

WWAB Meeting

1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

WYOMING WATER AND WASTE ADVISORY BOARD

RE: WWAB MEETING PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT OF WWAB MEETING PROCEEDINGS

Pursuant to notice duly given to all parties in interest, this matter came on for meeting on the 29th day of June, 2021, at the hour of 9:05 a.m., before the Wyoming Water and Waste Advisory Board.

Mr. Alan Kirkbride, Chairman, presiding, with Mr. James Cochran in attendance, and Mr. Brian Deurloo and Ms. Lorie Cahn also in attendance virtually.

MR. Matt VanWormer, Attorney for the Board appearing virtually; Ms. Jennifer Zygmunt, Acting Water Quality Administrator; Mr. Jerry Breed, Matt Buchhols, Cindi Martinez and Carol Stark, Hazardous Waste and Voluntary Remediation Program; and Ms. Gina Thompson, Water Quality Division, were also in attendance, as well as various members of the public.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (Meeting proceedings commenced

3 9:05 a.m., June 29, 2021.)

4 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Well, I would call
5 it -- call this meeting to order. And it would seem like
6 the first thing to do is to identify who's here.

7 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: I'm Alan Kirkbride,
9 chairman of the Board.

10 And to my right.

11 BOARD MEMBER COCHRAN: Jim Cochran
12 representing local government.

13 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Okay. And we can go
14 anywhere.

15 MS. STARK: Yes. I don't know if I should
16 sit down or not. I'm Carol Stark, and I will be presenting
17 the hazardous waste rules, and I'll introduce myself again
18 when we get started.

19 MS. THOMPSON: I think you all know me.
20 It's Gina Thompson with Water Quality Division. And
21 then --

22 MS. MARTINEZ: Cindi Martinez, Solid and
23 Hazardous Waste in Cheyenne.

24 MR. BREED: I'm Jerry Breed with the
25 Hazardous Waste and Voluntary Remediation Program.

1 MR. BUCHHOLZ: I'm Matt Buchholz. I'm also
2 with the Hazardous Waste Program.

3 MS. ZYGMUNT: Good morning, I'm Jennifer
4 Zygmunt. I'm the acting administrator for the Water
5 Quality Division.

6 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: And online we have?

7 BOARD MEMBER DEURLOO: Good morning. I'm
8 Brian Deurloo. Good morning. I'm Brian Deurloo. I
9 represent industry on the Water and Waste Advisory Board.

10 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: I'm Lorie Cahn. I
11 represent the public at large on the Board.

12 MS. THOMPSON: Looks like we have some
13 attorneys with us today. And the attorneys will -- we can
14 ask them to jump in if we -- if we need to.

15 Then it looks like we also have some members from
16 the public on there as well today.

17 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: All right. Okay.
18 Well, welcome to everyone.

19 Gina, anything we need to deal with before we
20 turn it over to Water Quality?

21 MS. THOMPSON: No, I don't believe so, sir.

22 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: All right. Well, why
23 don't we proceed there.

24 MS. ZYGMUNT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 Good morning. Again, my name is Jennifer Zygmunt, acting

1 administrator for the Water Quality Division.

2 First, just a couple of staffing updates so you
3 know of changes here at DEQ. I think everyone is aware
4 that Kevin Frederick, our previous administrator, retired
5 on May 4th. I stepped in as acting, and the permanent
6 position, we should know in the next couple months who will
7 get the permanent position. So, obviously, that's a big
8 transition for us. Kevin was here I think 32 years, so
9 quite a long time.

10 And then, secondly, in case you have not heard,
11 Rich Cripe our water and wastewater section manager took a
12 position in the private sector. Bill Tillman is currently
13 serving as the interim water and wastewater section
14 manager. And we also posted that position and hope to hire
15 somebody permanently in the next couple months.

16 So we plan to bring Chapter 22 before you today.
17 And I just appreciate the opportunity to give you a
18 briefing on where we're at with that chapter and why
19 there's been a change in plans.

20 Chapter 22 is our capacity development standards
21 for public water supplies. Capacity development is an
22 important part of our SRF program. Public entities using
23 drinking water SRF funds must meet capacity development
24 requirements. Our capacity development program evaluates
25 the technical, financial and managerial resources of

1 certain public water systems. And demonstration of
2 capacity development means that a public water system will
3 have adequate resources to operate that system in the long
4 term, ensure that drinking water supplies are provided to
5 their customers.

6 So Chapter 22 lists the requirements for capacity
7 development. And, again, public water supplies must meet
8 those requirements in order to apply for drinking water SRF
9 funds or permits to construct.

10 The federal America's Water Infrastructure Act of
11 2018 added federal SRF programs that required states to add
12 asset management into their capacity development
13 requirements. Asset management in brief just means that
14 public water supplies need to have a long-term plan in
15 place to ensure that they can operate the system and manage
16 their infrastructure, again, to provide in the long-term
17 drinking water supply to their customers.

18 So states are required to incorporate asset
19 management into their capacity development strategies by
20 the end of this year, December 2021. And we originally
21 felt that Chapter 22 was the place to incorporate those
22 asset management requirements. 22 is really the foundation
23 for our capacity development requirements, but we also have
24 a separate strategy planning document that was originally
25 drafted in 2000 and approved by EPA in 2000.

1 Now after further conversation with EPA Region 8,
2 we determined that the best place to incorporate these
3 asset management requirements required by the America's
4 Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 is actually going to be in
5 that capacity development strategy document and not a rule.

6 The federal requirements do not require that we
7 update Chapter 22. And incorporating those requirements
8 into the strategy document will give us the flexibility we
9 need to apply asset management requirements to all the
10 public water systems that we need to be addressing with
11 those requirements.

12 So that is our plan moving forward. The only
13 other revisions that we had proposed to Chapter 22 would
14 have been our standard Attorney General edits to streamline
15 the chapter, reduce redundancy, add clarity. But given
16 that the asset management requirements were the only
17 substantive change and the main driver for why we're
18 opening that rule, we did not feel the Attorney General
19 edits at this time were enough reason to keep the rule
20 moving forward.

21 So at this time we've pulled that chapter from
22 the rulemaking division process, and we're going to be
23 working with EPA and stakeholders to update our strategy
24 document by the end of this year. And, again, that will
25 suffice to meet the federal requirements we need to meet in

1 order to continue our SRF funding for drinking water
2 facilities.

3 So that's a briefing that I wanted to propose to
4 you today. Again, 22, we don't have any reason to revise
5 it at this point. We will meet the federal requirements
6 through our strategy document.

7 At this time we don't have anything planned for
8 third quarter, so we will look forward to seeing you
9 probably in the fourth quarter with our next rulemaking
10 package. So that's what I wanted to pass on to folks
11 today, but, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to answer any
12 questions I can.

13 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Well, I have one.

14 MS. ZYGMUNT: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: And put it in lay --
16 to put this in layman's terms, these rules as to asset
17 management is to make sure we got enough water; is that
18 right?

19 MS. ZYGMUNT: Yeah, asset -- let me -- so
20 the definition is kind of a wordy definition. But asset
21 management is more of a planning exercise to develop a
22 long-term plan to sustain the systems and services that
23 these drinking water facilities provide.

24 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Okay.

25 MS. ZYGMUNT: Ensuring that you have the

1 maintenance, ensuring you have the infrastructure,
2 inventory, your equipment, and making sure that you got a
3 plan so that, you know, 10, 20 years from now you can
4 operate and maintain the system.

5 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Okay. Very logical.
6 And I'm curious about is this the -- is this not anywhere
7 else, and has this not existed, this kind of information?

8 MS. ZYGMUNT: You know, my understanding is
9 that it's probably been inherent and kind of commonsense
10 planning for these utilities, but it was called out
11 specifically in the water infrastructure act of 2018, and
12 hence needing to put language in as -- calling that out
13 specifically as part of capacity development.

14 I don't know the full history, but I can look
15 into a better answer for you, Mr. Chairman, about what
16 existed prior to asset management.

17 MS. THOMPSON: So, Mr. Chairman, the
18 systems in -- that are subject to the rule and subject to
19 this strategy have always had to demonstrate like
20 technical, managerial and --

21 MS. ZYGMUNT: Financial.

22 MS. THOMPSON: -- financial capabilities to
23 handle their system.

24 So this actually isn't a water quality like what
25 does your water look like and how you do your water. It's

1 in addition to you want to operate a water system, do you
2 have the basic skills to make sure that that, you know --
3 that that enterprise is sustainable over the long-term.
4 And especially if you're asking the State for funds in
5 order to do an upgrade or to fix a problem, can we trust
6 that you're good with -- that you're a good manager of your
7 resources to where you'll be able to pay that loan back.

8 And I think that in Wyoming, we do not experience
9 a lot of difficulty with this. It is commonsensical. I
10 think there are regions around the country that maybe they
11 were not being managed as well, and it was burdensome to
12 the customer where, you know, I -- I just need my water and
13 my supplier cannot get their act together. And so the
14 government stepped in, like they do sometimes.

15 So it's more of a -- it's a federal initiative.
16 The rule has been in place since '99. Our strategy's been
17 in place since '99 or 2000. And it's just like a quiet
18 little engine that putters on in the background. It's
19 not -- it's not an exciting rule that we talk about a lot.
20 And this would have been our first revision to it since
21 '99. But our Division works very closely with the Office
22 of State Lands and Investments and the Water Development
23 Office, and, you know, they're kind of administering this
24 rule and implementing it, you know, on a monthly basis when
25 we meet with them to talk about loan requests for water

1 systems, so...

2 MS. ZYGMUNT: And to add to that, one thing
3 I forgot to note in my briefing is we did submit this
4 revised rule to public notice earlier this year, I believe
5 in March or April --

6 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

7 MS. ZYGMUNT: -- and we did not receive any
8 comments. As we update our strategy document, we will have
9 stakeholder input associated with updating that document.
10 We'll be reaching out to folks like the Rural Water
11 Association, probably the Wyoming Association of
12 Municipalities, to allow them time to provide input. But
13 so far we haven't had any concern from our stakeholders on
14 the proposed revisions or the new federal requirements.

15 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Good answers. Thank
16 you.

17 Does anyone else have a question relative to this
18 issue?

19 All right. Thank you.

20 MS. ZYGMUNT: Thank you very much.

21 Thanks, Gina.

22 MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: I believe we can move
24 on to Item 3.

25 MS. THOMPSON: That's right.

1 Jerry, when Jennifer moves, would you like to
2 introduce yourself and I'll work on getting your slides
3 ready.

4 MR. BREED: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
5 Board Members. Appreciate your time and the opportunity to
6 present the update to our Hazardous Waste rules and
7 regulations that are incorporation by reference that are
8 new regulations from EPA that we need to incorporate.

9 I'm Jerry Breed, Program Manager For Hazardous
10 Waste and Voluntary Remediation Program. Carol Stark,
11 she's pretty much in charge of our rulemaking and keeps us
12 up to date in working with EPA. So she'll be doing
13 presentation. Cindi's introduced herself, and Matt's
14 introduced himself.

15 And online, program manager for inspection and
16 compliance in Solid & Hazardous Waste division is Bob
17 Breuer. And since these are really rules targeted toward
18 hazardous waste generators, Bob's an expert in that. So if
19 you have -- you know, really detailed questions, he'll be
20 able to answer those.

21 And then also Matt VanWormer is our AG, and he's
22 online as well if there's some questions about how we
23 changed our rules in terms of formatting, things like that.

24 And with that, Mr. Chairman --

25 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: You may proceed.

1 MS. STARK: Wonderful. Wonderful.

2 Mr. Chairman and Board Members.

3 I -- as Jerry introduced, my name is Carol Stark.
4 I'm officially a Voluntary Remediation Project Manager, but
5 kind of unofficially the Hazardous Waste Rules Coordinator
6 for the DEQ Solid and Hazardous Waste Division. Thank you
7 for hearing our presentation on the proposed adoption of
8 the Hazardous Waste rules revisions for the great state of
9 Wyoming. I think this is -- this is usually a good thing.

10 Go to slide 2. Oh, here are slides.

11 So these are points that I'd like to be sharing
12 with you regarding the -- I'm on slide 2 -- the Hazardous
13 Waste Rules Incorporation By Reference, or IBR for short,
14 2021, and it's update 2. And the reason we're using the
15 update numbers is our --

16 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Excuse me.

17 MS. STARK: Yes, ma'am.

18 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Carol, are you sharing
19 the screen when you talk about slide 2, because we don't
20 see a shared screen.

21 MS. THOMPSON: Hold on one moment. Thanks
22 for pointing that out. I thought we were good.

23 MS. STARK: This is Ms. Cahn?

24 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

25 MS. STARK: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: And IBR is?

2 MS. STARK: Incorporation by reference.

3 MS. THOMPSON: Lorie, can you see that okay
4 now?

5 (Off-the-record discussion.)

6 MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

7 MS. STARK: Can she hear me? Because the
8 Board should have all the slides. No? Okay. Still work
9 on it.

10 MS. THOMPSON: Is it good?

11 MS. STARK: All right. Thank you,
12 Ms. Cahn.

13 So the points that we will be sharing -- I will
14 be sharing with you is kind of what we -- this is what I'm
15 going to discuss with you today, each of these points. I
16 will try not to read every line. It gets hard on the
17 PowerPoint. But I would like to go over these points, the
18 overview of the rule adoption process. That's kind of
19 lengthy. I'm not going to read all those.

20 The proposed rules, I'll have a list of them.
21 The highlights of each proposed rule with the Federal
22 Register Citations. So if you need to go look at it or
23 want to go look at it, you can.

24 Outreach. I will discuss what we have done for
25 outreach.

1 Reauthorization of the rules, approximate
2 timeline that it's going to take us to get all of our rules
3 adopted, and my contact information.

4 So we can move on to the next slide.

5 This is an overview of the hazardous waste rule
6 adoption process. I just thought I'd throw this in here to
7 let you know what we do to adopt the rules. Every year EPA
8 advises or adds rules. Two, three, or four. And they're
9 either mandatory or they're adoptional -- or they're
10 optional.

11 DEQ considers the rule applicability to Wyoming,
12 and there are many steps that are taken to revise our
13 Chapter 1 rules to adopt the federal rule, even though it's
14 incorporation by reference.

15 The additional steps include what's listed below.
16 You can see we're on item 6, which is the WWAB meeting. We
17 go all the way through to the very end in EPA review, which
18 they've reviewed this many times, so we should be pretty
19 good there.

20 And then an authorization from the EPA. And
21 before that, of course, you can see we have the governor's
22 final adoption. So we go through this process whenever we
23 adopt rules. There are -- the five rules that we're going
24 to adopt are the definition of a solid waste. And I'll go
25 over each one after this.

1 The pharmaceuticals management and amendment to
2 the nicotine P075 listing. And P075 is just the hazardous
3 waste code.

4 And then the optional rules -- and if we didn't
5 adopt these, you can see at the bottom, these rules are not
6 more stringent than the federal rulings. Wyoming's
7 adopting these rules so that our Wyoming rules are not more
8 stringent than federal rules. These are kind of an easing
9 of the rules.

10 The safe management of recalled air bags. You'll
11 hear about that. Increasing recycling by adding aerosol
12 cans to the universal waste regulations. And modernizing
13 the ignitable liquids determinations. It's a laboratory
14 method, as I'll discuss.

15 So I'll go over each one in a little more detail.
16 The definition of solid waste rule overview. The DSW rule,
17 as we call it, had earlier versions. It had versions in
18 2008, 2015 and 2018 that we did not initially adopt by
19 Wyoming, because there were uncertainties and there were
20 litigations going on.

21 And effective May 30, 2018, the final rule became
22 effective, and that included the 2015 rule with revisions.

23 So in 2018, what happened was they implemented a
24 court decision regarding the recycling of hazardous waste
25 materials, such as spent material, byproducts, sludges,

1 that when discarded would have been identified as hazardous
2 waste. And you'll hear more about that in a minute.
3 Wyoming is proposing to adopt the current DSW rule and
4 those revisions.

5 So we can go to the next slide.

6 So mainly the definition of a solid waste rule
7 affects refineries. It promotes legitimate recycling of
8 hazardous secondary materials, as I already mentioned.

9 It removes barriers to legitimate recycling. It
10 benefits businesses and the environment. It conserves
11 natural resources, saves energy and reduces hazardous
12 waste -- or waste and disposal costs. And it creates a
13 clear definition of legitimate recycling of hazardous
14 secondary materials such as reclaiming of catalysts in
15 refineries. And the Federal Register referenced there is
16 at the bottom.

17 So the DSW rule has several parts. There are
18 mandatory changes and there are optional changes. The
19 mandatory changes are -- I don't try to read them all, but
20 sham recycling, speculative accumulation. And these are
21 mandatory changes that we have to take.

22 The optional changes are DSW exclusions and
23 nonwaste determinations. And as I mentioned before, the
24 optional parts are adopted in order to be more consistent
25 and not more stringent than the federal rules.

1 So the next one is the safe management of
2 hazardous waste rules. And the rule facilitates the
3 environmentally sound disposal of recalled defective Takata
4 airbag inflators by dealerships and salvage yards.

5 And there are certain conditions that have to be
6 met by them to exempt the collection of airbag waste from
7 waste requirements but still a safe recall of the bags.

8 And unexploded recall airbags are ignitable and
9 reactive and they make discarded inflaters a hazardous
10 waste. And the explosive risk increases with storage time
11 and humidity. So you can imagine these salvage yards full
12 of Takata -- vehicles that have Takata airbags.

13 If you have more interest in them -- in this, you
14 can Google Morgan Freeman Airbag Recall, and he has really
15 good informative two-minute YouTube video where he talks
16 about the recall and why it's important. And there's a
17 link to a make and model locator, so you can find out if
18 any of your vehicles have this recalled airbag, if you
19 didn't have -- you know, people move and they don't get the
20 notices. And that way you can be notified.

21 The next rule is the Hazardous Waste
22 pharmaceuticals and nicotine rule highlight. These are the
23 highlights of that rule. This rule it creates a new rule
24 for the management of hazardous waste, pharmaceuticals by
25 healthcare facilities. It prohibits disposal of

1 pharmaceuticals down the drain. It eliminates dual
2 regulation by the drug enforcement authorities and
3 controlled pharmaceut -- as controlled pharmaceuticals. It
4 maintains the household waste exemption during take-back
5 events. You know, the take-back days where you can take
6 your old medicines to the fire department and whatnot.

7 It exempts over-the-counter nicotine replacement
8 therapies, such as patches, gums and lozenges. Those are
9 not included. And E-cigarettes, E-liquids and prescription
10 nicotine replacement therapies are not exempt from the
11 listing -- the hazardous waste listing of P075 as a
12 hazardous waste. And, again, there's a Federal Register
13 reference if you'd like to look that rule up.

14 So the next rule is the -- increasing the
15 recycling by adding the aerosol cans to the Universal Waste
16 Rule. This rule adds aerosol cans to that Universal Waste
17 Rule to allow for recycling. The Universal Waste Rule
18 exempts certain wastes from being considered hazardous
19 waste. Aerosols can account for 40 percent of the retail
20 items that are managed as hazardous waste. So that's
21 really helpful.

22 And the rule reduces the quantity of those wastes
23 going into municipal waste landfills. Not like some of the
24 other rules, there are certain stipulations they have to
25 follow, so -- to make it a part of the Universal Waste

1 Rule. And the Federal Register reference.

2 Go to the next slide. This is the last rule.

3 And it's the last rule we adopted. We almost didn't adopt
4 it because we were almost through our process and this one
5 came up. It's modernizing ignitable liquids
6 determinations. The rule is the ignitable -- just stepping
7 back. Ignitable hazardous waste is regulated to minimize
8 its opportunity to cause or contribute fires during waste
9 management activities, such as storage and disposal.

10 So what this rule does is it affects anyone who
11 conducts testing to determine the ignitability of certain
12 wastes, or uses the SW-846, which is air sampling, and
13 certain stack emission methods. It updates that rule.
14 That hasn't been updated for quite some time since 1980.
15 It revises how liquids are identified under the Resource
16 Conservation and Recovery Act, and under the Code of
17 Federal Regulations as listed there.

18 And it provides flexibility to use modern testing
19 methods. It didn't exist when they started the process in
20 1980, when they had first adopted this rule. It adds the
21 American Standard Testing Method, or ASTM, rule as an
22 alternative sampling standard for the older Pensky-Martens
23 method. So this is what we did for outreach. The
24 following industries in Wyoming were impacted by these
25 rules. And because of COVID, we had to do things

1 differently. We had planned to go up to hospitals and
2 pharmacies, you know, several, and kind of congregate and
3 have people come in or go into a DEQ office and have
4 several managers come in and meet with us. And because of
5 COVID, we were not able to do that. So what we did was we
6 came up with a series of slide shows similar to this, but
7 more focused on each rule. And for refineries, of course,
8 they're affected by the DSW rules and aerosol rules; nine
9 mines affected by the aerosol rule; eight hospitals, the
10 pharmaceutical; and ten auto dealerships for airbags and
11 the aerosol rule.

12 So we sent that out to all of these -- these
13 presentations out and there weren't any questions or
14 comments received from any of these industries. And we had
15 a public notice and that ended June 14th and there were no
16 comments received in the rule updates. So this is kind of
17 the last step. This is what we do after the governor
18 signs.

19 And to back up again. In May of 2019, we adopted
20 eight rules previously when we went to the Board in 2019.
21 And after we went through that process, it was May of 2019,
22 we -- the governor signed and we adopted Update 1. We
23 submitted to the EPA for reauthorization as a part of the
24 process. And EPA made a lot of recommended edits,
25 delegation and exception errors. There were times where we

1 didn't have to adopt a certain part of the rule because
2 they were in charge of it.

3 One example are manifests -- hazardous waste
4 manifests that came up with a user fee. And we adopted
5 their rule, but there were certain parts we don't have
6 anything to do with the charging of money to generators.
7 That's an EPA -- that's their responsibility. And so
8 because of that, those were some things that we needed to
9 remove from our rules. So we cleaned that up.

10 And then in 2020, October of 2020, we provided it
11 to the EPA and asked for their review and feedback. We got
12 some feedback. In December we did same thing with our
13 Attorney General, and they went through and made some
14 really great revisions that made things more clear and
15 reduced -- it just really helped the rules be a little more
16 clear and concise. And current revision proposes the five
17 new rules, and the -- it includes the mention -- the
18 above-mentioned EPA and AG revisions.

19 So our general timeline is we started this in
20 January, February of 2020. Public notice May of 2021.
21 We're seeing you guys now here at the end of June. Then
22 we'll be going before the EQC, the governor and submitting
23 a package hopefully, if everything goes right, by spring of
24 2022.

25 So this is my contact information. And that's --

1 that's kind of -- that's it in a nutshell. We just wanted
2 to make sure we kind of gave it -- I know we probably
3 didn't need to do it in a PowerPoint, but it just kind of
4 helps to get all that information out there. You can look
5 at it. You can understand it, hopefully.

6 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: I have a question.

7 MS. STARK: Yes, sir. Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: What happens to these
9 issues between now and spring of 2022? The airbags --
10 those uninflated airbags, et cetera?

11 MR. BREED: Mr. Chairman. Bob, can you
12 answer the question?

13 MS. THOMPSON: It looks like he's muted.

14 MR. BREED: So what happens normally when
15 they're doing a Federal Rule that comes in place and we
16 haven't adopted it yet in our rule?

17 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Yeah, that's the
18 question.

19 MR. BREED: It's still enforceable, so --
20 we can't enforce it through our rules, but EPA can enforce
21 it and come into the State. But what we normally do with
22 things like this, we just tell the generator we don't have
23 it in our rules right now, but this is what we'd like you
24 to do, because if you don't, then EPA can come in and force
25 you to comply with that rule. So there's several like

1 that. Like the lab rule we did the last rulemaking. It
2 was really beneficial to universities to be able to take
3 their lab waste. And so because that was really helpful to
4 them, we just said we'll comply with the Federal Rule, and
5 we will be good with that. So it just takes one to two
6 years put something in place to get everything through to
7 get the rule adopted, so we have to have some way to be
8 reasonable and make sense to --

9 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Good answer. Thank
10 you.

11 Other questions, comments at this time?

12 All right. What do we need to do about this?

13 MS. THOMPSON: So I -- Mr. Chairman, I
14 think if -- if we have -- if the Board has any questions on
15 the actual proposed changes to the rule, if there was
16 anything that anyone noticed they wanted to discuss
17 further, we should do that. And then it looks like there
18 are potentially folks from the public on, and we should ask
19 them if they have anything to say.

20 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Okay.

21 MR. BREUER: I think I unmuted myself. Can
22 you guys hear me in Casper? It's Bob Breuer, inspection
23 compliance.

24 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

25 MR. BREUER: Sorry. I'm unfamiliar with

1 Zoom. I just figured out how to unmute. But, yeah, I
2 agree with what Jerry has said. We've continued to inspect
3 dealerships and vehicle maintenance shops. For example,
4 none of them have exceeded the max storage. I think it's
5 200, maybe 250 airbags. Some can generate quite a few.
6 Certain large Toyota SUVs for example, I think there's as
7 many as four or five airbags to be replaced in some of
8 those. But we've continued to inspect vehicle maintenance
9 shops and haven't had a significant problem with
10 accumulation of these or not going to the right outlets.
11 So just wanted to add to Jerry's adequate response.

12 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Well, what are they --
13 vehicles that are going to the junk yards, who's
14 responsible for seeing that those airbags are out of there?

15 MR. BREUER: You know, if the airbags
16 remain in a vehicle or goes to a salvage yard, it's not
17 considered a distinct separate waste stream. It's just
18 part of the scrap metal salvage business. Granted, some
19 may go off inside the vehicle, but they go off inside
20 vehicles all the time. But they are not removed as a
21 separate waste stream -- and there's plenty that go to
22 salvage yards with the airbags still in them.

23 We have trouble with some salvage yards draining
24 the oil and antifreeze. You can imagine that we would have
25 trouble with salvage yards regarding intricate removal of

1 an airbag, you know. So they remain in the vehicle and
2 just overall regulated the same way the scrap metal or
3 vehicle as a whole.

4 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Uh-huh. Other
5 questions from the Board?

6 MS. THOMPSON: Looks like Lorie has a
7 question.

8 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Lorie.

9 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Are we going through
10 section by section on this? No?

11 MS. THOMPSON: Yes, Lorie. And which
12 version would you want to go through? The clean or the
13 strike?

14 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: I'm going to go through
15 the clean version.

16 MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

17 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Okay. The first
18 comment I have is in Section 3. Are there any comments or
19 questions before Section 3?

20 In section -- in Section 3, we're looking at
21 substitutions of terms, state terms for federal terms. And
22 the format you guys adopted, which I think is very helpful,
23 is to have what is the federal term and then have a period,
24 and then after that have the substituted state term.

25 So if we look at Roman numeral B -- or letter

1 B -- small letter B on line 61, we're missing the period.
2 So are we replacing Administrator and Regional
3 Administrator, with Director of the Wyoming Department of
4 Environmental Quality, or are we replacing just
5 administrator? So should -- with regional administrator.
6 So I'm wondering where the period belongs, because it's not
7 in there.

8 MR. BREED: Ms. Cahn, this is Jerry. I
9 think it's the Administrator and Regional Administrator.

10 Matt, if you -- do you know if that's correct or
11 not?

12 MS. THOMPSON: So there should be a period
13 instead of comma after Regional Administrator, is that what
14 you're thinking?

15 MR. BREED: Yes.

16 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Yes.

17 MR. VANWORMER: Jerry. This is Matt. I
18 agree with you. It would follow Regional Administrator.

19 MR. BREED: Okay. Thank you.

20 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Okay. The next -- next
21 comment that I have is the next page on lines 74 through
22 77, which referred to qualified professional engineer and
23 what we are replacing that with. The -- I'm not sure the
24 last sentence that says "This differs from the EPA phrase
25 'qualified Professional Engineer'" is necessary, since

1 the -- it seems redundant. The first line is "qualified
2 professional engineer." So that implies -- that says
3 that's what we're replacing. And then it says a
4 professional engineer registered in the state of Wyoming.
5 So I thought starting on line 76 that last sentence is
6 unnecessary and should be deleted.

7 MR. BREED: Thank you. I'm good with that,
8 if you are, Matt.

9 MR. VANWORMER: Yeah, Jerry, that -- that
10 seems like a good recommendation. I think we should take
11 that into consideration.

12 MR. BREED: Okay. Thank you.

13 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: And then the next
14 definition for qualified geologist or geologist, it's line
15 79 through 82, it's the same thing, the last sentence,
16 "This differs from the EPA phrase 'qualified geologist or
17 geologists.'" I believe that should be deleted as well as
18 being redundant.

19 MR. BREED: Okay. Thank you.

20 Carol, do you have something?

21 MS. STARK: Yeah, I just -- I thought that
22 the reason we did that on both of those was to -- because
23 IBR is incorporation by reference, and we're calling out
24 anywhere we're different. I thought that's why we did
25 that. I thought that sentence was to do, is call out this

1 is different from EPA's. That's all.

2 MR. BREED: That's what the -- (f) and (g),
3 when they say qualified professional engineer, that is --

4 MS. STARK: That's what that is.

5 MR. BREED: That is the difference. We
6 just don't need to repeat that that's the difference.

7 MS. STARK: Okay. I'm good.

8 MS. BREED: Sorry, Ms. Cahn.

9 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: The next comment that I
10 have is in Section 4. And for the rest of the board
11 members, please feel free to interrupt if I'm skipping over
12 some concern that you have. It's on page 1-4, line --
13 starting on line 142. And I don't believe the definition
14 DEQ is proposing of one excess cancer per million people is
15 correct, because the definition that DEQ is proposing is a
16 probability of one chance in one million of an individual
17 developing cancer. And that definition ignores the point
18 that this does not say one cancer per million people. This
19 is one excess cancer per million people. So I believe the
20 definition needs to have the word excess in there to be --
21 to be -- and indicate that it's an act of the natural
22 background risk, this (technical difficulties) --

23 THE REPORTER: I need help here.

24 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: -- resulting from
25 lifetime exposure to carcinogens. So maybe we need the

1 word beyond their background risk or something else in
2 there, because the definition is not correct from a risk
3 assessment perspective.

4 MR. BREED: Sorry. I didn't quite --

5 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Lorie, we're
6 struggling with the communication here. Your voice is
7 garbling occasionally.

8 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Oh, I'm sorry.

9 MS. THOMPSON: We apologize. The internet
10 was spotty for a moment.

11 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Okay. Shall I try
12 again?

13 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Please repeat what you
14 said.

15 MS. THOMPSON: Yeah.

16 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Okay. So the one
17 excess cancer per million people is different from one
18 cancer per million people. And your -- your follow-up
19 definition ignores the excess part of that definition. So
20 from a risk assessment perspective, your definition is not
21 correct, and so it's -- we need to be looking at an excess
22 beyond the background risk or the natural background risk
23 that you would get in a lifetime of being exposed to
24 carcinogens. So the definition that DEQ is proposing, a
25 probability of one chance in one million of an individual

1 developing cancer is ignoring that we're -- we need to look
2 at the excess of their probability of developing cancer.
3 So let's say one in -- you know, one in -- I don't know
4 what it would be -- one in a million. If some risk of
5 developing some particular cancer was one in a million, but
6 because of what something is being proposed -- something --
7 the excess cancer is directly a result of that activity
8 that's an excess of that background risk. And so somehow
9 we're missing the excess -- the above beyond -- you know,
10 beyond background risk is missing from the definition.

11 So my proposal would be -- and you guys can bring
12 it back to your risk assessors to get better wording -- but
13 I would say something like a probability of one chance in
14 one million of an individual developing a cancer beyond --
15 you know, beyond their natural background risk or beyond
16 their background risk. Something -- something to indicate
17 it's beyond what they're already, you know, exposed to.
18 This is something in excess. Does that make sense?

19 MR. BREED: Yes. Thank you. That does
20 make sense. Yeah, this has been in our rules for -- since
21 1997, I think. So it was good you catch it, because --

22 MS. STARK: Yes.

23 MR. BREED: -- we do only look above
24 background risk. We're not including background. So we
25 need that clarification. I appreciate that. Thank you.

1 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: My next comment is
2 lines 144 through 148 on the next page. And -- so I'm --
3 so it starts out with potentially exposed populations. And
4 I like the first sentence. First part of the first
5 sentence -- next sentence, which is your definition. Any
6 or all individuals potentially coming into contact with
7 contaminants of concern. And I think that's good. But the
8 rest of it I'm not sure it belongs or is necessary, and it
9 seems confusing to me. And that part is including those
10 groups within the exposed population that because of
11 specific health effects of some pollutants or factors
12 related to the population itself would experience a higher
13 risk than would the average population as a result of a
14 given level of exposure. And I would just delete all that.
15 I think it -- it muddles the definition, and it's kind of
16 not necessary and it doesn't even seem to belong there. So
17 I'll leave that open for discussion.

18 MR. BREED: Okay. What we're trying to get
19 at there is to make sure that we're identifying sensitive
20 populations. So could we -- what do you think of any or
21 all individuals, including sensitive populations,
22 potentially coming into contact with contaminants of
23 concern?

24 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Sure.

25 MR. BREED: Okay. Thank you.

1 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: The next comment I have
2 is on item (x), starting on line 151. And this is the
3 sewer system, and the definition includes -- it just says
4 pipelines, conduits, storm sewers, et cetera. And it says
5 used for collecting or conducting wastes to an ultimate
6 point for treatment or disposal. And I thought waste there
7 should be more specific. We're not talking about all
8 liquid wastes that go through pipelines and conduits.
9 We're only talking about sewage or sanitary waste, sewer
10 waste. So I thought we need some addition -- some modifier
11 before wastes. Either sanitary wastes or sewer wastes or
12 something to indicate -- we're not talking about all liquid
13 wastes here.

14 MR. BREED: I'd have to go back and look at
15 that, because a lot of sewer systems in refineries, for
16 example, are not sanitary sewers. They're wastewater sewer
17 systems that do collect other kinds of like listed
18 hazardous waste and those kind of things.

19 Bob, I don't know if you have -- Bob, maybe
20 you're on mute or -- do you have something to add?

21 MR. BREUER: I apologize for not knowing
22 this mute system. Again, this is Bob Breuer with DEQ in
23 Casper.

24 Lorie may have a point there. One suggestion
25 might be authorized waste, because a lot of large

1 municipalities, for example, Casper and I believe Cheyenne,
2 have pretreatment authorization where they can allow some
3 industrial liquid waste into their conveyance system for
4 treatment, because a lot of them lend themselves to
5 biological treatment. Especially the world-class treatment
6 they have in Casper.

7 So we can discuss this offline or -- or maybe the
8 suggestion to qualify that as authorized, in other words,
9 authorized by pretreatment authority, which in our cases
10 would be the Casper utilities and Cheyenne utility
11 authorities. That's not absolutely necessary, but I can
12 just see Lorie's point there.

13 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: And I'd be happy to go
14 over that. I think that -- you know, authorized sounds
15 good to me, but whatever you come up with addresses my
16 concern would be great. So thank you for that. Thanks.

17 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: I would like to inject
18 a Zoom tip for Mr. Breuer. If you just hold the space bar
19 down, you effectively unmute yourself. And raise it up and
20 then you're muted again. Real easy way if you're making a
21 short comment.

22 MR. BREUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
23 need all the tips I can get.

24 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 I just learned something really useful. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Lorie, I think you've
2 still got the floor, if you choose.

3 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Okay. I've got -- my
4 next comment is in Section 124 on page 1-6, line 203. The
5 term -- so we're now in the section on Applications For a
6 Permit. And item (iii) says "Upon receipt of notice that
7 the application is complete, the applicant shall:" And
8 then item (C) starts "Cause a notice to be published." And
9 could we just say published a notice rather than cause a
10 notice to be published? It just seemed a little awkward.

11 MR. BREED: Matt, are you okay with that?

12 MR. VANWORMER: Yeah, Jerry, I would agree
13 with that. I think it makes the language more streamlined
14 and would read better if it said "published a notice." I
15 agree with Board Member Cahn.

16 MR. BREED: Okay. Thank you both.

17 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: My next comment is on
18 page 1-7, lines 236 through 240. And my only question is
19 why is this in -- this couple of sentences in parentheses?
20 So I don't -- I don't disagree that the information needs
21 to be there. I'm just not used to seeing a bunch of -- a
22 couple of sentences in parentheses. So that is my
23 question.

24 MR. BREED: And I think this comes from --
25 we've run into a couple problems once in a while where

1 people don't get the notice when they think they should
2 have or we think that they should have. So as a way for
3 them -- for us to give them a little bit of time so we can
4 still accept their comments if there was a problem within
5 that 45 days of actually from when it began to when it
6 would end. So it was just -- it was for that reason.

7 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: I mean, you comply with
8 the requirements of 46 CFR 124.13, additional time shall be
9 granted under 40 CFR 124.10 to the extent that a commenter
10 who requests additional time demonstrates the need for such
11 time. And that entire thing I just read is in parentheses.
12 And I'm -- I agree that that needs to be in there. I'm
13 just questioning -- not whether it be in there or not, but
14 why is it in parentheses? I think the parentheses can be
15 removed. I think the information is important. (Technical
16 difficulties).

17 MS. STARK: Ms. Cahn, could we ask Matt
18 VanWormer, our AG, that question?

19 MR. VANWORMER: Board Member Cahn and Carol
20 and Jerry, this goes back to an older version of the rules.
21 I agree with Board Member Cahn. I don't think those
22 parentheses are adding anything useful for that language.
23 It would have the same meaning and effect if they're
24 removed. And I think it's a good cleanup edit to take the
25 parenthetical out.

1 MS. THOMPSON: One thing to note, too, as a
2 sideboard, is if you were trying to draw attention to that
3 because you had problems, you could make it a subparagraph
4 under (iii), because you have little space there and it
5 would draw your eye in. It's not a requirement, but if you
6 were trying to draw attention, that would be one way to do
7 it, and that would be compliant with the Secretary of
8 State's formatting rules.

9 MR. BREED: Okay. Thank you.

10 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: My next comment is just
11 typo. On line 1-13 -- I'm sorry, on page 1-13, line 450.
12 We have "authorized toto perform these export functions,"
13 and it should -- there's just two to's put together. So we
14 note "toto" to be changed to "to."

15 MR. BREED: Thank you.

16 MS. STARK: Thank you.

17 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: My next comment is on
18 page 1-17, lines 618 through 621. And it's items (x) and
19 (xi), romanettes. And I think we're missing -- it doesn't
20 seem to be parallel construction to all the romanettes that
21 come before, and so I'm thinking we might need to add the
22 word "within" at the beginning of both (x) and (xi).

23 So if you look back at the start of all those
24 romanettes, it's -- also (i) on line 583. "In addition to
25 the location standards of this chapter, Class II

1 facilities, as defined in Section 4(f) of these rules,
2 shall not be located in violation of the following
3 standards:" And when we get to (x), it just says "One
4 thousand feet of any perennial lake," but I think it needs
5 to state "Within one thousand feet." So we're not talking
6 about beyond 1,000 feet. And same with (xi), I think it
7 needs to be "Within 300 feet of any perennial." So I would
8 just add the word "within" in both -- beginning of line 618
9 and line 621.

10 MR. BREED: Yes. Thank you. That's a good
11 catch.

12 MS. STARK: Thank you.

13 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Sorry. Just bear with
14 me while I scroll through my markups.

15 And that's it for me. I thought you guys did an
16 excellent job and these were very clean. I really didn't
17 have that many comments, and so I thought you did a great
18 job. That's all there is for me. Thank you.

19 MR. BREED: Thank you very much.

20 MS. STARK: Thank you, Lorie -- Ms. Cahn.

21 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Does any other board
22 member have some comments here? No?

23 All right. Member of the public? Does any
24 member of the public -- would any of them like to comment
25 on anything about this rule as suggested?

1 Well, I don't hear anything. Go on. What should
2 we do?

3 MS. THOMPSON: So I think, Mr. Chairman,
4 that the -- that the Division is looking for the Board's
5 recommendation to keep on trucking through the -- through
6 the --

7 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Through the process.

8 MS. THOMPSON: So we would appreciate
9 discussion and vote of your advice to keep moving forward
10 to the Council.

11 MR. BREED: Yes. Thank you, Gina.

12 MS. THOMPSON: I'll just speak for this
13 Division I don't belong to. Sorry.

14 MR. BREED: Thank you for doing it.

15 MS. STARK: Thank you, Gina.

16 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Well, to the board,
17 what would you -- would you have more comments or would you
18 like to take action?

19 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: I would like to propose
20 a motion. And the motion would state that the Water and
21 Waste Advisory Board recommends forwarding this to EQC,
22 given the changes that we discussed today at our meeting.

23 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Is there a second?

24 BOARD MEMBER DEURLOO: I'll second that.
25 This is Brian Deurloo.

1 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Yes, sir.

2 All right. Is there discussion on this motion?

3 Let's proceed to vote. All in favor say aye.

4 BOARD MEMBER COCHRAN: Aye.

5 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Aye.

6 BOARD MEMBER DEURLOO: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: And there's no -- no
8 room for anybody against. This motion passes.

9 MR. BREED: Thank you very much.

10 MS. STARK: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Yes.

12 MS. THOMPSON: So, Mr. Chairman, the next
13 item on the agenda is just to discuss scheduling and
14 location of the next meeting. As the interim administrator
15 for Water Quality Division indicated, we are not sure that
16 we have a rule to bring to you. I think that we will --
17 Water Quality Division probably does not have a rulemaking
18 to bring to you in the third quarter, but I'm hesitant to
19 speak for the Solid Waste Program of the Solid and
20 Hazardous Waste Division, because I'm sure -- I know that
21 they're working on things. I'm just not sure what their
22 deadlines are.

23 So I think my proposal for you would be to allow
24 me to check in with them to see if they have items to bring
25 to you at the next meeting. And then if they do, we would

1 proceed with our usual Doodle Poll and scheduling. Keeping
2 in mind that the chairman had expressed an idea that it
3 would be nice to meet in person if, you know, the global
4 conditions allow that at the time. So we would be looking
5 at most likely a September meeting. And then in the
6 polling we would indicate that we would be meeting in
7 person. But if the chairman has a preference for location,
8 we can prioritize that as well.

9 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Yeah. Well, might it
10 be late September if we met?

11 MS. THOMPSON: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: What do you think,
13 folks, about -- I mean, if we're going to meet in person,
14 probably that would be better meeting to do than December,
15 right?

16 MS. THOMPSON: Probably.

17 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Not necessarily, but
18 usually.

19 MS. THOMPSON: Additionally, too, we have a
20 portable kit that we're actually strangely using today
21 because our usual infrastructure was failing when we tried
22 to start this meeting earlier. So we do have a portable
23 kit so we can make any meeting kind of a hybrid. So if
24 folks were not able to attend in person, but they could
25 attend remotely, we could still do that as well.

1 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Well, my fellow board
2 members, what about Casper in late September, if necessary?
3 Is that central enough?

4 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: I'm okay with Cheyenne,
5 but I'm a little bit confused because I thought Gina said
6 at this point there's nothing that you know of for the
7 third quarter. So this is only if the other Division
8 brings us something, otherwise, we'd be looking at fourth
9 quarter meeting, correct?

10 MS. THOMPSON: That's correct. Yes I --
11 I -- I've been discussing rulemaking timelines with the
12 other Division in the other programs, but they were waiting
13 on some feedback from EPA, and I don't know if they've got
14 that and they're prepared to come to you again, or if
15 they'll be still waiting. So I didn't want to say, yes,
16 we're definitely having a meeting, and I also didn't want
17 to give you the wrong impression that, no, we won't be
18 meeting at all and then have to change course. So I was
19 kind of hoping to kind of tentatively put it out there and
20 then kind of firm up the plan as we have more information.
21 So --

22 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: So it might be a
23 possibility that we have maybe an early fourth quarter
24 meeting if we don't have a third quarter?

25 MS. THOMPSON: I'm not sure that we would

1 make it earlier than December. November's very
2 challenging. And generally if we're -- if we're looking to
3 do something in the fourth quarter, it's because we're
4 trying to wrap up our edits, so we wouldn't necessarily
5 have something ready by October either. So I think if we
6 planned on a fourth quarter meeting, we would still be
7 doing it in December. But we would do it well in advance
8 of holiday, between that nice sweet spot between
9 Thanksgiving and when everyone starts leaving for winter
10 vacations, so...

11 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Uh-huh. When 45 other
12 things are plugged in.

13 MS. THOMPSON: Right. Yeah.

14 So I guess one thing too, we don't have to decide
15 to where you would want it, but if Casper is a preference,
16 we could definitely start looking at that once we have some
17 information from our sister division. And then I guess
18 look for emails from me in the next few weeks once we
19 figure that out. And then if we decide not to have a
20 meeting, I'll email you all to see what we can do for the
21 fourth quarter. So that's pretty much all I have for
22 today.

23 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: Okay. Gina, for me, it
24 might -- Cheyenne might work out better in case I'm out of
25 the country and it's easier to fly into Cheyenne than it

1 would be to fly into Casper. So just depending on -- when
2 we get closer to that time, I can let you know what's
3 convenient for me. Thank you.

4 MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: How about you, Brian?
6 How are you for flying into Cheyenne?

7 BOARD MEMBER DEURLOO: Well, I got a little
8 power parachute and it only goes 30 miles an hour, so it'd
9 take me a while to get from here to there.

10 Wherever. Casper. Cheyenne. Doesn't matter to
11 me. I like this teleconference, if we're still allowed to
12 do this. This is -- if you're not opposed to it,
13 Mr. Chairman. But if we're -- if I can roll in business --
14 I'll go wherever. I'm happy. I've got lots of reasons to
15 come to Cheyenne for sure.

16 MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: All right. Is that a
18 little easier on the staff?

19 MS. THOMPSON: So it's easier on the staff,
20 but it's also less costly for the staff. We're being
21 advised to be mindful of our spending still, and we're
22 working hard to do that. If we have a meeting in Cheyenne,
23 then we don't incur lodging and mileage costs. And also,
24 since two of the Board are from Laramie County, we also
25 don't incur the cost for the Board. So that can -- that

1 can help us out a little. But, again, it's based on the
2 Board's preference, and then we just work with the
3 administrators to get a final plan together, so...

4 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Uh-huh. Okay. Then
5 let's angle for Cheyenne for the next meeting, and we'll
6 wait -- we'll wait, see what the divisions have for us.

7 MS. THOMPSON: Yes. Thank you, sir.

8 BOARD MEMBER CAHN: And I would also say I
9 would second what Brian has -- you know, Board Member Brian
10 has asked for, which is the Zoom meetings. Because I think
11 particularly trying to drive in the winter across the
12 state, you know, it could be better to also have a Zoom
13 backup, in case the weather does its Wyoming thing.

14 MS. THOMPSON: Yes. I agree. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Yes. That's
16 commonsense. Okay.

17 MS. THOMPSON: Okay. So you'll have to
18 adjourn.

19 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: All right. Does
20 anybody have anything else that ought to come before this
21 meeting? Then I declare it adjourned.

22 BOARD MEMBER DEURLOO: I move we adjourn,
23 sure.

24 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: Do we need that?

25 MS. THOMPSON: I don't think so. We're

1 like loose --

2 CHAIRMAN KIRKBRIDE: It's an authoritarian
3 move here, Brian. It's adjourned.

4 (Meeting proceedings concluded
5 10:12 a.m., June 29, 2021.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, KATHY J. KENDRICK, a Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported by machine shorthand the foregoing proceedings contained herein, constituting a full, true and correct transcript.

Dated this 18th day of July, 2021.


KATHY J. KENDRICK
Registered Professional Reporter

