



CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson?
MR. DAVIDSON: Here.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler?
MR. ETZLER: Here.
CHAIRMAN GARD: And Ms. Kozyrski?
MS. KOZYRSKI: Here.
CHAIRMAN GARD: And Chairman Gard is
here, so we have one, two, three -- seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, so we do have a quorum. At this point $I$ 'm going to ask Dallas O'Hern to cover the meeting logistics for in-person and remote participants.

MR. O'HERN: Thank you for joining us today. My name is Dallas O'Hern. I'm a Digital Media Specialist.

We will be taking questions and comments from the public today. For those meeting -- for those members of the public in the meeting room today, please make sure that you complete a speaker card if you would like to speak. Speaker cards are located on a table at the entrance, and should be given to Karla Kindrick when completed. For those joining us via Zoom, if you
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would like to speak, please use the raised hand or chat feature. To access the raised hand and chat feature, at the bottom of your screen, in the middle of that menu there is a chat icon which you can click on to show the chat dialogue. You should also see the raised hand option. Please utilize the raised hand option or chat features if you have any questions or comments.

For those joining us by phone, you can raise your hand by pressing 9, and when called upon, you can unmute by pressing 6 [sic].

For everyone in today's meeting, please identify yourself when speaking. If any members of the media have joined us via Zoom, please utilize the chat feature or e-mail
media@idem.indiana.gov [sic] if you have any questions. This meeting is being recorded and will be posted on IDEM's Web site.

And with that, I'll turn the meeting back over to Beverly Gard.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you so much.

Our first order of business today is

| 1 | approval of the summary of the March 8th, 2022 -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | that's not right -- 2023 Board meeting. Are |
| 3 | there any additions or corrections to the summary |
| 4 | as presented? |
| 5 | (No response.) |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN GARD: If so, I need a |
| 7 | motion to approve. |
| 8 | DR. ALEXANDROVICH: So moved. |
| 9 | DR. NIEMIEC: Second. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? |
| 11 | DR. NIEMIEC: Second. This is Ted |
| 12 | Niemiec. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN GARD: This is a voice vote. |
| 14 | All in favor, say aye. |
| 15 | MR. HORN: Aye. |
| 16 | MS. NELSON: Aye. |
| 17 | DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Aye. |
| 18 | MR. ETZLER: Aye. |
| 19 | MR. RULON: Aye. |
| 20 | MR. SMITH: Aye. |
| 21 | DR. NIEMIEC: Aye. |
| 22 | MS. KOZYRSKI: Aye. |
| 23 | MR. DAVIDSON: Aye. |

CHAIRMAN GARD: Aye.
Any opposed, nay.
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: The summary is approved as drafted.

Commissioner, your report, please.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Thank you,
Chairman Gard, members of the Board. Thank you for being here today.

Since March there's been quite a bit of stuff going on. First, $I$ want to report on staffing. We've been -- all state government has been focused on staffing up since the Governor's compensation study was completed in October. In January, we were at 769 employees, which was a little bit up from October, which was right around 750 .

Today we're sitting at 801 , so we have seen growth in our different programs, which is great. We have seen multiple applications for a position that we post, and those -- the people that we find are good quality candidates, and so, that's been a huge improvement as well.

And so, now we are being very diligent when we post positions to make sure, you know, with the new compensation and with our budget, that we are able to afford the different people per fund that they sit in, and then making sure we make strategic decisions on where we actually need assistance regardless of the program.

Two people in particular, one is here with me today that $I$ want to recognize, Colleen Rennaker. For those in here --

Colleen, can you stand up?
Colleen's our new Deputy Assistant Commissioner in the Office of Land Quality. She'll be overseeing our Tanks Branch. Doug Louks, who -- he's still with us, but he'll be leaving state employment on Friday. She will be taking over his duties, and she has a long background in the tanks world, and I'm real excited for her to join the senior team.

And then additionally, because of all of the new staff we're bringing in, many are very young, and -- which is great, it gives us the ability to train them up, but we need somebody to
focus on training and development, and so, we have invested in a staff training and development person. That individual, her name's Amanda Hall, she started on Monday as well.

She has a pretty high hurdle that she's working towards. There's multiple buckets that we have her focusing on. One is obviously training and development. Another is a leadership program that we can operate within the agency. Other agencies have those, but IDEM employees only get so many seats, so I want to use that for longer term. And then three, establishing a very good and thorough mentorship program, not only within programs, but across the agency, so people know each other regardless if you're in Air, Land and Water.

The next thing $I$ want to cover is the rather large EPA climate pollution reduction grant, the greenhouse grant initiative. We were one of, I think, 48 states that put our name in the hat for that. So, there's two parts to it. The first part is literally states are -- could apply, and they get up to three million dollars
to plan how to reduce greenhouse gas within the state.

And so, we did that. We are currently working through the final application process with the EPA as well as bringing on a vendor to help us do a greenhouse gas inventory, and then do outreach and communication with everybody else that may be interested in that program. The great thing about this particular grant process is: Once we get to the second pot, which is 4.6 billion in competitive grants, it's all voluntary.

So, companies, industries, governments, you name it, they can apply for these dollars to do voluntary reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that maybe they wanted to do before, but they couldn't because of cost. So, then we're able to subsidize that through these grant processes. Now, that's the bigger amount of money, that's a ways out, so we have to do about a year or so worth of the planning, but we're excited to get started there.

We are -- we're also -- we're constantly
looking at: How can we create efficiencies within the agency? One that $I$ have been particularly focused on is our cleanup programs, the State Cleanup Program and the Voluntary Remediation Program.

On average, when you are a responsible party walking into one of those programs, you're looking at between 11 and 14 years in which you will be in that program. And for a variety of reasons, some of it is IDEM processes, some of it is insurance issues, there's a whole gamut of problems.

But I've tasked our remediation team with looking at: What can we do to knock that down? How can we be more efficient? How can we move these things faster? Communities want these properties back on their tax rolls quickly. We have more sites than we have people to manage, and the people that are managing the sites are getting burned out because they have way more properties that they're managing than they can keep up with.

So, just by doing simple process
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improvements that we're going to be rolling out to the remediation community, we are able to potentially knock some of those down from 11 to 14 to four to seven years, which is a huge increase of time that we can use other places. So, we're going to be communicating that out to the remediation world in July or August and see what their thoughts are on what we're wanting to change, and then we're going to move that forward.

And then finally, $I$ was going to talk a little bit about the legislative session. There are quite a few bills that were worked on in the environmental field. One that I'm particularly proud of, and thankful for Drake Abramson, he's our Legislative Director who shepherded the bill through the session, was the ability to increase our airport fees, and we will be hearing the preliminary adoption of that rule today. That was backed by all of our industry folks, which was great. Everybody came to table and said, "IDEM needs this. We need the Air Permit Program to stay in Indiana and not be taken over by EPA."

And so, that was a major win.
There were a number of other bills that we got involved in, one that had to do with the Excess Liability Trust Fund. It allows for more compliance-based expenditures to come out of the fund. Right now we wait to spend money until there's a problem. This allows us to spend money before there's a problem, to hopefully not spend as much on problems, which includes like paying 50 percent for tank replacement or allowing some of the above-ground storage tanks, specifically in airports and bulk facilities that have access to the ELTF fund, and other things like that, trying to be proactive, because that fund balance is building and there's more that we can do with it.

There was a study bill on -- where IDEM has to do a study on wind blades, solar panels and lithium batteries, on how we dispose of those long term. So, we're going to get started on that, and then -- and there's a number of other bills, and if you guys have any questions on a particular bill that $I$ don't bring up, I'm happy
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to try and answer.
But there's also the rulemaking bill,
which $I$ know this Board took particular attention to, and many of the other agencies are paying large attention to. It's House Bill 1623. It made a number of changes. I don't think $I$ could express exactly how that's going to look and how that's going to change what we're doing now.

We're -- Nancy and our legal team and our rules team are working with the Governor's Office, they're putting on workshops to make sure that we all understand what the changes are and what they mean, and how to do rulemaking going forward. This meeting and the meeting, I think, in August we're going to be working on rules grandfathered in to continue working down the old process.

From a procedural standpoint, with regards to your activity with rulemakings, it -- it doesn't change dramatically. We get rid of our first notice, but we still basically have to do the first notice through a second notice, I guess. We still have to answer comments. The
difference is we have to have language out to the public before we can propose a rule.

And then the -- we don't have to do as
many -- I believe as many, you know, preliminary adoption versus final adoption versus whatever adoption. So -- but we'll -- next meeting, Nancy and her team are going to have a full rundown of what this means for rulemaking, how this is going to look going forward, and we'll be able to answer a lot more questions on that then.

And $I$ think that's it for me. I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Commissioner, I have
a question. I know they lifted some more regulations from wetlands, and then the administration or the Supreme Court also weighed in on that, so is it -- what protection, if any, do we have for wetlands in Indiana right now?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: So, first, there
was -- there was some language that was floating around this session on wetlands. That language did not make it through, but it was with the promise that $I$ and my team would work with the
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builders and other concerned parties throughout the summer to come up with a compromise on how we deal with some of the ambiguities around the different classes of wetlands and what falls in and what falls out, and a more streamlined process, and we've already started those conversations.

As far as federally, the Sackett case in front of the U.S. Supreme Court, it was decided that the EPA's regulation of wetlands stops at the wetland that abuts a water of the U.S., a river, lake or stream. It has to be directly next to that water, and they used language like it has to have a continuous connection, that you wouldn't be able to tell one from the other.

So, in the past, many of the wetlands -just in the past three years -- many of the wetlands in Indiana were considered federal, because you could find a significant nexus from a river, lake or stream that they would consider federal and connect that to the wetland through ditches or other streams or what have you. That's no longer the case now.

So, those wetlands that would have been protected federally a couple of months ago would now fall under the state wetland program. So, there are still protections for those wetlands. Now we're just going to see what happens this next section -- next legislative session -- on what the changes to our program will be.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you.

Do any other Commission members have any questions?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: This is Joanne.

I have one question. The greenhouse gas inventory, how broad is it going to be? Is it state government? Industry? Everything.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Everything.
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Everything.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: So, part of what
we're going to be doing is -- and we've already started the conversations -- is having -- because there's multiple agencies that have to be involved. This is much bigger than just IDEM. INDOT is going to be involved, Department of Ag's going to be involved, probably Department of

Health and other agencies that have that kind of a footprint. And then it is literally a greenhouse gas inventory of everything in your state, so it's going to be pretty in depth.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Are you going to get that done in two years?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Well, that's why we're hiring -- that why we're trying to hire a third party that specializes in doing these kind of things, because yeah -- no, if it was on us, no, we couldn't. There's no way. But we can use that money -- it's three million -- for the purposes of hiring somebody to do that.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Thank you.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Commissioners have
other questions?
MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes, Chairman.
I wonder -- you mentioned you would be rolling out some streamlining proposals for remediation to that community, and what form will that take? Is there a direct link to that community?

```
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: So, the first thing we're going to do is we -- like with any program, we have frequent customers, so we're reaching out to those guys first, the attorneys and the consultants --
MS. KOZYRSKI: Okay.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: -- that directly work with that. And then there's a larger community of consultants called MCSA that we will be working through, and I've been talking about this for a year or more, but now we're at the point in which we have something, we have meat on the bones, that we can then go and show people. MS. KOZYRSKI: Thank you. COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah. CHAIRMAN GARD: Very good. Any other questions?
``` (No response.) CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. If not, thank you, Commissioner.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GARD: We will then ask
Chris Pedersen for a rulemaking report.

MS. PEDERSEN: Thank you. I'm Chris Pedersen, in the Rules Development section of the Office of Legal Counsel.

For today's Board packet, an updated document was sent out electronically. It is provided in hard copy for the Board members participating in person. The document is the preliminarily adopted rule with IDEM's suggested changes for the definition of solid waste rulemaking. The difference between the original and the newer updated version is just formatting revisions for clarification, but we wanted to make sure that the Board acted on the correct copy, so that's the one that will be the exhibit. I just wanted to let you know that was the difference there.

Right now we are tentatively expecting the next Board meeting to be on August 9th, 2023, and at that meeting we anticipate presenting the Title \(V\) Permitting Fee Rule to you for final adoption, if it is preliminarily adopted today. And at this time, that is the only rulemaking we have on the agenda, but there's always a
possibility that another rulemaking will start moving forward, and if so, they will also come to the Board.

And that's all I have, but I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you, Chris.
Are there any questions for Chris?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you.
Today we have hearings for the following rule -- regular rule Board actions: Adoption of Title 326, CFR Updates; the preliminary adoption of Title V Permitting Fees and Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Certification; we have a final adoption of Definition of Solid Waste, and Underground Storage Tank Revisions. There will be a hearing on the nonexpiring rules in accordance with requirements of IC 13-14-9.5-1.1. And finally, we will discuss the citizens petition to determine if a hearing should be scheduled.

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 Kindrick at the
sign-in table.
The rules being considered at today's
meeting were included in 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 legal 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 and raise your right hand and state
your name?
                                    (Reporter sworn.)
            CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you.
    Moving on, this is a public hearing before
the Environmental Rules Board of the state of

Indiana concerning adoption of 326 IAC 1-1-3 and 326 IAC 20-1-1, Title 326 CFR Update.

I will now introduce Exhibit \(A\), the draft rule, into the record of the hearing.

Keelyn Walsh will present the rule.
MS. WALSH: Good afternoon, members
of the Board. I'm Keelyn Walsh, and I'm here to present LSA No. 23-29, references to the Code of Federal Regulations, for your consideration.

The reference to the Code of Federal
Regulations at 326 IAC \(1-1-3\) indicates the yearly addition of the CFR that is applicable to Federal Regulations that have being incorporated by reference throughout 326 IAC, unless a different edition is specified in the rule. The latest version of the CFR contained in 326 IAC 1-1-3 is July 1st, 2018. Since that date, several new federal regulations have been promulgated that are not reflected in the current version of 326 IAC.

Some of these regulations include the national emission standard for hazardous air pollutants for the Portland Cement Manufacturing
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Industry, emissions monitoring provisions in State implementation plans required under the Nitrogen Oxides SIP Call, Standards for Performance of New Residential Wood Heaters, New Residential Hydronic Heaters, and Forced-Air Furnaces, and Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act.

This rulemaking will incorporate citations by reference from Titles 29 and 40 of the CFR into 326 IAC. But updating the reference date to July 1st, 2022, 326 IAC will be consistent with those regulations that the Federal Government promulgated between July 1st, 2018 and June 30 th, 2022. This rule will also amend 326 IAC 20-1-1 to incorporate by reference 40 CFR 63 subpart C.

This rule was most recently amended on January 5th, 2022 with the addition of 1-bromopropane to the Clean Air Act Section \(112(b)\), the list of hazardous air pollutants. Previously, deletion of pollutants were the only changes made to the HAP list in Subpart \(C\), but the January final rule contains
```

the first addition to the HAP list of
1-bromopropane. Therefore, it's necessary to
incorporate that list into the state rules to
ensure that permits are accurately issued and
that state rules are consistent with federal
standards.
IDEM requests that the Board final adopt
this rule as presented, and myself and program
staff are available to answer any further
questions that you have.
Thanks.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any
questions for Keelyn on the rule?
(No response.)

```
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you,
Keelyn.
    MS. WALSH: Uh-huh.
    CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any speaker
cards?
    MS. KINDRICK: No, ma'am.
    CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you.
    Are there -- is there anyone that's on
remotely that cares to address the rule, the
```

proposed rule?

```
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. The hearing is concluded. The Board will now consider final adoption of 326 IAC 1-1-3 and 326 IAC 20-1-1, Title 326 CFR Update.

Is there any Board discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a motion to
be made to final adopt the rule as presented?
MS. NELSON: So moved.
MR. RULON: Ken Rulon, so moved.
MS. NELSON: Seconded, Katie Nelson.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. I'll call the roll.

Dr. Niemiec?
DR. NIEMIEC: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler?

MR. SCHULER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon?

MR. RULON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson?

MS. NELSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson?

MR. DAVIDSON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler?

MR. ETZLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski?

MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: And the Chair votes
aye. That's ten yeses and zero nays. The rule has been final adopted.

This is a preliminary hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana concerning preliminary adoption of 326 IAC 2-1.1-7, Title V Permitting Fees.

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

Seth Engdahl will present the rule.
MR. ENGDAHL: Members of the Board, good afternoon. My name is Seth Engdahl, and I am a rule writer in the Rules Development section
within IDEM's Office of Legal Counsel.
The rulemaking current under consideration is statutorily mandated and would increase the annual base fee for two permit types: Title V operating permits and federally enforceable state operating permits, or FESOP's. Specifically, the annual base fee for these permits would increase from the current fee of \(\$ 2,381\) to \(\$ 6,100\). This will result in an increase in revenue of roughly 4.3 million dollars per year to support the Title V permitting program.

For some background information on this rulemaking, the Clean Air Act requires state permitting programs to be supported by fees sufficient to cover all direct and indirect incurred costs in the development and administration of the program. Without proper funding, the management of the program would be ceded to U.S. EPA.

IDEM charges Title \(V\) sources two fees: An annual fee, and a fee based on the tonnage emitted. Over the past decade, the agency has seen a steady decline in billable emissions.

This is attributable to a myriad of factors, including coal-fire facilities transitioning to natural gas or facilities shuttering altogether.

While a reduction in overall emissions is undoubtedly a good thing for the state, it has resulted in a growing deficit, currently two to three million dollars annually for the Title \(V\) permitting program at IDEM. Accordingly, the agency works with the Indiana General Assembly and interested stakeholders to pass legislation to raise the annual base fees and allow for a more predictable income stream for the program.

This culminated in the passage of Senate Enrolled Act 155, which was signed by the Governor on April 20 th of this year. This rulemaking and the legislation mandating it are necessary to fully fund the Title \(V\) permitting program.

I would note that this is the third time IDEM has raised its Title \(V\) fees in the past 30 years, with the most recent increase in 2019. A statutory cap of one increase of 10 percent or less per five-year period remains in place;
however, this cap was bypassed by senate Enrolled Act 155 for this increase.

IDEM requests that the Board approve this rule as presented, and \(I\) am happy to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any
questions?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you, Seth.
Are there any speaker cards?
MS. KINDRICK: No, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you.
Is there anyone remotely that cares to
address the permitting fees?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. The hearing is concluded. The Board will now consider preliminary adoption of 326 IAC \(1-1.1-7\), Title V Permitting Fees.

Is there any Board discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, is there a
motion to preliminarily adopt the rules?


CHAIRMAN GARD: And the Chair votes
aye. That would be --
MR. RULON: Chairman Gard, this is
Ken Rulon. I vote yes as well, please.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Oh, I'm sorry. That
would be eleven yeses and zero nays.
This is a public hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana concerning preliminary adoption of 327 IAC 5-23, Wastewater Treatment Operator Certification.

I will now introduce Exhibit \(C\), the draft rule, into the record of the hearing.

Krystal Hackney will present the rule.
MS. HACKNEY: Good afternoon, members of the Board. My name is Krystal Hackney. I'm a rule writer in the Rules Development Section within the IDEM's Office of Legal Counsel.

I am here to present Rule No. 18-365 for Wastewater Treatment Plants and Operators. This rulemaking repeals the existing rule at 327 IAC 5-22 and replaces it with 327 IAC 5-23. This rule addresses state statutory requirements that were made in 2015 and 2018 that affect

IC 13-18-11.

These statutory changes allow electronic examination through a third-party administrator, add certification examination fees, require proof of compliance with continuing education requirements submitted with certificate renewal applications, update the renewal cycle for operator certificates from two years to three years, and adds reciprocity for certified operators from other U.S. territories applying for certification in Indiana.

The new rule reorganizes and restructures sections as wells as updating them with the following necessary changes:

Clarifications for definitions, plant classifications, qualifications and substitution qualifications, duties of an operator, passing score for certification examination, and the removal of specific allowable substitutions for education and experience to be replaced with more general criteria for allowable substitutions;

The inclusion of third-party examinations and fees independent of IDEM;

The addition of exemptions on deadlines for renewal applications and examinations for individuals impacted by U.S. deployment;

The addition of a provision requiring applicants who fail the examination three consecutive times to attend and pass an IDEM-approved technical examination preparation course that is directly related to wastewater treatment before they can take the exam again;

The clarification for new applications to include course completion documents;

Operators who have had their certifications revoked or suspended are prohibited from performing lab analysis on samples used for compliance purposes;

The addition of a limit for provisional certificates to a 90-day effect period with a maximum extension of no more than one year;

And the reclassification of certain wastewater treatment plants due to the current struggle with meeting the requirements in the existing classification system.

IDEM will present a nonrule policy
document concerning the education and experience substitutions to the Board when the final adoption hearing is held.

IDEM requests that the Board preliminarily adopt this rule as presented. Program experts and I are both available to answer any questions that you may have.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any
questions for Krystal?
MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes, I have a couple.
Can you clarify: If an individual is preparing for, say, a Class D, what's currently a Class D, will they be required to become an apprentice? Is that going to be a new requirement for ultimate certification?

MS. HACKNEY: I'm going to defer to Jason or Mark and --

MR. HOUSE: Yeah. So, Jason House, Branch Chief, Compliance and Enforcement in the Office of Water Quality. No, no. So, you can go down the pathway of becoming an apprentice on your way to becoming a certified operator, or if
you have the education and experience necessary
to become an operator, you can take the
examination for that particular classification.
Does that help?
MS. KOZYRSKI: Yeah. Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions?
MS. KOZYRSKI: No.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Any speaker cards?
MS. KINDRICK: No, ma'am.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
Anyone remotely that wants -- wants to address the rule?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: The hearing is
concluded. The Board will now consider
preliminary adoption of 327 IAC 5-23, Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Certification.

Is there any Board discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a motion to
preliminarily adopt the rules?
MR. HORN: This is Chris Horn. I
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & would so move. \\
\hline 2 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? \\
\hline 3 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Second. \\
\hline 4 & CHAIRMAN GARD: I'll call the roll. \\
\hline 5 & Dr. Niemiec? \\
\hline 6 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. \\
\hline 7 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? \\
\hline 8 & DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. \\
\hline 9 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler? \\
\hline 10 & MR. SCHULER: Yes. \\
\hline 11 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith? \\
\hline 12 & MR. SMITH: Yes. \\
\hline 13 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? \\
\hline 14 & MR. RULON: Yes. \\
\hline 15 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson? \\
\hline 16 & MS. NELSON: Yes. \\
\hline 17 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? \\
\hline 18 & MR. HORN: Yes. \\
\hline 19 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson? \\
\hline 20 & MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. \\
\hline 21 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? \\
\hline 22 & MR. ETZLER: Yes. \\
\hline 23 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: And the Chair votes aye. That's eleven yeas, zero nays. The rules have been preliminarily adopted.

Before \(I\) move on to the next one, \(I\) do have one correction. On the first vote to adopt the final rules, it was not ten to zero, it was eleven to zero.

Now, this is a public hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the state of Indiana concerning final adoption of 329 IAC 3.1-5-4, 329 IAC 3.1-5-7, and 329 IAC 3.1-6, Definition of Solid Waste.

I will now introduce Exhibit D, the rule as preliminarily adopted with IDEM's suggested changes into the record of the hearing.

Dan Watts will present the rule.
MR. WATTS: Good afternoon, members
of the Board and Chairwoman Gard. I'm Dan Watts,
of Rules Development Section, and I'm presenting LSA Document 20-23 for final adoption.

IDEM is presenting this rule for final adoption a second time because the proposed rule

1

2
3
adopted on March 8 th did not include the amendments to 329 IAC \(3.1-6-1\) and the recently effective LSA No. 22-216 final rule. If this rule is promulgated as currently adopted, it would unintentionally repeal the recently effective rule requirements.

In this proposed rule presented for final adoption, 329 IAC 3.1-6-1-1(b) (8) includes the additional Federal Register notice adopted in LSA 22-216, which became effective on March 24 th of this year. These changes are shown with underlines in the updated proposed rule sent to the Board, and no other changes to the rule language are being presented for final adoption.

This rule itself amends the hazardous waste rules in 329 IAC 6.1 [sic] with the incorporation by reference of recent updates to the federal identification of solid waste for the purposes of hazardous waste management. The rulemaking is in response to federal court vacatur of certain requirements in a 2015 federal rule for the definition of solid waste, which IDEM has previously adopted.
```

With this rulemaking, IDEM's hazardous waste rules will be consistent with the federal definition of solid waste and also comply with the state statutory change in Public Law 120-2022 pertaining to these federal requirements.
Representatives from IDEM are available to answer questions you may have for this rulemaking, and the Department regrets this error and requests that the Board adopt this rule so Indiana's hazardous waste rules can be consistent with the federal requirements.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any

```
questions for Dan?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you, Dan.
Are there any speaker cards?
MS. KINDRICK: No, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there anyone
remotely who wants to address the proposed rule?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. The hearing is
concluded. The Board will now consider final
```

adoption of 329 IAC 3.1-5-4, 329 IAC 3.1-5-7, and
329 IAC 3.1-6, Definition of Solid Waste.
Any Board discussion?
(No response.)

```
        CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Is there a
    motion to adopt IDEM's suggested changes?
        MR. DAVIDSON: So moved.
        MR. RULON: Ken Rulon, so moved.
        CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second?
        MR. DAVIDSON: Second.
        CHAIRMAN GARD: I'll call the roll.
        Dr. Niemiec?
        DR. NIEMIEC: Yes.
        CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich?
        DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes.
        CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler?
        MR. SCHULER: Yes.
        CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith?
        MR. SMITH: Yes.
            CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon?
            MR. RULON: Yes.
            CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson?
            MS. NELSON: Yes.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? \\
\hline 2 & MR. HORN: Yes. \\
\hline 3 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson? \\
\hline 4 & MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. \\
\hline 5 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? \\
\hline 6 & MR. ETZLER: Yes. \\
\hline 7 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? \\
\hline 8 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. \\
\hline 9 & CHAIRMAN GARD: And the Chair votes \\
\hline 10 & aye. That's eleven ayes, zero nays. The changes \\
\hline 11 & have been adopted. Is there a motion to final \\
\hline 12 & adopt the rules as amended? \\
\hline 13 & MR. HORN: I would so move, Chris \\
\hline 14 & Horn. \\
\hline 15 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? \\
\hline 16 & MS. NELSON: Second, Katie Nelson. \\
\hline 17 & CHAIRMAN GARD: I'll call the roll. \\
\hline 18 & Dr. Niemiec? \\
\hline 19 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. \\
\hline 20 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? \\
\hline 21 & DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. \\
\hline 22 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler? \\
\hline 23 & MR. SCHULER: Yes. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon?

MR. RULON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson?

MS. NELSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn?
MR. HORN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson?

MR. DAVIDSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler?

MR. ETZLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski?

MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GARD: And the Chair votes
aye. That's eleven yeas, zero nays. So, the rules have been -- is that -- we amended the rules. No, that was a final adoption, so eleven yeas, zero nays.

This is a public hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana concerning final adoption of 329 IAC 9,

Underground Storage Tank Revisions.

I will now introduce Exhibit \(F\), the preliminarily adopted -- with IDEM's -- as preliminarily adopted with IDEM's suggested changes into the record of the hearing.

Seth Engdahl will present the rule. MR. ENGDAHL: Members of the Board, good afternoon again. My name is Seth Engdahl, and I'm a rule writer within the Rules Development Section within IDEM's Office of Legal Counsel.

The rulemaking currently under consideration would make several changes to rules at 329 IAC 9. The overarching goal of this rulemaking is to better align rules governing the underground storage tanks, or UST's, in Indiana with the Code of Federal Regulations.

Accordingly, the bulk of this rulemaking repeals sections of 329 IAC 9 that are either more proscriptive or identical to their federal counterparts, and then incorporates the relevant sections of the Code of Federal Regulations.

I would emphasize this is not a complete repeal and incorporation by reference for rules
governing UST's. Rules such as those governing UST closure at 329 IAC \(9-6\) are staying in place because their federal counterparts are generally vague and allow states to develop state-specific rules and programs. This rulemaking primarily impacts state-specific rules governing initial response, site investigation, corrective action, reporting, record keeping, and financial responsibility.

Repealing these sections and incorporating their federal counterparts will provide the agency and UST owners and operators needed flexibility in responding to leaks, spills and overfills of UST's. This rulemaking also incorporates the contents of certain notification forms in 329 IAC 9-2-2. The incorporation of these forms was deemed essential by the Office of Management and Budget to provide predictability to UST owners and operators.

There has been one minor change to the rule language since preliminary adoption. In 329 IAC 9-2-2, there are multiple references to forms approved by the Indiana Department of

Administration. The reference to this government body was in error, as it is the Indiana Archives and Records Administration that approves forms for use by the Department. Accordingly, this erroneous reference has been corrected for final adoption.

This rulemaking was preliminarily adopted by the Board in November of last year. IDEM chose to withdraw the rulemaking from consideration at the March Board meeting to ensure that legislation pending consideration by the Indiana General Assembly would not impact the rule. Because there was no such impact, the rule now is being considered today without any substantive changes.

IDEM requests that the Board approve this rule as presented, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any
questions for Seth?
MS. KOZYRSKI: I do.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you.
MS. KOZYRSKI: Chairman, I do have a
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & question. \\
\hline 2 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes. \\
\hline 3 & MS. KOZYRSKI: With the adoption of \\
\hline 4 & these forms, will there need to be a migration? \\
\hline 5 & Is this a kind of new set of forms that is \\
\hline 6 & different than what is currently being used -- \\
\hline 7 & MR. ENGDAHL: No, it's the current -- \\
\hline 8 & MS. KOZYRSKI: -- by the \\
\hline 9 & administration? \\
\hline 10 & MR. ENGDAHL: -- forms -- yes, the \\
\hline 11 & current forms, all of the contents of the forms \\
\hline 12 & is put into rule language. OMB would like us to \\
\hline 13 & start doing that from now on so that those \\
\hline 14 & reading the rule can predict what they'll need to \\
\hline 15 & have. \\
\hline 16 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Thank you. \\
\hline 17 & MR. ENGDAHL: So -- \\
\hline 18 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions? \\
\hline 19 & (No response.) \\
\hline 20 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Any speaker cards? \\
\hline 21 & MS. KINDRICK: No, ma'am. \\
\hline 22 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Anybody remotely? \\
\hline 23 & (No response.) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. The hearing is \\
\hline 2 & concluded. The Board will now consider final \\
\hline 3 & adoption of 329 IAC 9, Underground Storage Tank \\
\hline 4 & Revision. \\
\hline 5 & Is there any Board discussion? \\
\hline 6 & (No response.) \\
\hline 7 & CHAIRMAN GARD: We need a motion to \\
\hline 8 & adopt IDEM's suggested changes. \\
\hline 9 & MR. SMITH: So moved, Chris Smith. \\
\hline 10 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? \\
\hline 11 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Second. \\
\hline 12 & CHAIRMAN GARD: I'll call the roll. \\
\hline 13 & Dr. Niemiec? \\
\hline 14 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. \\
\hline 15 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? \\
\hline 16 & DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. \\
\hline 17 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler? \\
\hline 18 & MR. SCHULER: Yes. \\
\hline 19 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith? \\
\hline 20 & MR. SMITH: Yes. \\
\hline 21 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? \\
\hline 22 & MR. RULON: Yes. \\
\hline 23 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MS. NELSON: Yes. \\
\hline 2 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? \\
\hline 3 & MR. HORN: Yes. \\
\hline 4 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson? \\
\hline 5 & MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. \\
\hline 6 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? \\
\hline 7 & MR. ETZLER: Yes. \\
\hline 8 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? \\
\hline 9 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. \\
\hline 10 & CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye. \\
\hline 11 & That's eleven yeas, zero nays. The suggested \\
\hline 12 & changes by IDEM have been adopted. Is there a \\
\hline 13 & motion to final adopt the rules as amended? \\
\hline 14 & MR. DAVIDSON: So moved. \\
\hline 15 & MS. NELSON: Second, Katie Nelson. \\
\hline 16 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there -- did I \\
\hline 17 & hear a second? \\
\hline 18 & MS. NELSON: Yes, Katie Nelson. \\
\hline 19 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. I'll call the \\
\hline 20 & roll. \\
\hline 21 & Dr. Niemiec? \\
\hline 22 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. \\
\hline 23 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. \\
\hline 2 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler? \\
\hline 3 & MR. SCHULER: Yes. \\
\hline 4 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith? \\
\hline 5 & MR. SMITH: Yes. \\
\hline 6 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? \\
\hline 7 & MR. RULON: Yes. \\
\hline 8 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson? \\
\hline 9 & MS. NELSON: Yes. \\
\hline 10 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? \\
\hline 11 & MR. HORN: Yes. \\
\hline 12 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson? \\
\hline 13 & MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. \\
\hline 14 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? \\
\hline 15 & MR. ETZLER: Yes. \\
\hline 16 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? \\
\hline 17 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. \\
\hline 18 & CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye, \\
\hline 19 & so it's eleven yeas, zero nays. The rule has \\
\hline 20 & been final adopted as amended. \\
\hline 21 & This is a public hearing before the \\
\hline 22 & Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana \\
\hline 23 & concerning the review of rules that do not expire \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
under IC 13-14-9.5-1.1. Every year IDEM is required to publish a list of rules that have been effective for seven years but not subject to expiration because they are necessary for a federally delegated program to receive or maintain federal funding.

This year, notices were published for the rule -- the air rules in Title 326 and waste rules in Title 327. A 30-day comment period was provided for each of those. No comments were received.

I will now introduce Exhibit \(F\), the list of rules in Title 326 that do not expire, and Exhibit \(G\), the list of rules in Title 327 that do not expire under IC 13-14-9.5-1.1, into the record of the hearing.

At this time, is there anyone who would like to comment on any rules listed in either notice?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any speaker cards?

MS. KINDRICK: No, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Anyone
remotely?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. If not, this
hearing is concluded. The Board must determine, based on comments received, whether it should direct the agency to open a new rulemaking for any of the rules that are listed in the notices. If the Board chooses not to ask for a rulemaking, notice [sic] must be made that no further action be taken on these rules.
```

    Is there any discussion?
    ```
                                    (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: So, the motion that \(I\) would need would be: Either no further action on listed rules, or to direct the agency to begin rulemaking on a specific listed rule. So, do I have one of those motions?

MR. RULON: Yeah, Ken Rulon. I move that we would do no further action.

DR. NIEMIEC: Second.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there -- okay.
Roll-call vote.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & Mr. -- Dr. Niemiec? \\
\hline 2 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. \\
\hline 3 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? \\
\hline 4 & DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. \\
\hline 5 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler? \\
\hline 6 & MR. SCHULER: Yes. \\
\hline 7 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith? \\
\hline 8 & MR. SMITH: Yes. \\
\hline 9 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? \\
\hline 10 & MR. RULON: Yes. \\
\hline 11 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson? \\
\hline 12 & MS. NELSON: Yes. \\
\hline 13 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? \\
\hline 14 & MR. HORN: Yes. \\
\hline 15 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson? \\
\hline 16 & MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. \\
\hline 17 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? \\
\hline 18 & MR. ETZLER: Yes. \\
\hline 19 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? \\
\hline 20 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. \\
\hline 21 & CHAIRMAN GARD: And the Chair votes \\
\hline 22 & aye. That's eleven ayes, zero nays, so we will \\
\hline 23 & have no further rulemaking on the rules that were \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
designated.
Citizen's Petition presentation. This is a petition to revise the Fugitive Dust Rules, if you all remember. Today the Board will consider the merit of the Citizen's Petition on Fugitive Dust to decide if a hearing should be scheduled to further consider an update of the existing fugitive dust regulations specifically regulated for fugitive dust created by the companies located along East 96th Street, Hazel Dell, and Gray Roads in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Nancy King will give an overview of the Citizen Petition process before the Board discussion. And some of you all remember we've gone through several of these before.

MS. KING: Thank you, Chair Gard.
As Chair Gard mentioned, we have done this, but it's been a little while since you folks have had a Citizen's Petition before you, so I will kind of briefly -- I think I sent you some information on that, but \(I\) will briefly just run through it really quickly in case you have any questions.

Under state law, Indiana Code 13-14-8-5, any person can present a written proposal to adopt, amend or repeal a rule as long as the petition meets the requirements in the statute. It must be supported by a statement of reasons and accompanied by a petition signed by at least two hundred people who support the position taken on the proposal.

We came up with our own process -- that's basically what the statute says, so over the years working with this, we came up with our own process. A citizen's petition on rulemaking is presented to the Board at a regularly scheduled Board meeting, then the Board accepts the petition, and the agency staff then can -- we, the rule folks, are the ones who verify whether it meets the requirements, if there are -- you know, there aren't duplications of names, things like that.

The statute requires that the proposal be accompanied by the petition that has to have at least two hundred signatures on it, it has to be supported by a statement of reasons, and the
proposal cannot deal with a subject matter upon which this Board has held a hearing within the previous six months of the submission of the actual proposal.

And the last requirement is that the
proposal not be plainly devoid of merit, and that was a question that some of you had, as to how we determine merit, and as \(I\) provided, just the most basic of -- there's no statutory definition for that. Therefore, when you don't have a statutory definition, you look at the most common use of that term, "merit."

And so, it is up to this Board to make the determination of whether a petition that is brought before you, if it meets the other requirements of the statute, whether it has merit to hold a hearing. That hearing would be to basically discuss what the issue is that has arisen and also whether the Board would then direct the agency to engage in rulemaking.

I think the most recent one that we had was probably the one related to the water program, which -- and that was a situation where,
again, there's not a lot in the statute, so what we came up with was sort of that work-group type process, to work on the issue itself. So, it's not just a rulemaking or nothing, you know, it's that people need the ability to be able to speak to the Board.

So, that's just a quick overview of that. We did make those determinations for this particular petition. It met the statutory requirements. And so, now it's up to you as the Board to decide how you'd like to move forward with that, but I'm happy to answer any questions you may have on the process, such as it is.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Are there any
questions for Nancy, first of all, about the process that we're going through, and second, on the proposed merit of the petition?

MR. RULON: Yes, Chairman Gard, Ken
Rulon. I have one quick question for Nancy.
Is this statutorily allowable that we would direct a specific rule to just like one specific location in the state, or does it have to be a statewide rule?

MS. KING: The statute doesn't speak to that, but generally speaking, when we are doing regulations in rulemaking, the general requirement is that those are applicable. I mean there are situations where we have specific rules that actually are about specific entities and that -- like especially in air rules, we have - you know, we have stack requirements for industries.

But in a situation like fugitive dust, where it really is -- you know, it's something that has -- it's not specific to any -- the complaint is specific to a particular area, but the concept of it in terms of how it is regulated isn't specific to a particular industry. So, there's nothing that tells you you couldn't specifically do that, but that could be problematic in terms of how it is then applied elsewhere or not applied elsewhere.

So, generally in a situation like this, where it is something of a general nature from a regulatory perspective, it would probably be the most prudent to make it something that is
relatively broadly effective.
MR. RULON: Right. And that was my concern, because if we're not going to allow gravel pits anywhere in the State of Indiana, we're not going to have any more houses built in the state. I just wanted those -- I wanted to make sure what we're talking about.

Thank you for that.
MS. KING: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN GARD: You know, Nancy,
correct me if I'm wrong on this, and this is kind of a DNR issue, but \(I\) think with the extraction of minerals, \(I\) think that that is something that if somebody's in that business and finds a location that they can extract minerals, they can do it.

MS. KING: I might have to speak with me friends at DNR on that, because we don't really deal in the mineral extraction business, so -- I mean other than to, you know, probably regulate people after the fact, so --

MR. SMITH: Madam Chair, there's a couple of avenues. Coal, oil and gas have their
own sets of statute and administrative rule. Aggregate, really the only thing the Department looks at is implications to floodway flow so they are not stockpiling materials that then adversely flood their neighbors. So, they're permitted with specific layouts to their facilities to ensure, when we have floodwaters, they flow as efficiently as possible.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Uh-huh. Okay. Thank you.

Well, you know, with this specific location, you know, \(I\) happen to drive through there fairly frequently, and the gravel pits -and it's a nuisance, I agree. I had my car washed the other day and then drove through there and, you know, my tires were all dirty. But those -- those gravel pits were there long before all of that development started there. The development started long after the gravel pits were originally there.

So, I guess I'm a little bit concerned that if we started having a hearing on this, that we're going to get into this business of having
hearings on a lot of different things just for very specific locations, and \(I\) think that can be a problem. But, you know, I'm happy for anybody to disagree with me if you want to.

I also hope all of you saw the attachment that was sent by, I think, Martin Marietta that told of how often they sweep the highway and water it down and those sorts of things.

MR. DAVIDSON: I would agree with you, and \(I\) guess a little -- slightly different, Madam Chair, that \(I\) don't want folks to feel like they don't have a place to bring a concern, but I think the failure of the local zoning -- to me, it doesn't matter who's there first. The local zoning that sometimes allows dissimilar developments to exist contributes to this type of breakdown.

Regardless of what rule could be passed or contemplated, you're left sometimes with indifferent neighbors. And so, maybe express some of these concerns back within your local community that governs some of how the development occurs within the county or within
the city.
CHAIRMAN GARD: That's -- that's
right. Well, you know, the people that developed around there knew those gravel pits were there.

Any -- any other thoughts from members of the Commission on how to deal with this?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: This is Joanne
Alexandrovich.

I do have some thoughts. I don't disagree with either you or Cal, but \(I\) spent considerable time studying this issue presented by the Petitioners, and based on my studies, I determined that the Petitioners did not present enough evidence to prove that there is indeed a problem that we can address as a Board.

But then \(I\) realized it's the Board's duty to hear testimony and new evidence that may lead us to decide whether a new rulemaking is necessary. Therefore, I concluded that the petition is not plainly devoid of merit and that it's the responsibility of this Board to hold a hearing on the issue.

So, unless there's any more discussion,

I'd like to move that we take a vote on whether this -- the petition is completely devoid of merit -- plainly devoid of merit, and hopefully, if the Board agrees with my position, schedule a hearing at our next meeting.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Did \(I\) hear a second? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, not hearing a second, the motion has failed. Does -- do I hear a motion to -- and I think, just to clarify the record, we probably need to have a motion to -to not have a hearing, that we think it's devoid of merit. Is there a motion there?

MR. RULON: Chairman Gard, Ken Rulon. I guess I would make the motion that at this time the petition is devoid of merit. Obviously let them know that if they go back and can satisfy what Joanne wants in terms of proof that it isn't without merit, you know, that there is some merit to it. But at this time, based on what she just said, we don't have any evidence that it has
merit, and so, therefore, \(I\) would move that until further evidence is brought forward, that this petition is without -- is devoid of merit.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there -- is there
a second to that motion?
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Was that a
motion? Can \(I\) comment on that?
CHAIRMAN GARD: Let's get -- let's get the second first.

Do we have a second?
MR. HORN: I would make a second on that motion, Chris Horn.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Now we're open for discussion.

Dr. Alexandrovich?
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Okay. Just to
clarify, \(I\) felt like the Petitioners did not provide enough evidence to prove that there's something we can do, but that doesn't mean we can do something or maybe we can't do something. You know, I don't know which way, and \(I\) think that trying to answer that question means that it's not devoid of merit, because we don't know what
the answer is; you know, there's nothing we can do or there's something we can do. We don't know yet until we have a hearing, until we get more evidence. Is there something we can do? That's what \(I\) meant, \(I\) think, if that makes more sense.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there -- is there
any other discussion? Anybody else?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, I think
probably we need a roll-call vote on this.
So, Dr. Niemiec?
DR. NIEMIEC: Again, what's before
us? Do you want to rephrase it? I believe I understand what it is and what my vote is going to be, but I believe what was put forward was that -- a motion to not have any further meetings about this at this time.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yeah, I think
Mr. Rulon has said that it is determined this petition is devoid of merit; is that correct? DR. NIEMIEC: Okay.

MR. RULON: Yeah, I was just -- I was
making the motion that it's devoid of merit at
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & this time. \\
\hline 2 & DR. NIEMIEC: Okay. \\
\hline 3 & MR. RULON: So, the vote would be \\
\hline 4 & that it's devoid of merit, but I'm -- \\
\hline 5 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. \\
\hline 6 & MR. RULON: -- just saying that the \\
\hline 7 & people that petitioned, if they want to bring \\
\hline 8 & evidence, we can always hear it again later. But \\
\hline 9 & right now, it's not there, so that -- so that is \\
\hline 10 & the motion, that it is currently devoid of merit. \\
\hline 11 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yeah, that's what I \\
\hline 12 & thought, and then my vote is yes. \\
\hline 13 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Dr. Niemiec? \\
\hline 14 & DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. \\
\hline 15 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? \\
\hline 16 & DR. ALEXANDROVICH: No. \\
\hline 17 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Schuler? \\
\hline 18 & MR. SCHULER: Yes. \\
\hline 19 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Smith? \\
\hline 20 & MR. SMITH: Yes. \\
\hline 21 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? \\
\hline 22 & MR. RULON: Yes. \\
\hline 23 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Nelson? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MS. NELSON: Yes. \\
\hline 2 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? \\
\hline 3 & MR. HORN: Yes. \\
\hline 4 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson? \\
\hline 5 & MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. \\
\hline 6 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? \\
\hline 7 & MR. ETZLER: Yes. \\
\hline 8 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? \\
\hline 9 & MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. \\
\hline 10 & CHAIRMAN GARD: And the Chair votes \\
\hline 11 & aye, so it's ten yeas, one nay, so at this time, \\
\hline 12 & we will not schedule a hearing on the petition. \\
\hline 13 & On Other Matters, this is an Open Forum. \\
\hline 14 & Is there anyone that wishes to address the Board \\
\hline 15 & today? \\
\hline 16 & MS. DREESEN: Hello. Can you hear \\
\hline 17 & me? \\
\hline 18 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes, I can. Just, \\
\hline 19 & you know, identify yourself, please. \\
\hline 20 & MS. DREESEN: Sure. My name is Joyce \\
\hline 21 & Dreesen. I live in the Crystal Lake area, and I \\
\hline 22 & was at the last meeting when we presented the \\
\hline 23 & petition on fugitive dust. I did have a number \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
of pieces of evidence to present at that time, but it was determined in March that we would meet again today. So, we had a bit of evidence to present in March, but we did not present it, so I'm a bit concerned that the group has decided that there is no merit when we have not presented evidence.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you. MS. DREESEN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there anyone else
that wants to address the Board today?
MR. KEMP: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Not necessarily on
this, but on anything.

MR. KEMP: On this. I'm -- my name
is Ferrell Kemp, and I sit on the Homeowners Association Board for Crystal Lake, and I just got involved in this, and what Joyce just mentioned, we have evidence, but when we -- I listened on the call last time with the Board. The Board basically said that is not the time to present the evidence, that you would then take it back and discuss it, and come back to us and let
us know whether it was devoid of merit. And now you're making a decision, and we haven't had an opportunity to present it.

Also, there's a current rule, regulation, that's out there right now that they're not abiding by, an attachment that you reviewed from Martin Marietta that we have not even seen. So, we don't know whether that was valid, invalid, accurate, not accurate.

So, I think that \(I\) would ask you to reconsider taking a look at this. I live there, and there's health concerns with how much dust in the last three or four years that these companies are generating. We're not asking them to go away. We know they were there before our residential district.

However, we're just asking to be good neighbors. What do we need to help them with or them help us with to help eliminate some of the dust? That's all we're asking. We're not asking for them to move. We're just asking for some help, and if you guys aren't going to do it, where do we go?

CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, let me make one comment. You made reference to the current rule, and, in your opinion, the current rule is not being enforced in this situation, and if that's -- if you feel that way, there's a way that you can go to the agency and ask them to look and see if in fact the rule's being abided by or if it's being violated. So, I would suggest that that group be looked at at this point.

MS. DREESEN: We have -- we have sent in concerns, and there were actually violations given out. The last inspection, I believe, was in November of 2022, and there were violations sent to some of the companies along 96th street. We have been trying to work with the Compliance Division to find out what specifically was sent to them and what the ramifications were.

We were given access to the VFC, which is the IDEM Virtual Filing Cabinet, but after trying for a couple of hours to get to the specific violation and results, we were not able to. So, we've been e-mailing back and forth with the

Office of Air Quality Compliance and Enforcement to try to get the information on the violation letters and what action has been taken, but thus far have not had any luck.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: This is --

CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, I think --

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: This is Brian

Rockensuess, Commissioner. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes, Commissioner.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah. So, we'll
make sure to get you the inspection reports and violation letters. We'll make sure that you have -- who are you working with within the agency? Is there a particular individual?

MS. DREESEN: We've been e-mailing with Kurt Graham.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Okay. We will
make sure his -- that -- my Assistant Commissioner, Deputy, and Air Quality are here right now, so we'll make sure Graham sends you those documents. I don't know if the enforcement process is over or not, but we will -- we'll-if it is, we'll send you the agreed order,
whatever penalties that went along with that, and then you can let us know what you think once you review it.

MS. DREESEN: So, is it correct -and again, we have two issues. The first issue is enforcement of current regulations, because dust is not supposed to leave the properties, and I know the companies are doing a lot to mitigate the dust, but there still is quite a bit leaving, and that's one of the reasons that we developed the petition.

And it did take quite a -- you know, we have over the 200-plus signatures, because there are definite concerns for health issues within the neighborhood. And we are very clear that the entities were here prior to development, but we are concerned. Is it correct that, based on the meeting today, we will not be able to approach you again for six months?

CHAIRMAN GARD: Nancy?
MS. KING: Hi. No, that is in fact
not the case. The six months applies to an
actual hearing, so --

MS. DREESEN: Okay.
MS. KING: -- the Citizen's Petition can be reinvigorated, and certainly it sounds like with the fact that there is additional information, that certainly might be something that would be beneficial for the Board to see. So, that six-month thing is only about a formal hearing in the statute.

CHAIRMAN GARD: So - -

MS. DREESEN: Thank you. Is there a way that we can send you the evidence prior to the meeting in August, or will we need to wait until that time?

MS. KING: You can submit that
information and we can provide it to the Board. That's generally how we do it, so we're certainly happy to provide that information. We provided the Board, I believe earlier, when this was originally brought up, with some of the compliance information that the Commissioner spoke about as well. So, yeah, I mean it's incumbent upon us to provide as much information so that people can make informed decisions on
1
these things.
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CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, you know, at this point, just having this discussion now, I think, will serve to at least help address some of the enforcement issues that you have talked about, and the fact that now you're probably going to get more information, so your petition at this point has not been totally worthless. It's started an administrative process that I think probably needs to be done, and after you get that -- all of that information, you know, if you're not satisfied and if you have additional information that you think would prove that the issue is not devoid of merit, the petition can always be amended and refiled. Just start a new petition.

MR. SMITH: Well, Madam Chair, I think it's also important, too, for the Board to understand whether it's an issue of rules actually needing to be changed or enforcement of current rules, you know, if that is the actual solution.
```

                    MS. NELSON: That's --
    ```

to address any issue?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: And \(I\) want to make clear, just -- this discussion isn't a public - an official public hearing on the issue. This is an Open Forum that we provide for anybody, whether it's virtual or in the audience, to comment on any IDEM issue.

MS. VOIVODAS: Hi. My name is Joyce
Voivodas, and \(I\) am also part of the committee for the petition, and \(I\) think you hit the nail on the head is that really the reason why really we knew that the measures, the control measures, were not being followed are the current rules.

And there's a strong list of those current measures that need to be controlled in Article \(3261(\mathrm{a})(6),(6),(5),(4)\), and it's very lengthy, and \(I\) don't know if it has been viewed, that this has been done frequently. Is it inspected frequently to see that these control measures are done?

And the second thing is this business has grown so much, tenfold in the past -- well, the
last time these rules were done was 2001, and then it's changed a lot since then. So, that's \(m y\) input on that.

CHAIRMAN GARD: So, you know, at this point, I think we're talking about an enforcement issue, which the Commissioner has addressed, that he's directed his staff to provide you the information that you have requested, and \(I\) think if the Commissioner sees that there are obvious violations, the agency can address those.

Those are administrative issues, and this Board, other than just calling the attention to it to the administration, we have -- we have no enforcement power as the Board here on this -- on enforcing rules.

Is there any comment on any other issue? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Does the
Board, anybody on the Board, have any comments on any other issue?

MR. RULON: Ken Rulon again. I just wanted to really congratulate the IDEM staff and our new director on what an exemplary job
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managing the process at the Statehouse this year, and I think somebody should say "Thank you" once in a while, so \(I\) think they deserve that.

I trust that if there's an enforcement issue, that they will jump on that. They're pretty good at that, so I just wanted to thank them for an excellent job working with the legislature this year. Very well done.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Thanks, Ken. CHAIRMAN GARD: I think you're exactly right, Ken. I'm very proud of this staff, and I'm particularly proud of the Commissioner. You all may not know that he was my Legislative Assistant for a number of years, and so, I feel like I've kind of grown up with him. So -- but I'm particularly pleased with his direction of the agency.

Is there -- are there any other closing comments from any Board Members?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, if not, the next meeting is tentatively set for August the 9th, 2023 at 1:30 in Conference Room A, and
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & we may or may not provide Zoom. That will be \\
\hline 2 & determined, and we'll let you all know about \\
\hline 3 & that. \\
\hline 4 & So, is there a motion to adjourn? \\
\hline 5 & DR. NIEMIEC: So moved. \\
\hline 6 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? \\
\hline 7 & MS. NELSON: Second, Katie Nelson. \\
\hline 8 & CHAIRMAN GARD: All in favor, say \\
\hline 9 & aye. \\
\hline 10 & MR. HORN: Aye. \\
\hline 11 & MS. NELSON: Aye. \\
\hline 12 & DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Aye. \\
\hline 13 & MR. ETZLER: Aye. \\
\hline 14 & MR. RULON: Aye. \\
\hline 15 & MR. SMITH: Aye. \\
\hline 16 & DR. NIEMIEC: Aye. \\
\hline 17 & MS. KOzYRSKI: Aye. \\
\hline 18 & MR. DAVIDSON: Aye. \\
\hline 19 & MR. SCHULER: Aye. \\
\hline 20 & CHAIRMAN GARD: Aye. \\
\hline 21 & Opposed, nay. \\
\hline 22 & (No response.) \\
\hline 23 & CHAIRMAN GARD: So, you all enjoy the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

few months of the summer. This is kind of a
great one. At least we had some rain.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah.
Thereupon, the proceedings of
June 14, 2023 were concluded
at 2:50 o'clock p.m.
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