ & 20: 10,22: 20,33: 14, \\ & 37: 7,38: 18,44: 21, \\ & 58: 11,73: 21,77: 3, \\ & 77: 4,77: 5,77: 7, \\ & 81: 5,81: 6,85: 18 \\ & \text { puts }[1]-12: 18 \\ & \text { putting }[4]-16: 15, \\ & 21: 2,80: 11,81: 1 \\ & \hline \quad \text { Q } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:21, 17:7, 18:12, } \\ & \text { 21:8, 23:4, 23:8, } \\ & 23: 16,25: 21,25: 22, \\ & 26: 1,34: 18,35: 15, \\ & 35: 17,43: 23,47: 3, \\ & 48: 9,49: 3,54: 18, \\ & 54: 20,55: 1,55: 11, \\ & 55: 19,57: 8,61: 5 \text {, } \\ & 65: 6,66: 1,71: 17, \\ & 77: 17,79: 12,85: 20, \\ & \text { 86:15 } \\ & \text { quick }[4]-14: 8,61: 6, \\ & 71: 5,79: 14 \\ & \text { quickly }[3]-9: 12, \\ & 39: 7,81: 15 \\ & \text { quite }[4]-7: 18,41: 23, \\ & 54: 10,67: 9 \\ & \text { quiz }[1]-18: 20 \\ & \text { quorum }[1]-3: 4 \\ & \text { quote }[1]-64: 2 \\ & \text { quotes }[1]-56: 9 \end{aligned}$R <br> raise $[1]-27: 19$ <br> raised $[5]-4: 4,4: 5$, <br> $4: 14,4: 15,56: 8$ <br> raised-hand $[4]-4: 4$, <br> $4: 5,4: 14,4: 15$ <br> range $[2]-29: 20$, <br> $30: 15$ <br> rather $[5]-9: 12$, <br> $10: 19,11: 19,32: 6$, <br> $61: 1$ <br> RCRA $_{[1]}-10: 11$ <br> re $[1]-53: 3$ <br> re-evaluation $[1]-$ <br> $53: 3$ <br> reaches $[2]-39: 15$, <br> $39: 17$ <br> read $[1]-58: 12$ <br> reading $[1]-57: 13$ <br> ready $[2]-25: 18$, <br> $81: 16$ <br> real $[2]-32: 11,58: 16$ <br> reality $[1]-80: 13$ <br> realized $[1]-28: 15$ <br> really $[23]-8: 6,10: 21$, <br> $11: 14,21: 10,31: 3$, <br> $32: 19,34: 23,40: 20$, <br> $43: 6,44: 4,63: 8$, <br> $65: 22,72: 21,73: 1$, <br> $73: 9,73: 17,74: 5$, <br> $74: 6,74: 19,75: 18$, <br> $78: 12,86: 10,88: 5$ <br> reason $[2]-38: 1,76: 3$ <br> reasons $[1]-56: 16$ <br> receive $[1]-65: 10$ <br> received $[10]-29: 11$, <br> $29: 15,48: 11,52: 6$, | ```72:5, 80:17, 81:19, 81:21, 82:13, 83:3 receiving [1] - 82:22 recently [3]-8:8, 8:14, 11:12 recommendation [1] - 73:23 recommended [1] - 73:21 record [3] - 49:14, 89:8, 91:15 recreational [3] - 36:20, 40:6, 44:9 reduce [4]-14:18, 41:4, 52:7, 70:10 reduces [1]-68:7 reduction [1] - 14:9 reference [2] - 69:6, 70:15 reference-based [1] - 70:15 referenced [1] - 57:20 refund \({ }_{[1]}\) - 30:8 regarding [2]-29:9, 48:18 regards [1] - 47:5 regional [2]-8:21, 46:4 regular [2]-26:14, 82:2 regulate [3]-11:19, 56:23, 63:23 regulated \([9]-58: 2\), 58:14, 58:21, 61:13, 68:3, 74:16, 75:3, 77:2, 84:3 regulatory [4]-14:15, 52:17, 52:19, 68:21 relationship [5]-14:1, 57:22, 58:9, 59:14, 61:13 relationship- building [1] - 14:1 relationships [4] - 57:21, 58:1, 60:17, 61:14 rely [1] - 75:11 remain [1] - 52:3 remember [2]-23:7, 23:13 remind [1] - 85:21 reminder [1] - 27:2 reminds [1] - 22:13 remove [1] - 41:5 removed [1] - 69:7 removing [1] - 75:14 renewal [1]-30:16 renewals [1]-30:18 reopen [2]-82:2, 82:10``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & 87: 19,89: 16,91: 22, \\ & 93: 20,94: 15,95: 4 \\ & \text { responses [3] - 48:23, } \\ & 67: 8,72: 5 \\ & \text { responsibility }[1] \text { - } \\ & 47: 8 \\ & \text { restoration }[2]- \\ & 47: 13,47: 18 \\ & \text { restroom }[1]-33: 5 \\ & \text { result }[2]-42: 19,44: 5 \\ & \text { retired }[2]-24: 20 \\ & \text { retiring }[1]-8: 2 \\ & \text { return }[1]-4: 21 \\ & \text { review }[4]-76: 1, \\ & 76: 14,79: 4,85: 3 \\ & \text { reviewed }[1]-76: 14 \\ & \text { revise }[1]-70: 14 \\ & \text { rewrote }[1]-74: 20 \\ & \text { Ric }[2]-2: 4,5: 5 \\ & \text { river }[3]-39: 12, \\ & 39: 13,47: 22 \\ & \text { road }[2]-13: 22,59: 12 \\ & \text { rock }[1]-61: 1 \\ & \text { Rockensuess }[3]- \\ & 2: 12,6: 4,7: 9 \\ & \text { ROCKENSUESS }[28]- \\ & 6: 3,7: 10,16: 6, \\ & 16: 10,17: 1,17: 4, \\ & 17: 14,17: 23,18: 11, \\ & 18: 15,26: 11,45: 13, \\ & 46: 14,46: 17,46: 22, \\ & 47: 2,59: 16,62: 1, \\ & 62: 5,62: 21,63: 2, \\ & 64: 17,66: 9,78: 17, \\ & 79: 2,87: 20,87: 23, \\ & 94: 1 \\ & \text { role }[2]-8: 15,9: 4 \\ & \text { roles }[1]-9: 7 \\ & \text { roll }[4]-87: 2,87: 9, \\ & 89: 23,92: 8 \\ & \text { roll-call }[4]-87: 2, \\ & 87: 9,89: 23,92: 8 \\ & \text { rolling }[2]-14: 23, \\ & 15: 3 \\ & \text { Room }[2]-1: 15,94: 9 \\ & \text { room }[1]-3: 9 \\ & \text { rudely }[1]-24: 20 \\ & \text { Rule }[1]-84: 20 \\ & \text { rule }[53]-9: 13,20: 2, \\ & 20: 12,24: 4,24: 9, \\ & 25: 4,25: 18,26: 14, \\ & 28: 3,49: 11,49: 14, \\ & 49: 19,52: 3,52: 7, \\ & 52: 8,54: 17,59: 7, \\ & 60: 14,62: 22,63: 18, \\ & 65: 11,67: 12,68: 14, \\ & 69: 8,69: 13,69: 19, \\ & 69: 22,70: 2,70: 7, \\ & 70: 12,70: 19,71: 2, \\ & 78: 7,78: 15,80: 11, \end{aligned}$ | ```80:21, 81:23, 82:1, 82:7, 82:10, 83:1, 84:10, 89:1, 89:6, 89:8, 89:10, 89:14, 91:7, 91:15, 91:16, 91:20, 92:2, 93:16 rulemaking [13] - 17:20, 19:1, 19:14, 21:8, 24:15, 25:3, 50:2, 65:16, 65:17, 66:7, 68:12, 82:2, 86:12 rulemakings [4] - 49:22, 68:1, 68:4, 68:19 rules [55] - 10:9, 10:10, 10:13, 18:3, 19:6, 19:15, 19:18, 19:20, 20:6, 20:15, 21:11, 23:10, 23:20, 24:18, 25:11, 25:15, 26:18, 27:5, 27:16, 28:1, 49:16, 49:19, 50:5, 50:7, 50:9, 50:15, 51:4, 51:9, 51:18, 51:21, 52:4, 55:1, 55:12, 55:15, 55:17, 60:11, 66:20, 67:10, 67:21, 68:18, 69:13, 72:6, 75:6, 77:5, 77:8, 78:21, 79:4, 80:7, 84:20, 86:18, 89:4, 89:11, 89:18, 91:10, 94:6 RULES [1]-1:1 Rules [4] - 1:10, 3:6, 26:17, 49:9 Rulon [6] - 2:6, 6:10, 87:18, 87:21, 89:20, 90:9 rulon [1] - 92:18 RULON [5] - 6:10, 88:1, 89:20, 90:10, 92:19 run [4]-8:23, 32:8, 44:19, 67:5 running \([1]-8: 18\) runoff [1] - 45:23 runs [1] - 32:2 \begin{tabular}{l} \(\mathbf{S}\) \\ \hline sample \([2]-44: 16\), \\ \(44: 20\) \\ sampled \([2]-38: 5\), \\ \(43: 13\) \\ samples \([2]-41: 20\), \\ \(42: 13\) \\ sampling \([2]-42: 18\), \\ \(43: 15\) \end{tabular}``` | ```scenario [1]-21:1 scheduled [1] - 25:14 sciences [1] - 35:9 screen [2] - 4:6, 4:8 screening [1] - 42:13 script [2] - 28:11 seamlessly [1]-32:2 search [1] - 38:22 season [1]-44:9 seat [1] - 33:6 second [14]-6:22, 6:23, 65:10, 65:19, 82:15, 86:21, 87:5, 87:6, 89:21, 92:4, 92:5, 92:6, 94:19, 94:21 secondly [1] - 75:5 section [11]-16:18, 24:18, 25:11, 27:1, 36:12, 49:1, 49:20, 69:15, 70:14, 70:16, 74:20 see [25]-4:7, 4:13, 10:1, 10:5, 13:19, 20:13, 22:10, 22:22, 38:7, 39:1, 39:5, 42:12, 42:15, 43:20, 45:4, 46:6, 64:15, 79:21, 80:2, 81:11, 82:8, 82:16, 82:18, 83:3 seeing [6] - 16:23, 32:15, 43:7, 43:8, 47:6, 83:2 seeking \([1]-69: 12\) seem [2] - 20:4, 40:21 segments [2]-39:10, 39:14 selenium [4]-41:13, 41:15, 42:7, 48:18 self [3] - 68:5, 68:13, 68:17 self-disclosure [3] - 68:5, 68:13, 68:17 Senate [2]-12:16, 29:22 send [5] - 3:23, 12:18, 21:1, 43:22, 71:9 senior [1] - 32:16 sensitive [1] - 42:7 sent [2] - 31:14, 78:22 sentiment \({ }_{[1]}\) - 69:10 separate [1]-26:19 September [3] - 44:10, 85:7, 85:9 septic [1] - 46:2 septics [1] - 45:23 services [1] - \(34: 22\) session [2]-12:8, 29:23``` | ```session's [1] - 13:16 set [3] - 32:7, 32:21, 94:8 Seth [6] - 2:17, 49:15, 49:18, 54:23, 59:17, 81:21 several [5] - 34:3, 42:11, 52:6, 63:5, 70:12 several-year [1] - 34:3 sewer [2] - 11:13, 46:4 sewers [1] - 46:7 Shadeland [1] - 44:17 shall [1] - 69:23 share [1] - 73:7 SharePoint \({ }_{[1]}\) - 35:7 sharepoint [2]-31:11, 32:23 Shelby [2]-1:13, 96:4 Shelbyville [1] - 96:4 shift [3]-13:20, 16:17, 71:7 shifts [1] - 8:6 shocked [1]-60:21 shook [1] - 94:1 short [1] - 26:8 shortcut [1] - 32:21 shortcuts [1] - 32:22 shortened [1] - 23:9 shortly [1] - 77:8 shout [1] - 4:1 shout-outs [1]-4:1 show [2]-4:12, 13:22 showing [2] - 42:22, 43:12 shows [1] - 77:6 sic [4]-88:15, 90:21, 91:14, 93:7 side [1] - 58:14 sight \([1]-58: 1\) \(\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}[2]-27: 4,85: 4\) sign-in [1] - 27:4 signed [2] - 12:13, 13:12 significant \({ }_{[1]}-53: 2\) significantly [1] - 68:7 silly [1] - 33:2 similar [2]-53:18, 64:16 simple [1] - 59:6 simply [2]-11:7, 67:11 sing [1] - 58:5 single [2]-11:23, 26:18 sit \([1]-33: 10\) site [19]-27:10, 27:17, 31:11, 31:15, 31:16, 31:22, 32:1,``` | ```32:4, 32:12, 33:1, 35:7, 35:12, 37:7, 38:20, 43:20, 44:22, 44:23, 48:22 sites [3]-31:14, 43:10, 43:12 sitting [3] - 32:16, 33:3, 33:8 situations [2]-64:20, 72:17 size [2] - 39:10, 56:13 slide [11] - 36:11, 37:15, 38:12, 39:6, 40:3, 40:19, 41:9, 42:8, 42:21, 43:5, 43:18 slip [1] - 64:4 slowly [1] - 66:8 small [3]-5:14, 56:9, 56:17 smaller [2] - 39:14, 76:11 smart [1] - 74:6 snafu [1] - 15:12 solid [1] - 5:13 solution [1] - 65:5 solutions [1] - 47:13 someone [1]-22:12 sometimes [1] - 39:19 soon [4]-15:2, 34:10, 48:22, 94:12 sorry [6] - 28:20, 47:18, 65:8, 79:16, 88:1, 88:5 sort [2] - 22:20, 24:13 sought [1] - 51:17 sounds [1] - 80:10 source [1] - 11:6 sources [3] - 30:2, 35:13, 64:1 south [1] - 94:10 South [1]-1:14 SPEAKER \({ }_{[1]}-56: 22\) speaker [3] - 66:13, 78:1, 89:11 speakers [1] - 91:17 SPEAKERS \({ }_{[1]}-2: 19\) speaking [3]-3:23, 28:16, 66:20 special [1]-55:9 specific [6]-21:8, 63:12, 65:19, 67:4, 68:9, 82:4 specifically \([4]\) - 20:18, 70:8, 70:15, 70:22 spectrum [1]-21:14 spend \([1]-35: 11\) spent \([1]-8: 2\) spreadsheet \([1]\) - 35:2``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { staff }[6]-33: 20, \\ & 33: 21,44: 18,66: 4, \\ & 72: 7,74: 5 \\ & \text { STAFF }[1]-2: 14 \\ & \text { staffing }[2]-7: 17, \\ & 16: 5 \\ & \text { stakeholder }[1]- \\ & 51: 15 \\ & \text { stand }[3]-27: 19, \\ & 73: 15,77: 13 \\ & \text { standard }[3]-9: 14, \\ & 10: 15,10: 18 \\ & \text { standards }[3]-10: 17, \\ & 41: 14,41: 23 \\ & \text { star }[1]-64: 2 \\ & \text { start }[16]-3: 9,3: 14, \\ & 6: 7,14: 23,15: 3, \\ & 19: 14,20: 3,24: 3, \\ & 24: 5,33: 3,35: 3, \\ & 46: 3,70: 2,72: 7 \\ & \text { started }[5]-10: 2, \\ & 10: 3,10: 4,33: 13, \\ & 34: 4 \\ & \text { starting }[3]-13: 14, \\ & 21: 13,24: 11 \\ & \text { startup }[1]-53: 10 \\ & \text { stat }[1]-20: 9 \\ & \text { STATE }[1]-1: 1 \\ & \text { state }[15]-10: 1,14: 2, \\ & 14: 19,27: 19,36: 14, \\ & 39: 17,39: 20,42: 3, \\ & 43: 1,43: 14,44: 8, \\ & 47: 20,61: 15,68: 11, \\ & 78: 23 \\ & \text { State }[7]-1: 12,6: 14, \\ & 28: 1,49: 9,89: 4, \\ & 91: 10,96: 13 \\ & \text { state's }[2]-50: 13, \\ & 50: 14 \\ & \text { states }[7]-9: 10, \\ & 14: 13,14: 15,36: 13, \\ & 69: 9,69: 13,69: 22 \\ & \text { status }[2]-15: 16, \\ & 38: 11 \\ & \text { statute }[13]-20: 9, \\ & 20: 15,20: 18,21: 6, \\ & 22: 17,23: 13,60: 14, \\ & 69: 2,69: 6,69: 13, \\ & 70: 19,71: 1,79: 1 \\ & \text { statute's }[1]-69: 16 \\ & \text { statutes }[1]-50: 1 \\ & \text { statutorily }[2]-50: 16, \\ & 50: 17 \\ & \text { statutory }[3]-51: 3, \\ & 67: 16,67: 17 \\ & \text { stay }[2]-63: 17,79: 17 \\ & \text { steal }[1]-20: 7 \\ & \text { step }[3]-22: 18,22: 19, \\ & 41: 7 \\ & \text { stepped }[1]-62: 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { still }[8]-15: 21,15: 23, \\ & 59: 13,65: 2,67: 8, \\ & 80: 3,82: 17,84: 10 \\ & \text { storage }[5]-50: 15, \\ & 50: 20,53: 17,53: 23, \\ & 54: 13 \\ & \text { store }[1]-31: 12 \\ & \text { stormwater }[1]-8: 9 \\ & \text { stream }[3]-38: 23, \\ & 40: 4,47: 22 \\ & \text { streams }[4]-39: 9, \\ & 39: 16,39: 20,40: 8 \\ & \text { street }[2]-59: 4,59: 9 \\ & \text { Street }[1]-1: 15 \\ & \text { stressed }[1]-73: 11 \\ & \text { stretch }[1]-39: 11 \\ & \text { stricter }[1]-64: 18 \\ & \text { strike }[1]-64: 6 \\ & \text { stroke }[1]-58: 16 \\ & \text { strong }[1]-58: 3 \\ & \text { stronger }[1]-76: 16 \\ & \text { strongly }[1]-71: 3 \\ & \text { structure }[2]-51: 20, \\ & 52: 2 \\ & \text { struggle }[1]-63: 21 \\ & \text { stuck }[1]-82: 4 \\ & \text { study }[1]-76: 14 \\ & \text { stuff }[2]-57: 4,78: 22 \\ & \text { stumble }[1]-33: 12 \\ & \text { sturgeon }[1]-42: 5 \\ & \text { subject }[1]-94: 10 \\ & \text { submissions }[1]- \\ & 27: 14 \\ & \text { submit }[3]-30: 16, \\ & 78: 1,79: 3 \\ & \text { submitted }[6]-14: 9, \\ & 14: 17,36: 22,38: 14, \\ & 63: 5,67: 7 \\ & \text { submitting }[1]-72: 4 \\ & \text { substantial }[3]- \\ & 45: 16,56: 2,56: 11 \\ & \text { substantive }[2]- \\ & 51: 18,65: 12 \\ & \text { successful }[1]-68: 6 \\ & \text { successor }[1]-58: 11 \\ & \text { sufficient }[3]-30: 3, \\ & 63: 7,67: 18 \\ & \text { sufficiently }[1]-74: 22 \\ & \text { suggested }[2]-79: 19, \\ & 83: 4 \\ & \text { suggesting }[1]-11: 18 \\ & \text { suggests }[1]-70: 2 \\ & \text { summary }[3]-6: 18, \\ & 21: 23,37: 12 \\ & \text { summer }[2]-13: 23, \\ & 14: 3 \\ & \text { super }[1]-8: 4 \\ & \text { supply }[1]-36: 19 \\ & \text { support }[1]-29: 21 \end{aligned}$ | ```supporting [3] - 31:18, 36:14, 38:6 supposed [2]-28:12, 84:18 surplus [1] - 30:6 surprised [1] - 86:13 surrounding [1] - 53:3 swath [2]-46:8, 64:1 switch [1] - 59:8 sworn [1] - 27:21 system [2]-21:15, 34:22```T <br> Table $[1]-27: 4$ <br> tackle [1] - 31:23 <br> tailor $[1]-52: 8$ <br> take-aways $[1]-43: 6$ <br> tank [3] - 50:15, 53:17, <br> $54: 14$ <br> tanks $[2]-50: 20$, <br> $53: 23$ <br> task [1] $-32: 8$ <br> tasks $[2]-31: 12,32: 5$ <br> team $[2]-8: 19,8: 20$ <br> teams $[2]-4: 2,13: 15$ <br> Teams $[1]-4: 19$ <br> technical $[1]-4: 3$ <br> Ted $[9]-2: 4,6: 11$, <br> $6: 23,86: 22,87: 6$, <br> $89: 22,92: 6,94: 20$, <br> $94: 21$ <br> TELEPHONE $[1]-$ <br> $1: 22$ <br> ten $[4]-13: 8,30: 18$, <br> $33: 16,56: 18$ <br> tentative $[1]-94: 10$ <br> tentatively $[3]-25: 14$, <br> $94: 7$ <br> terms $[4]-24: 1$, <br> $68: 20,76: 23,82: 23$ <br> terrified $[1]-31: 19$ <br> testify $[1]-27: 2$ <br> testimony $[1]-67: 3$ <br> testing $[2]-9: 18,9: 22$ <br> tests $[1]-44: 19$ <br> thankful $[1]-8: 4$ <br> thanking $[1]-72: 7$ <br> THE $[1]-1: 1$ <br> themselves $[2]-3: 13$, <br> $3: 14$ <br> theory $[1]-75: 19$ <br> Thereupon $[1]-95: 9$ <br> they've $[3]-43: 8$, <br> $45: 16,74: 11$ <br> thinking $[1]-21: 12$ <br> three $[16]-9: 17$, <br> $13: 11,25: 15,26: 18$, <br> $30: 7,34: 6,34: 8$, <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:16, 49:22, 54:23, } \\ & \text { 55:2, 55:11, 66:20, } \\ & \text { 68:4, 74:19, 89:11 } \\ & \text { thrust }[1]-73: 17 \\ & \text { thunder }[1]-20: 7 \\ & \text { tight }[1]-74: 2 \\ & \text { tighter }[1]-64: 3 \\ & \text { timeline }[3]-24: 6, \\ & 74: 2,74: 3 \\ & \text { timing }[1]-78: 11 \\ & \text { tissue }[3]-40: 16, \\ & 40: 18,41: 20 \\ & \text { Title }[6]-29: 18,30: 2, \\ & 30: 3,30: 18,55: 17, \\ & 55: 18 \\ & \text { title }[13]-28: 2,49: 11, \\ & 49: 13,52: 9,55: 17, \\ & 65: 16,65: 18,78: 6, \\ & 89: 5,89: 13,91: 11, \\ & 91: 14,91: 19 \\ & \text { titles }[1]-26: 15 \\ & \text { TMDL }[5]-37: 19, \\ & 37: 23,41: 5,43: 2, \\ & 43: 4 \\ & \text { TMDL's }[1]-43: 16 \\ & \text { today }[21]-6: 17, \\ & 10: 20,13: 18,18: 2, \\ & \text { 19:21, 20:7, } 20: 13, \\ & 25: 17,25: 20,26: 13, \\ & 29: 5,36: 8,55: 15, \\ & 62: 3,65: 2,67: 2, \\ & 73: 15,82: 22,85: 23, \\ & 86: 5,93: 19 \\ & \text { today's }[3]-27: 3, \\ & 27: 5,27: 12 \\ & \text { toes }[1]-62: 12 \\ & \text { together }[7]-22: 20, \\ & 62: 16,77: 3,77: 5, \\ & 81: 2,81: 5,85: 19 \\ & \text { token }[1]-23: 21 \\ & \text { tomorrow }[1]-59: 23 \\ & \text { took }[3]-14: 16,31: 9, \\ & 34: 2 \\ & \text { tool }[1]-42: 13 \\ & \text { top }[3]-4: 6,40: 4, \\ & 40: 5 \\ & \text { Total }[1]-37: 19 \\ & \text { total }[2]-29: 11,42: 14 \\ & \text { touch }[1]-4: 8 \\ & \text { touched }[1]-81: 21 \\ & \text { tough }[2]-19: 9,57: 17 \\ & \text { towards }[3]-46: 6, \\ & 46: 9,65: 4 \\ & \text { towns }[1]-14: 14 \\ & \text { toxins }[1]-44: 20 \\ & \text { track }[4]-35: 2,35: 4, \\ & 39: 3,79: 17 \\ & \text { transcribed }[1]-96: 8 \\ & \text { transcript }[5]-27: 12, \\ & 27: 13,27: 16,85: 2, \end{aligned}$ | ```96:6 transition [1]-69:12 transparent [1] - 61:18 transpose [1] - 51:17 treatment [1] - 10:7 trillion [2]-9:16, 10:2 true [2]-56:11, 96:5 trust [2]-55:7, 58:10 try \([3]-21: 9,62: 19\), 64:6 trying [6] - 11:18, 33:11, 59:12, 61:21, 62:16, 81:15 tsunami [1]-86:2 tweak [1] - 86:4 tweaked [1]-86:1 tweaks [1] - 86:13 twice [1] - 30:17 twisting [1] - 21:3 two [8]-13:11, 14:21, 29:16, 36:23, 39:19, 50:11, 66:13, 85:6 types [4]-29:9, 29:15, 42:6, 43:7 typical [1] - 79:9 typically [2]-13:11, 69:21```U <br> U.S $_{[5]}-11: 12,36: 23$, <br> $37: 8,51: 11,75: 8$ <br> unable $[3]-51: 7$, <br> $51: 10,51: 12$ <br> unanticipated $[1]-$ <br> $53: 1$ <br> uncertainty $[1]-58: 4$ <br> unclear $[1]-68: 20$ <br> under $[16]-13: 2,19: 7$, <br> 19:12, 19:16, 20:14, <br> 21:16, 24:6, 27:1, <br> $54: 8,54: 12,55: 15$, <br> $55: 16,68: 8,69: 14$, <br> $71: 5,74: 1$ <br> underground $[5]-$ <br> $50: 15,50: 20,53: 17$, <br> $53: 23,54: 13$ <br> underline $[1]-94: 7$ <br> undersigned $[1]-$ <br> $96: 2$ <br> UNIDENTIFIED $[1]-$ <br> $56: 22$ <br> unless $[1]-16: 16$ <br> unobligated $[1]-30: 5$ <br> up $[30]-4: 9,7: 20$, <br> $14: 3,14: 7,16: 15$, <br> 17:5, $21: 21,24: 16$, <br> $24: 17,25: 5,32: 21$, <br> $33: 4,34: 22,39: 9$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



