



| 1 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | DR. NIEMIEC: Here. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? |
| 4 | MR. HORN: Present. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 6 | (No response.) |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 8 | (No response.) |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GARD: He was there -- |
| 10 | MR. RULON: Present. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. |
| 12 | Ms. Totten? |
| 13 | (No response.) |
| 14 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: She's on there. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Is she on there? |
| 16 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Your mike's not on, |
| 18 | Ms. Totten. |
| 19 | Mr. Bortner? |
| 20 | MR. BORTNER: Here. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Brown? |
| 22 | MS. BROWN: Here. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN GARD: And I'd like to |

welcome Jaime Brown. She is new to the Commission, representing manufacturing. MS. BROWN: -- be here.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich?
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: I'm here by Zoom.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski?

MS. KOZYRSKI: Here.
CHAIRMAN GARD: I'll get this sooner or later.

> (Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Ketzenberger?
MR. KETZENBERGER: I'm here.

CHAIRMAN GARD: We're glad to see
you.

MR. KETZENBERGER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: And we have another new member, Ric Zehr.

MR. ZEHR: And I'm here.

CHAIRMAN GARD: And he represents construction. And the Chair is present, so we do have a quorum.

Our first order of business today is the approval of the summary of the June 14th, 2023

Board meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to the summary as presented?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yeah. At the
bottom of page 1 there's a typo. It says,
"air -- airport fees." It should be "air permit fees."

CHAIRMAN GARD: You're always good at this.

Do we need a motion on that?
MS. KING: We'll just make the amendment.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yeah.
DR. NIEMIEC: If there are no
other -- no other corrections -- this is Ted Niemiec -- also, $I$ believe there should be a correction in the second paragraph of the Commissioner's report. The spelling of Ms. Rennaker's name does not match what it is in her e-mail, according to what we've received. It's spelled with a first name C o l $\quad$ e $n$ in the minutes summary.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Oh, Colleen.
CHAIRMAN GARD: And it should be how?

| 1 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: $C$ o l l e e n. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. |
| 3 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: We can -- |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GARD: So noted. |
| 5 | Any other typos or anything like that? |
| 6 | (No response.) |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Is there a |
| 8 | motion to approve -- |
| 9 | DR. NIEMIEC: So approved -- |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GARD: -- as -- |
| 11 | DR. NIEMIEC: -- this is Ted Niemiec. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN GARD: -- as amended? |
| 13 | Is there a second? |
| 14 | MR. RULON: Second, Ken Rulon. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Voice vote. All in |
| 16 | favor, say aye. |
| 17 | (Board members responded, "Aye.") |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Opposed, nay. |
| 19 | (No response.) |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN GARD: The summary of the |
| 21 | minutes are approved as amended. |
| 22 | Comm. Rockensuess, your report. |
| 23 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Good afternoon, |

Chair Gard, members of the Board. Thanks for being here or on-line today. Welcome, Jaime and Ric, to the Board. Thanks for being here as well.

So, as an update from the agency, the last month and a half or so and then continuing on until later this fall, Drake Abramson, my Legislative Director, Parvonay Stover, my Chief of Staff, and $I$ have been traveling around the state meeting with legislative leaders just to talk about what issues they're seeing, providing information to them on what we do as an agency, why we do it, how we differ from EPA, what our relationship is like with EPA.

The last couple of years, just listening in and some of the issues Drake has dealt with seems to focus on things where there's confusion on where our authority lies and where EPA begins or vice-versa, or why we do things and how we do things. And so, we thought it was important to travel around the state to meet with people in their districts, to just start building relationships with some of these folks.

There has been a decent number of legislators that have turned over in the last four or five years, and so, a lot of them come in not knowing what every agency does, especially one as technical and sometimes big, at least in topics big, as we are.

So, so far we've been in New Albany -New Albany and Evansville. Our next stop is in Portage, Indiana and we're scheduling stops I know near Goshen and Fort Wayne and Terre Haute. We're going to be doing some regional ones with legislators in the donut counties as well. So, hoping the relationships start getting better and we start communicating on a better clip than we have been, because it just helps us stem off issues before they become issues that the legislature needs to deal with, which most of the time they shouldn't have to.

I mentioned last time that, you know, we've been heads down trying to figure out how we're going to implement the new rules process through House Enrolled Act 1623. Nancy and her team recently met with Office of Management and

Budget and the Governor's Office to make sure that the process in which we believe is how we can move forward is correct.

IDEM's -- or the Environmental Rules
Board's process is still different than all of the other rules boards, because we flow in and out of Title 4 and Title 13, where all other agencies are now under Title 4. So, it does create a little bit of confusion, but we have a road map set out.

Our next step is to check in with the Attorney General's Office to make sure they agree with that, because they sign off on all of our rules, so we don't want to have any rules invalidated. And then Nancy's team is working on putting together documentation and flow charts, et cetera, for the Board so everybody knows what the path forward's going to be, and we'll have a better update on that probably at our -- if we have another Board meeting this year -- at our next Board meeting.

We've been super active recently, and I
mentioned this a little bit last meeting, on the
topic of wetlands and wotus and all of that. The Sackett decision came down, which I mentioned last time, which changed the dynamics on who regulates which wetlands in each state.

And so, with that discussion, we started engaging with the Builders Association and their members and the consultants to figure out, with the isolated wetlands statutes, what's working, what's not working. Largely what's not working is the form we've been using, and there's confusion on it.

So, the first meeting went really well. Everybody was freely talking about issues, which was great, because that doesn't always happen, and then we had a subsequent meeting with a smaller team of consultants and IDEM staff, and what $I$ heard coming out of that is there's a lot of agreements on how to move that forward, which is great.

There will be some kind of legislation this next session to clarify some of these things, but $I$ think coming from it together rather than on opposite ends of the spectrum is
super helpful to move whatever we move this next session forward with hopefully low or little amount of resistance.

We are also -- on staffing, a quick update there. I guess I did mention Colleen Rennaker in the last meeting, because we're correcting her name. She is our new Deputy Assistant Commissioner.

We are also working on hiring the 15 new Drinking Water staff that we were -- we got funding for this last session, and because of the duties we're taking on from Homeland Security and some of the other changes to the Excess Liability Trust Fund statute, we'll be hiring another three people in that area.

And I don't think she mentioned this at the last Board meeting, but MaryAnn Stevens, our longtime rule writer, especially on water quality issues, retired after 47 years. She retired last Friday, and what was really cool is I mentioned it to the Governor's Office, and they quickly got me a Distinguished Hoosier to give to her because of her years of service to the state.

And then finally, part of 1623 as well has to do with anybody that collects fines or penalties or fees, anything like that, that stuff has to be in rules now, which our fees are. Our fines are not, our penalty dollars are not. Those have always been through a nonrule policy document that we've -- we haven't really changed in 25 years.

So, because of that, we are taking that policy, we will be drafting it into a rule form. I actually have to go in front of the Budget Committee to get that approved, and $I$ have to do it by the end of this year, so we will be going -- they have a meeting in October -- September, October and December, so I'll probably hit the October or December meetings.

But our penalty policy was actually used as the draft that other agencies should look at to draft their own penalty policies. It's pretty well laid out. It gives you like the maximum we can do each day, and then it puts you into a matrix on whether you're a minor/minor violator or a major/major violator, or your violation is
that way.
And so, it should -- we're not changing
anything with the policy. It hasn't had any
issues over the years, so I'm hoping the Budget
Committee will go well and we'll get that moving pretty quickly.

And that is it for my report.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there any change to the way that this Board will do business in the new spectrum?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: The -- not
necessarily how you do business. I think there's a potential change in how many hearings we have to have on particular issues. If we don't get substantive comments on a particular issue, so like the air fees, right, because that's coming up today, if we would have gotten substantive comments that were -- in which we would need to change that rule, we would have to have another hearing, which we do anyway. So, that's really not a change.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Uh-huh.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: If we don't have
to do -- if we don't have substantive comments on things, $I$ think we can do one hearing and then move it forward. So, it does potentially cut down the amount of time that the Board has to spend on a particular topic. On our end, on the agency end, there are a bunch of -- a lot of different things that we're going to have to do now; right? So, when we public notice a rule, the first notice is, "Hey, we're thinking about doing a rule. What do you think?"

We can't do that now; right? When we do, we have to have the language with it. It has to be a full rule that we're giving to the public at that time, where today we do a first notice, "Hey, what do you think? We don't have language," then we do a second notice, "Here's the language, what do you think?" And then we have a hearing.
So, it kind of cuts out that -- it
combines the first and second notice together, which is somewhat of a streamlined approach, but we also only have a year now to get a rule done.

So, we have to have, on the agency side, all of our ducks in a row before we put out a rule, because we've got to make that year time frame.

And if we don't, we have to have a date certain in which we're going to get that rule done, and because some of our rules can be contentious at times, we're going to have to do a lot of that background first before we even initiate like a first notice, like we would have in the past.

CHAIRMAN GARD: So, no more 13-year rules like we had?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: There may be 13-year rules, but you won't see them until that last -- that 12 th or $13 t h$ year. (Laughter.)

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah, no more antidegs.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Anybody else have a question for the Commissioner?

MS. KOZYRSKI: I did have a question on the Department of Homeland Security responsibilities that are transferring to IDEM.

I'm familiar with the -- with regard to reporting. Is that staying with IDHS?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: That's staying
with them. What we're taking on is: They had a program in which they licensed people that installed underground storage tanks. MS. KOZYRSKI: Oh.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: And it --
actually that whole program just fell on the Fire Marshal, who is not in the business of underground storage tanks. Now, why that got put there, who knows? But we met with Director Thacker, who was the Fire Marshal before he was Director of Homeland Security, and he started asking us questions about what we do with tanks.

And the meeting went on forever, because we wouldn't shut up about what we do with tanks, because that's what we do, and he was like, "Well, you should probably take this on." And then a legislator had a constituent issue, and then it became his idea, which was great, that this should move over to IDEM.

```
And so, that's -- it just made it -- it
```

makes it more cohesive, and then we are able to see who -- from the minute it gets installed to the minute there's an issue, what's going on in that -- in the ground, because there's been times when we have had people open up the ground to see why the tanks were leaking, and the installer literally took a pipe and bent it, put it on a paint can, and because of the corrosion over time, that was an easy place for it to fail. MS. KOZYRSKI: Yeah.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: We can hopefully stop that from happening in the future.

MS. KOZYRSKI: Thank you.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Anyone on Zoom have a question for the Commissioner?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yeah.

MR. RULON: Yeah, I do.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Oh, go ahead,
Ken.

MR. RULON: Yeah. So, Chairman Gard,

I have a quick question for Brian.
Have we had any more contact with the people in Carmel? We kind of promised them that we would stay in touch, or IDEM would, and has that still been going on like we promised them? COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah, I actually
asked this morning, $I$ met with Aaron this morning, if we had had any more communication from them. We did go out and do another inspection. We didn't find issues, and we haven't really heard back from them since we made that initial contact. So, I did ask them to reach back out and just make sure that we're not dropping the ball anywhere, that -- because we want to be responsive.

MR. RULON: Thank you. That's great to hear.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Thanks, Ken. CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.

Dr. Alexandrovich?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes, thank you.
I'm just wondering on that new rulemaking,
is there anything to encourage more public
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participation? I know sometimes -- you know, it's been a while since we've really had a lot of comments, and it's a little bit discouraging to me that the public's not involved more.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah. So, I mean now with any kind of public notice, there has to be rule language that goes into it, which, on one hand, $I$ can see why the public would maybe not want to participate if you have -- if you don't know our system and you have to comment once about what you think and then comment again, you may think, "Well, I already commented. Why do I need to comment again?" So, that might help encourage it a little bit.

All Board meetings and all across the state now have to be live streamed and we have to keep records of those, so hopefully that will drive more interest into people participating or at least paying attention to what's going on.

And really, it's -- most of the rules we do affect different industries of some kind, and we've been doing a lot of engagement with those different industry groups, so they participate
more. Because the last -- the thing I hate dealing with the most is, you know, that we're passing a rule, and we don't hear about that there's an issue with the rule from $X$ industry or $X$ population of people until after the fact, and then it becomes a legislative issue.

Well, if we would have dealt with that while we were doing the rulemaking, maybe we wouldn't be dealing with it with the legislature. It makes it easier if we do it on the front end than the back end.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: I'm a fan of
streamed hearings. You know, Ken brought it up. I wasn't going to bring it up, but you guys know me. On transport trucks, you know, that are a transporting gravel, what are the -- who enforces the rules to cover all of that, to cover the trucks?

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Like when you're driving down the road?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: DOT.
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Because it seemed

```
to be one of the complaints of those folks, and the videos we got from the companies there, you couldn't see it till the very end, and the one truck that they showed wasn't covered, and I've kind of noticed around my town that there must be something that those people don't want to cover their trucks. You would think that there could be something simple, that we could encourage them to make sure that the trucks don't leave the property without being covered. So, that was just my observation and concern.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah, we can definitely reach out to the folks at INDOT about that. I know when I'm driving down the road and there's a truck that's not covered, I quickly pass them, because \(I\) don't want the rocks hitting my windshield.
```

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Well, there must be something hard about covering the trucks, because --

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: It's not hard. DR. ALEXANDROVICH: -- more and more are not covered than are covered.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah, it's not -most of them have to have -- a certain size, they have to have the screens that go over them.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Thank you.
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Anybody else?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. We'll move on.
Chris Pedersen for Rulemaking Report.
MS. PEDERSEN: Hello. I'm Chris
Pedersen, the Rules Development Section, Office of Legal Counsel.

Before I start, I wanted to mention that it appears that Bill Etzler and Cal Davidson are both on the Zoom call now.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
MS. PEDERSEN: They weren't before, but they appear to be on there now.

We do not have a recommendation for a date for the next Board meeting, and this is in part because with our rules that are currently in process under the old rulemaking process, we just don't have anything where we can predict when

```
they're going to be ready to come to the Board
meeting.
```

And then, as the Commissioner mentioned, with the new rule process, we're still working out some details, and those rules will have to be fully developed before they can be noticed and then brought to the Board.

So, we don't have a predicted date for the next Board meeting to recommend, but as soon as we have rules that are ready, then we will be in touch with the Board and work out a schedule to have another Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.

MS. PEDERSEN: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN GARD: And --

MS. PEDERSEN: Any - -

CHAIRMAN GARD: And we don't know if this will be your last Board meeting or not -MS. PEDERSEN: No.

CHAIRMAN GARD: -- because we don't
know when we'll have another one.

Chris is retiring, too, at the end of the year, which we're going to really miss you.

MS. PEDERSEN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Any questions
for Chris, either here or Zoom?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Today we have
hearings for the following regular rule board actions: Final adoption of the Title V

Permitting Fees, Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Certification. There will be -- also be a presentation on the Nonrule Policy Document: Allowable Substitutions for Prerequisite Education and Experience, Wastewater Operator Certification.

As a reminder, if you wish to testify at 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 the Board packets and are available for public inspection at the Office of Legal Counsel, 13 th 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 of the cause please stand, raise your right hand, and state your name?
(Reporter sworn.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you.
And I might add that those of you on Zoom can also testify; you just have to hit the little thing on the screen so they know you want to speak.

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

I'll now introduce Exhibit $A$, the preliminarily adopted rule, into the record of the hearing.

Seth Ingersoll [sic] 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 currently 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. Currently, there are around eleven hundred sources in Indiana that would be impacted by this increase.

This rulemaking would increase the annual base fees for these permits from the current fee of $\$ 2,381$ to $\$ 6,100$, resulting in roughly 4.3 million dollars per year in revenue to support the Title $V$ permitting program.

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

Currently, 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. While a reduction in overall emissions is certainly beneficial, it has resulted in a growing deficit, currently two to three million dollars, for the Title $V$ permitting program at IDEM.

Accordingly, the agency worked with the Indiana General Assembly and interested stakeholders to pass legislation to raise the annual base fees to allow for a more predictable income stream for the program and prevent the program from being ceded to U.S. EPA.

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.
This is only 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 ten percent or less per five-year period remains in place; however, the cap was bypassed by senate Enrolled Act 155 for this increase.

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 from anybody here?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Anybody on Zoom?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Thank you very much.

The hearing is concluded. The Board will now consider final adoption of 326 IAC 2-1.1-7, Title $V$ Permitting Fees. Is there Board discussion?

```
(No response.)
```



| 1 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? |
| 4 | MR. HORN: Yes. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 6 | (No response.) |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 8 | (No response.) |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon, do you |
| 10 | want to vote? |
| 11 | MR. RULON: Yes. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Totten? |
| 13 | (No response.) |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Bortner? |
| 15 | MR. BORTNER: Yes. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Brown? |
| 17 | MS. BROWN: Yes. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? |
| 19 | (No response.) |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich, do |
| 21 | you want to vote? |
| 22 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? |


| 1 | MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Ketzenberger? |
| 3 | MR. KETZENBERGER: Yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye. |
| 5 | Is Mr. Davidson on? |
| 6 | (No response.) |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: I guess -- |
| 8 | DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Chairman Gard, am |
| 9 | I not on your list? Joanne Alexandrovich votes |
| 10 | yes. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN GARD: I called your name |
| 12 | and you said yes. |
| 13 | MS. TOTTEN: Same here for Emily |
| 14 | Totten with IEDC. I vote yes. |
| 15 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: I think there's |
| 16 | issues with -- |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN GARD: I called both -- all |
| 18 | of your names. Just be sure that your mike's on. |
| 19 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Did you call |
| 20 | Mr. Zehr? |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. -- oh, I'm sorry. |
| 22 | You're on this list. Mr. Zehr? |
| 23 | MR. ZEHR: Aye. |

MR. RULON: Also, Ken Rulon votes yes, Chairman Gard. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yeah, I called your
name, too.
Okay. Mr. Davidson, are you there? (No response.)

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Cal, do you want to vote? You're on mute.
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Well, I guess he's not there.

The rule is adopted twelve to zero.

This is a public hearing before the Environmental Rules Board of the State of Indiana concerning final adoption of 327 IAC 5-23, Wastewater Treatment Operator Certification.

I will now introduce Exhibit B, the rule as preliminarily adopted with IDEM's suggested changes, 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, and I am a rule writer in the Rules Development Section
within the 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 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 operators' certificates from two years to three years, and add reciprocity for certified operators from other U.S. territories applying for a certification in Indiana.

The new rule reorganizes and restructures sections as well as updating them with the necessary changes.

Changes that have been made since preliminary adoption have been indicated in the Board packet on the Rule Information Sheet. A

```
clarification was made at 327 IAC 5-23-10(b)
and (c). These subsections have the same
intention and IDEM felt that it should be worded
similarly. There have been no additional changes
made to this rulemaking since preliminary
adoption.
IDEM will present a nonrule policy document concerning the education and experience substitutions to the Board here shortly.
IDEM requests that the Board final adopt this rule as presented. Program experts and I are available to answer any questions that you may have.
Thank you.
```

CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there anyone here that wants to speak on -- or do you have a question?

MS. KOZYRSKI: Oh, I have a question on the nonrule policy document --

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
MS. KOZYRSKI: -- not on the rule itself.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Anybody there have
any questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there any -- do we have any speaker cards?

MS. KINDRICK: No, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN GARD: The hearing is concluded. The Board will now consider final adoption of 327 IAC 5-23, Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Certification. Is there any Board discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Any Board discussion? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. I need a
motion to adopt IDEM's suggested changes.
MR. KETZENBERGER: So moved.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second?
MS. KOZYRSKI: Second.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Davidson?
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: So, I just got a
text from him.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Huh?
COMM. ROCKENSUESS: I just got a text

| 1 | from him. He's dropping off. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. |
| 3 | Mr. Etzler? |
| 4 | (No response.) |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? |
| 6 | MR. ETZLER: I vote aye. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec? |
| 8 | DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? |
| 10 | MR. HORN: Yes. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 14 | MR. RULON: Yes. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Totten? |
| 16 | (No response.) |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Totten? |
| 18 | (No response.) |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. -- |
| 20 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Mr. Rulon and |
| 21 | Mr. Totten [sic]? |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 23 | MR. RULON: Yeah, Chairman Gard, the |

mike is not flipping back to you sometimes after Chris speaks, so that may be what the problem is. CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. I'm sorry.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Do you hear it
when I speak?

MR. RULON: Yes, Brian, very clearly
when you speak, yes.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.

MR. RULON: Yeah, I'm having some kind of problems and $I$ don't know what's going on, but $I$ appear to have mine set up all right, but $I$ don't know.

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: We hear you.
Others may not --

CHAIRMAN GARD: I think it was the microphone that $I$ was using is malfunctioning.

MS. TOTTEN: I think that there may be some roll-call issues. I haven't heard my name, and $I$ know Dr. Alexandrovich doesn't hear her name.

COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Can you hear - MS. TOTTEN: Perhaps it's worth going over again.

| 1 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Can you hear |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Sen. Gard now? |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Can you hear me now? |
| 4 | MR. RULON: Yes, I can. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. |
| 6 | MS. TOTTEN: Not very well. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: I'm speaking -- |
| 8 | MR. RULON: The microphone may not be |
| 9 | very close to you. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GARD: It's -- |
| 11 | (Laughter.) |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN GARD: -- unless I eat it. |
| 13 | What about this? |
| 14 | MR. RULON: Yes. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. Well, we'll go |
| 16 | with this. |
| 17 | Ms. Totten? This -- we're voting on |
| 18 | accepting IDEM's suggested changes. |
| 19 | MS. TOTTEN: Thank you. I vote yes. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Bortner? |
| 21 | MR. BORTNER: Yes. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Brown? |
| 23 | MS. BROWN: Yes. |


| 1 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? |
| 4 | MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Ketzenberger? |
| 6 | MR. KETZENBERGER: Yes. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Zehr? |
| 8 | MR. ZEHR: Yes. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye. |
| 10 | The changes are adopted, twelve to zero. |
| 11 | Is there a motion to adopt the final rule |
| 12 | as amended? |
| 13 | MR. KETZENBERGER: So moved. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Is there a second? |
| 15 | MS. KOZYRSKI: Second. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GARD: I'm calling the roll. |
| 17 | Mr. Etzler? |
| 18 | (No response.) |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Etzler? |
| 20 | MR. ETZLER: Yes. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec? |
| 22 | (No response.) |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Niemiec? |


| 1 | DR. NIEMIEC: Yes. By the way, I |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | would say the microphone fades out with each |
| 3 | person, but yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Horn? |
| 5 | MR. HORN: Yes. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 7 | (No response.) |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 9 | (No response.) |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 11 | (No response.) |
| 12 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Ken? |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 14 | MR. RULON: My mike is on. I don't |
| 15 | know what else to change on it. |
| 16 | MS. TOTtEN: We're hearing Mr. Rulon |
| 17 | on Zoom. We are not hearing the room right now. |
| 18 | MR. RULON: Okay. Thank you. |
| 19 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Mr. Rulon? |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Rulon? |
| 21 | MR. RULON: Yes. Thank you. |
| 22 | COMM. ROCKENSUESS: Okay. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Totten? |


| 1 | MS. TOTTEN: Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Bortner? |
| 3 | MR. BORTNER: Yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Brown? |
| 5 | MS. BROWN: Can I ask you to please |
| 6 | repeat what we're answering right now? Because |
| 7 | I'm not straight with the vote. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN GARD: This is a -- this is |
| 9 | the vote on the final adoption of the rule as |
| 10 | amended. |
| 11 | MS. TOTTEN: Yes. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Dr. Alexandrovich? |
| 13 | DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Yes. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Ms. Kozyrski? |
| 15 | MS. KOZYRSKI: Yes. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Ketzenberger? |
| 17 | MR. KETZENBERGER: Yes. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN GARD: Mr. Zehr? |
| 19 | MR. ZEHR: Yes. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN GARD: The Chair votes aye. |
| 21 | The rule is adopted as amended. |
| 22 | We will now have a presentation on a |
| 23 | nonrule policy document by Jason House of IDEM's |

Office of Water Quality regarding allowed substitutions for prerequisite education experience, wastewater operator certification related to the rule adopted today on Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Certification in 327 IAC 5-23.

MR. HOUSE: Good afternoon, Board
members. My name is Jason House. I'm the Branch Chief of Compliance and Enforcement in IDEM's Office of Water Quality.

I come before you today to present the Nonrule Policy Document Water-020-NPD for final adoption. So -- and thank you for doing the final adoption on our rulemaking to change operator certification. This coincides with that rulemaking to allow for substitutions for education and experience for operators to sit for an examination to become an operator in the state of Indiana.

So, the Nonrule Policy Document does set forth the circumstances where individuals applying to become an Indiana certified wastewater treatment operator who do not

```
currently possess all of the required education
and experience required by 327 IAC 5-23-9 may be
given credit for these deficits by substitution
of other qualifications that they may have.
    The Nonrule Policy Document presents
specific guidance for allowable substitutions for
each of the ten wastewater operator license
classifications.
```

    The basis for the language in the NPD was
    derived from prior guidance, case examples,
discussions with individuals from the industry,
and considerations from IDEM staff in how to
provide better avenues for new individuals to
become certified, while maintaining the
professional integrity of the certification
program.

IDEM's goal with this Nonrule Policy
Document is to be transparent, consistent, clear,
and reasonable when reviewing applications to
determine when and how to apply the substitutions
to sit for the examination.
The document was placed on public notice
from June the 6th, 2023 through July the 21 st,
2023. No public comments were received during that period.

Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have about the Nonrule Policy Document.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you.
Ms. Kozyrski?
MS. KOZYRSKI: I did -- will you be approaching any of the trade associations,

Alliance for Wastewater Treatment --
MR. HOUSE: We worked with the trade associations during the rulemaking process and during the development of the Nonrule Policy Document, so they were involved in the discussions when we were developing the substitution outlines that we have laid out in the Nonrule Policy Document.

MS. KOZYRSKI: Okay. Just -- I know you -- in the past, you've worked with MSECA on other issues related to that. I don't know if there was any rollout other than just posting this on the Web site.

MR. HOUSE: No, we worked directly
with them. They were provided the language and provided input to us as we developed the Nonrule Policy Document substitutions and experience.

MS. KOZYRSKI: Thank you.
MR. HOUSE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Any other questions? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Any questions from
Zoom people?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay.
MR. HOUSE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Thank you.
Okay. This is an Open Forum. There's one thing that $I$ want to mention before $I$ ask for anyone else. There were several questions concerning the issue that we had talked about up on 96 th Street with gravel pits. I have had a couple of quick conversations with a resident there who actually is going to be helping them, I think, with the issue and wasn't really previously involved.

And the one thing that occurred to me, and

I discussed this with Nancy the other day, that it might be -- and I think you agreed with me, and if you didn't, say so, but -MS. KING: Oh, I will. CHAIRMAN GARD: -- that we -- that we have just a one-pager that's just suggested guidelines for how you -- how people that are going to bring a petition, citizen's petition, before us, you know, what -- what they need to bring with the original petition to essentially convince us that they have an issue that's not devoid of merit, and that it might be a little bit helpful to have that -- something for them.

And Nancy, do you want to mention that? MS. KING: Yeah, we did talk about that, and I do think it's a good idea. I mean I've given -- whenever we have these, and we don't have them very often, but whenever we do, we provide those folks as well as you with what the statute says. The statute is not particularly deep in terms of what the discussion is.

You have to have a certain number of
petitioners sign off. There's no information as to what the -- the opening statement or what you -- how you explain what you're petitioning for is on there. We've tried to put together a pretty rudimentary, "This is how it works, this is what we're going to do," and we've based that on how this Board, over the years, has handled these, and they don't come by very often, but when they do, it's always sort of a different situation.

The situation we had with the various towns that are working with their long-term control planning is a good example of one that was very different from the ones that we've had in the past, where someone says, "I have a problem with this rule. It seems out of date. You're talking about something that doesn't happen anymore, so maybe we should update it." Something more concrete like that, I think, is what the statute was sort of intended for, to a certain extent, and it hasn't changed in years.

I'm not suggesting that the statute
change, but $I$ do think that basically this is
another avenue for people to be able to address the Board, and they don't -- I'm used to you guys and how we do our Board stuff, but people don't get that.

And so, I think that -- as Chair Gard said, we did talk about me putting together something or our office putting together something that explains what it is that makes sense for folks to bring when they have a petition.

Yes, we have to verify that there's enough petitioners on it in accordance with the statute, and basically what the statute requires is: If the Board hasn't had a hearing on this particular issue -- and that is not defined either -- on this issue in the last six months, then they can make a determination as to whether whatever is brought before them is -- has merit or, as the statute says, is devoid of merit.

I did get a question about sort of what that means. I tried to provide a pretty simple just one-pager to the Board members as to what the concept of "devoid of merit" can mean, and
because it is the Board's decision, as bossy as I am, $I$ can't tell you, "Well, this is what you need to do, and do it, and this is fine, and just vote on it." I could never do that.
(Laughter.)
MS. KING: But -- no laughing,
Commissioner. But $I$ do think that this is a good situation that proves that, you know, when someone sees that there's a petition out there, like the quarry folks sent information to the Board members about how they follow the rule and all of that stuff.

You know, I'm not sure the folks that were on the petitioners' side were aware of that, because it wasn't something that we sent out, it was something that they chose to get ahold of the Board members about. And on one hand, we certainly want to encourage people to talk to the Board members; that's why there are various representatives on this Board.

On the other hand, we certainly don't want you inundated with things, you know, that you don't even know -- like "I haven't gotten
anything from IDEM. Why am $I$ getting all of this stuff?" It's a fine line, but by the same token, we certainly want to be as transparent as possible, and we want the Board to have the information necessary to decide whether something is a meritorious thing, too.

And you have to look at it this way: It's only asking to have a hearing, it's not saying, "You have to adopt a rule." Again, the example of the cities and towns working with their long-term control planning, it turned out that it turned into a work group with our folks in Water that has worked out well.

So, it didn't really involve changing rules or anything, but it is the Board guiding the agency on how best to deal with an issue that someone brings up, and $I$ don't think that that has been made as clear as we can make it, and this is an example for us to learn.

I do think that, again, you know, when the Board had the discussion at our last meeting about this particular petition, I think probably the petitioners felt like, "Well, we shouldn't

1
2
3
really get into the whole thing until the Board says, 'Let's have a hearing,'" and they maybe thought, "Well, that's just what they're going to do. That's the next step. They'll say, 'The next thing we'll do is have a hearing.'"

So, I think there was a bit of confusion, you know, from their perspective on that, and $I$ do certainly feel bad that they felt that they were, you know, sort of boxed out. It was not the intent. We were just following how we've done it in the past. So, maybe something like this is something that we can clarify.

And $I$ can draft something up and $I$ can
bring it to this Board, you know, at the next meeting, or $I$ can send it out to you beforehand and just get your thoughts on it, but $I$ don't want it to be, you know, a hundred pages or anything, but $I$ want it to be helpful for people, sort of a guidance on how we see this statute and how the process works based on what we've done in the past. So, that's kind of the plan, I think. CHAIRMAN GARD: Yeah, I think that will be good, and these are so few and far
between that we have new people coming on this Board oftentimes --

MS. KING: Right.

CHAIRMAN GARD: -- between petitions, and I'm sure it would help clarify it for them as well, because the statute is a little strange.

MS. KING: Well, it happens every once in a while.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yeah.
(Laughter.)
MS. KING: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. This is an
Open Forum. Is there anyone else that would like to address the Board?

DR. ALEXANDROVICH: Chairman Gard, this is Joanne.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Yes.
DR. ALEXANDROVICH: I'm just going to throw this out there, because I've had this thought, and $I$ already brought it up earlier, after our last meeting, to help with their problem. I don't know if it will or if it won't, but it seems to me that there could be some kind
of a permit requirement, some kind of enforcement mechanism that the trucks have to be covered before they go through the weigh station, that they can't get through without covering the truck. So, that's my idea to throw out there for whoever wants to hear it.

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. That -- it would be interesting to see the reaction to that, which $I$ agree, uncovered trucks are a menace. I mean just on the highway I've been hit by stones, and I think most everybody has at one time in their driving career. So, yeah, that -- that that's one thought. Thank you.

Anybody else?

> (No response.)

CHAIRMAN GARD: Okay. If there's no other issue to come before the Board, we will be in touch with you as to the next Board meeting. It's a little up in the air right now, depending on what they have to present to us, and we don't need to just be meeting.

```
    So, with that, is there a motion to
```

adjourn?
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