```
1
               STATE OF NEW MEXICO
 2
         WATER QUALITY CONTROL COMMISSION
 3
                               ) Docket No.:
     IN THE MATTER OF TRIAD
 4
     NATIONAL SECURITY, L.L.C.'S)
 5
     NEWPORT NEWS NUCLEAR BWXT- )
                                    WOCC 24-31
     LOS ALAMOS, L.L.C.'S, AND
     THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMEN)
 6
     OF ENERGY, OFFICE OF
                                       CERTIFIED
 7
     ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT'S )
                                      TRANSCRIPT
     PETITION FOR RULEMAKING
     TO AMEND 20.6.4.900 NMAC.
 8
 9
10
        HEARING RE THE MATTER OF TRIAD
    NATIONAL SECURITY, L.L.C.'S NEWPORT NEWS
    NUCLEAR BWXT-LOS ALAMOS, L.L.C.'S, AND THE
11
    UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, OFFICE
    OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT'S PETITION FOR
12
    RULEMAKING TO AMEND 20.6.4.900 NMAC.
13
              BEFORE THE HONORABLE:
14
15
                 FELICIA L. ORTH
16
            TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2025
17
                    10:47 A.M.
18
19
    REPORTED BY:
2.0
    DAVID M. LEE, RMR, CCR,
    Certificate Number 50391
21
    New Mexico CCR Number 537
22
    Cumbre Court Reporting Services, L.L.C.
    531 Harkle Road
23
    Suite A
    Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
    (505) 984-2244
2.4
    cumbrecourt@comcast.net
25
```

1	APPEARANCES
2	FOR THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL COMMISSION
3	BRUCE THOMSON, CHAIRMAN - MEMBER-AT- LARGE
4	WILLIAM BRANCARD - MEMBER-AT-LARGE
5	
6	KEITH CANDELARIA - MEMBER-AT-LARGE
7	LARRY DOMINGUEZ, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
8	BONNIE FREY, NEW MEXICO BUREAU OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES
9	DANIELLE GILLIAM, SECRETARY OF ENVIRONMENT - INTERIM DESIGNEE
11	KRISTA McWILLIAMS - MEMBER-AT-LARGE
12	CHRISTOPHER MOANDER, NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION DESIGNEE
13	SRIKANTH PALADUGU, NEW MEXICO
14	SECRETARY OF HEALTH OR DESIGNEE
15	KIRK PATTEN, NEW MEXICO GAME AND FISH
16	TOBY VELASQUEZ, STATE PARKS DIVISION, ENERGY MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES
17	DEPARTMENT
18	EDWARD VIGIL, SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
19	KATIE ZEMLICK, VICE CHAIRWOMAN
20	NEW MEXICO STATE ENGINEER AND INTRASTATE STREAM COMMISSION
21	FELICIA L. ORTH, HEARING OFFICER
22	felicia.l.orth@gmail.com
23	
24	
25	



1	FOR THE NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT:
2	NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
3	BY: BRECKEN SCOTT, ESQ. ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL
4	PAMELA JONES PARALEGAL
5	121 Tijeras Avenue Northeast Suite 1000
6	Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102-3400 (505) 490-0681
7	(505) 383-2064 (Facsimile) brecken.scott@env.nm.gov
8	pamela.jones@env.nm.gov
9	FOR PETITIONER NEWPORT NEWS NUCLEAR BWXT-LOS ALAMOS, L.L.C.
10	SPENCER FANE, L.L.P.
11	BY: KARI E. OLSON, ESQ. LOUIS ROSE, ESQ.
12	Post Office Box 2307 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2307
13	(505) 986-2686 (505) 982-4289 (Facsimile)
14	kolson@spencerfane.com lrose@spencerfane.com
15	NEWPORT NEWS NUCLEAR BWXT LOS ALAMOS
16	L.L.C.: BY: SILAS RUSSELL DEROMA, ESQ.
17	137 El Gancho Street Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544-2416
18	(505) 538-5800 srderoma@gmail.com
19	FOR PETITIONER TRIAD NATIONAL SECURITY,
20	L.L.C.:
21	LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL-ESH
22	BY: MOREEN C. DOLAN, ESQ. MAXINE MARTIN MCREYNOLDS, ESQ.
23	Post Office Box 1663 Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545-0001
24	(505) 487-3640 dolan@lanl.gov
25	mmcreynolds@lanl.gov



1	FOR UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, LOS
2	ALAMOS FIELD OFFICE:
3	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
4	LOS ALAMOS FIELD OFFICE BY: JOHN H. EVANS, ESQ.
5	ROBERT REINE, ESQ. Post Office Box 1663
6	Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545-0001 (505) 487-3640
7	john.h.evans@em.doe.gov robert.reine@em.doe.gov
8	NICHOLAS MAXWELL, PRO SE
9	inspector@sunshineaudit.com
10	FOR THE NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (NMDOJ):
11	NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
12	BY: REBECCA GUAY, ESQ. 408 Galisteo Street
13	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 (505) 303-1790
14	(505) 318-1007 (Facsimile) rguay@nmdoj.gov
15	ALSO PRESENT: LISA O'GRADY
16	INTERPRETER
17	DINORAH GUTIERREZ INTERPRETER
18	AMELIA CARDEÑA
19	INTERPRETER
20	
21	
22	
23	
25	
د ک	



1	INDEX	
2	EXAMINATION	PAGE
3	AMANDA B. WHITE, PH.D.	
4	Examination By Ms. Olson	37
5	Examination By Chairman Thomson	59
6	Examination By Commissioner Velasquez	59
7	Examination By Commissioner Brancard	61
8	Examination By Commissioner Frey	70
9	BARRY FULTON	
10	Examination By Ms. Olson	75
11	Examination By Commissioner Brancard	119
12	Examination By Chairman Thomson	125
13	Examination By Commissioner Dominguez	133
14	Examination By Vice Chairwoman Zemlick	138
15	Examination By Commissioner Frey	140
16	Examination By Commissioner Harms	146
17	Further Examination By Chairman Thomson	153
18	Further Examination By Commissioner	155
19	Frey	
20	MICHAEL G. BACA	
21	Direct Examination By Mr. Scott	158
22	Examination By Chairman Thomson	185
23	Examination By Commissioner Frey	187
24	SHELLY LEMON	
25	Direct Examination By Mr. Scott	209

1	Examination	n By Commissioner Brancard	216
2	Examination	n By Commissioner Frey	227
3			
4			
5		EXHIBITS	
6	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
7		MS. MAUREEN DOLAN OFFERS OPENING STATEMENT	16
8		MS. BRECKEN SCOTT OFFERS	20
9		OPENING STATEMENT	20
10		MS. KARI OLSON OFFERS OPENING STATEMENT	27
11	N3B	Document Bearing Title,	39
12		"Direct Testimony of Amanda B. White on Behalf	
13		of Triad National Security, L.L.C., Newport	
14		News Nuclear BWXT-Los Alamos, L.L.C., and the	
15		U.S. Department of Energy, Office of	
16		Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office,"	
17		in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R), Dated December 20, 2024	
18		(Petitioners'_0416 - Petitioners'_0431) (16	
19		Pages)	
20	N3B Exhibit 5	Document Depicting Resumé of Amanda B. White, PH.D.,	40
21	EXIIIDIC 3	in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R)	
22		(Petitioners'_0451 - Petitioners'_0454) (4	
23	M2D	Pages)	41
24	N3B Exhibit 2	Document Depicting Proposed Rulemaking Re Title 20: Environmental	41
25		Protection; Chapter 6:	

1		Water Quality; Part 4:	
2		Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface	
3		Waters, in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (Petitioners'_	
4		0358 - Petitioners'_0415) (58 Pages)	
5	N3B Exhibit 7	Document Bearing Title, "Public Meeting and	42
6		Public Comment Period Copper Water Quality	
7		Criteria for Pajarito Plateau; Public Meeting:	
8		September 26, 2023," in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R)	
9		(Petitioners'_0464) (1 Page)	
10	N3B	Document Depicting	43
11	Exhibit 8	Correspondence to Communities for Clean	
12		Water from N3B Los Alamos Dated January 22, 2024,	
13		"Subject: Enclosed is the Updated Copper	
14		Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria for the	
15		Pajarito Plateau: Demonstration Report,	
16		Dated November 20, 2023, and the Response to the	
17		Communities for Clean Water Comments on N3B's	
18		Draft Copper Criteria for the Pajarito Plateau	
19		Report, Dated November 9, 2023 Re Title 20:	
20		Environmental Protection; Chapter 6: Water	
21		Quality; Part 4: Standards for Interstate	
22		and Intrastate Surface Waters, in Re WQCC No.	
23		21-31(R) (Petitioners' _0465 Petitioners'_0471)	
24		(7 Pages)	
25			

1	N3B	Document Bearing Title,	77
2	Exhibit 4	"Direct Testimony of Barry Fulton, Benchmark	
3		Environmental, L.L.C., on Behalf of Triad National	
4		Security, L.L.C., Newport News Nuclear BWXT-Los	
5		Alamos, L.L.C., and the U.S. Department of	
6		Energy, Office of Environmental Management	
7		Los Alamos Field Office," in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R),	
8		Dated December 20, 2024 (Petitioners'_0432 -	
9		Petitioners'_0450) (19 Pages)	
10	N3B	Document Depicting Resumé	78
11	Exhibit 6	of Barry Fulton, in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R)	
12		(Petitioners'_0455 - Petitioners'_0463) (9	
13		Pages)	
14	N3B Exhibit 1	Document Bearing Title, "Copper Site-Specific	79
15		Water Quality Criteria for the Pajarito Plateau:	
16		Demonstration Report; Prepared For Newport News	
17		Nuclear BWXT-Los Alamos, 1200 Trinity Drive, Suite	
18		150, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544," Dated November	
19		20, 2023, in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (Petitioners'	
20		_0001 - Petitioners'_0357) (357 Pages)	
21	N3B	Document Bearing Title,	80
22	Exhibit 9	"Draft Work Plan: Development of Site-	
23		Specific Copper Criteria For Surface Waters of the	
24		Pajarito Plateau New Mexico; Prepared For: N3B	
25		Los Alamos, Dated July 6, 2020, in Re WQCC No. 21-31	

1		(R) (Petitioners'_0472 - Petitioners' 0496) (25	
2		Pages)	
3	NMED Exhibit 10	Document Bearing Title, "EPA Aquatic Life Ambient	80
4		Freshwater Quality Criteria - Copper, 2007	
5		Revision, " in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (Petitioners'	
6		_0497 - Petitioners'_0700) (204 Pages)	
7	NMED	Document Bearing Title,	81
8		"EPA 1995 Updates: Water Quality Criteria Documents	01
9		for the Protection of Aquatic Life in Ambient	
10		Water," in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (Petitioners'	
11		_0701 - Petitioners'_0814) (114 Pages)	
12	NMED	Document Bearing Title,	83
13		"Direct Technical Testimony of Kris Barrios," in Re	
14		WQCC No. 21-31(R) (Petitioners'_0815 -	
15		Petitioners'_0832) (18 Pages)	
16	NMED	_	83
17		Document Bearing Correspondence from United States Environmental	
18		Protection Agency to Georgia Department of	
19		Natural Resources Dated August 16, 2016, in Re	
20		WQCC No. 21-31(R) (Petitioners'_0833 -	
21		Petitioners'_0856) (24 Pages)	
22	NIN (III TO	_	0.4
23	NMED Exhibit 14	Document Bearing Title, "Data-Quality Objectives	84
24		and Data Quality Assessment Application of the Biotic	. •
25		Ligand Model to Generate Water Quality Criteria for	

1		Four Metals in Surface
2		Waters of the Pajarito Plateau, New Mexico;
3		Prepared For: Los Alamos National Security, Dated
4		April 27, 2018, in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (Petitioners'
5		_0857 - Petitioners'_0943) (87 Pages)
6	NMED	Document Depicting Resumé 160 of Michael G. Baca, in Re
7	EXIIIDIC 2	WQCC No. 21-31(R) (2 Pages)
8	NMED	Document Bearing Title, 162 "Direct Technical
9	EXIIDIC	Testimony of Michael Baca, " in Re WQCC No. 21-31
10		(R) (12 Pages)
11	NMED Exhibit 5	Document Bearing Title, 163 "EPA 1995 Updates: Water
12	EXIIIDIC 3	Quality Criteria Documents for the Protection of
13		Aquatic Life in Ambient Water, " in Re WQCC No.
14		21-31(R) (15 Pages)
15	NMED Exhibit 6	Document Bearing Title, 164 "EPA Aquatic Life Ambient
16	EXIIDIC	Freshwater Quality Criteria - Copper, 2007 Revision,"
17		in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (2 Pages)
18	NMED	Document Bearing Title, 165
19		"EPA Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria
20		- Copper, 2007 Revision," in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R)
21		(204 Pages)
22	NMED Exhibit 8	Document Bearing Title, 166
23	EXIIIDIC 0	"Metals Cooperative Research and Development
24		Agreement (CRADA) Phase I Report: Development of an
25		Overarching Bioavailability Modeling Approach to



1		Support US EPA's Aquatic Life Water Quality	
2		Criteria for Metals," Dated March 2022," in Re	
3		WQCC No. 21-31(R) (44 Pages)	
4	NMED	Document Bearing Title,	167
5		"WQCC 24-31 NMED Provide to the Public Documentation	
6		in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (13 Pages)	•
7	NMED	Document Bearing Title,	168
8		"WQCC 24-31 NMED Public Notice Documentation" in	100
9		Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (6 Pages)	
10	NMED	Document Bearing Title,	168
11	Exhibit 11	"Affidavit of Publication,' Dated October 9, 2024, in	
12		Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (3 Pages)	
13	NMED	Document Bearing Title,	169
14		"Water Quality Control Commission Public Notice:	109
15		Notice of Rescheduled Public Hearing For Proposed	a l
16		site-specific Copper Criteria For Stream	
17		Segments on the Pajarito Plateau, "Issued by Pamela	
18		Jones, WQCC Administrator, in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R)	
19		(6 Pages)	
20	NMED Exhibit 13	Document Bearing Title, "New Mexico Register /	170
21	EATITIOT (13	Volume XXXV, Issue 20 / October 22, 2024 Water	
22		Quality Control Commission Public Notice: Notice of	
23		Rescheduled Public Hearing	
24		For Proposed Site-Specific Copper Criteria For Stream	
25		Segments on the Pajarito Plateau," Issued By Pamela	

1		
1		Jones, WQCC Administrator, In Re WQCC No. 21-31(R)
2		(4 Pages)
3	NMED Exhibit 14	Document Bearing Title, 171 "State of New Mexico,
4		County of Los Alamos, Affidavit of Publication"
5		by Classified Representative Kirsten
6		Laskey, in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R) (2 Pages)
7	NMED	Document Depicting Resumé 211
8		of Lynette Stevens Guevara, in Re WQCC No. 21-31(R)
9		(3 Pages)
10	NMED Exhibit 4	Document Depicting Resumé 211 of Shelly Lemon, in Re
11		WQCC No. 21-31(R) (4 Pages)
12		
13	INFORMAT	ION REQUESTED BY COMMISSION
14		PageLine
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		



1	Santa Fe, New Mexico
2	January 14, 2025
3	10:47 a.m.
4	
5	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. Welcome
6	back. I hope everyone had a chance to
7	visit with Commissioner Dominguez because
8	this unfortunately may be your last
9	chance.
10	I call the meeting back into
11	session.
12	We are now going to have a
13	Public Hearing on Triad National Security,
14	L.L.C.'s and Newport News Nuclear BWXT-Los
15	Alamos, L.L.C.'s Petition for Rulemaking
16	to Amend Water Quality Standards
17	20.6.4.900 NMAC.
18	This will be a formal Public
19	Hearing. The Hearing Officer is
20	Ms. Felicia Orth.
21	If there are no questions or
22	concerns from the Commission, I will turn
23	the meeting over to Ms. Orth.
24	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Thank
25	you, Mr. Chair.

1	My name is Felicia Orth, the
2	Hearing Officer appointed by the
3	Commission to conduct a hearing in the
4	Petition to Amend the Surface Water
5	Quality standards for Intrastate and
6	Interstate Surface Waters, 20.6.4 New
7	Mexico Administrative Code.
8	The Petition was brought by
9	Triad National Security, Newport News
LO	Nuclear BWXT-Los Alamos, and the U.S.
11	Department of Energy Office of
L2	Environmental Management. This matter was
L3	docketed by the Commission Administrator
L4	as WQCC 24-31.
L5	I would like to introduce our
L6	interpreter, who has brought a team of
L7	interpreters to interpret between Spanish
L8	and English this morning.
L9	Ms. O'Grady.
20	INTERPRETER O'GRADY: Thank you,
21	Madam Hearing Officer.
22	My name is Lisa O'Grady, and I
23	have 2 other Interpreters interpreting
24	from English into Spanish and Spanish into
25	English, Denorah Gutierrez, Federally

1 certified Interpreter, and Amalia Cardeña, 2. State certified interpreter. 3 In order to access the language channels, if you are appearing via WebEx, 4 5 if you look at the lower left-hand corner of your screen you will see a globe. You 6 will need to click on the globe and choose 7 "English" if you want to hear the 8 9 interpretation of any Spanish comments in 10 If you are listening and you English. 11 want to listen in Spanish, you will need 12 to choose "Spanish." 13 I'll give the instructions now for those appearing on line to choose 14 15 Spanish. 16 (Speaking Spanish.) 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you, 18 Ms. O'Grady. 19 The Commission's Administrator 20 is recording the hearing on the platform 21 and the transcript is being made by David 22 Lee of Cumbre reporting. 23 We have the Petitioners and the 24 other parties in the matter, including the 25 Environment Department and Nicholas

1	Maxwell.
2	May I have entries of
3	appearances, please, or appearances for
4	each of you.
5	Ms. Olson.
6	MS. OLSON: Good morning, Madam
7	Hearing Officer, Chair Thomson, and
8	Commissioners:
9	My name is Kari Olson from
10	Spencer, Fane, Montgomery & Andrews. I am
11	here on behalf of Newport News Nuclear
12	BWXT-Los Alamos, commonly referred to as
13	N3B throughout this proceeding. We are
14	one of the 3 Co-Petitioners in this
15	proceeding.
16	With me in the hearing room
17	today is Silas DeRoma, who is in-house
18	Counsel for N3D.
19	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
20	Ms. Dolan.
21	MS. DOLAN: Thank you, Madam
22	Hearing Officer and Chair Thomson and
23	Commission:
24	My name is Maureen Dolan. I am
25	appearing on behalf of Triad National

CONTRACT OF THE PARTY OF THE PA

1 Security, L.L.C., the managing and operating contractor for Los Alamos 2. 3 National Laboratory. We are 4 Co-Petitioners. 5 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 6 MR. EVANS: Madam Hearing Officer, 7 my name is John Evans. I am appearing on behalf of the DOE Office of Environmental 8 9 Management. 10 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 11 Staff. 12 MS. SCOTT: Good morning. I am, 13 Brecken Scott on behalf of NMED, the New 14 Mexico Environment Department. 15 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 16 Mr. Maxwell, I see you on the 17 platform. 18 MR. MAXWELL: Good morning, your 19 Honor, and honored Commission: 20 My name is Nicholas Ray Maxwell. 21 I am one of the people of Lea 2.2 County, and I enter my appearance in the 23 matter today. Thank you. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 25 We will do things this way:

1	We'll start with Opening
2	Statements. I understand Ms. Scott will
3	make the Opening Statement, although when
4	we go to the evidence, the Petitioners
5	will put on their witnesses first. We
6	have 2 witnesses from the Petitioners.
7	Then your witness, with 2
8	potential Rebuttal witnesses, but one
9	Direct witness from the Environment
LO	Department, and any statement Mr. Maxwell
11	would like to make.
L2	Aside from Technical Testimony,
L3	we'll also accept Public Comment.
L4	We will take a lunch break from
L5	roughly a little before noon to a little
L6	before 1:00, and return at 1:00. That
L7	time is expressly reserved for Public
L8	Comment.
L9	I will also ask for Public
20	Comment at the end of the Technical case
21	from anyone, whatever time that happens to
22	be. If we have not yet finished the
23	hearing by 5:00 p.m., I'll break into the
24	Technical case again and accept Public
25	Comment at that time; it's reserved.

If we have finished before 5:00 1 2. p.m., there will not be a 5:00 p.m. 3 Comment Period. 4 Any of you on the platform or who are in the room who would like to 5 offer Public Comment, be sure to offer it 6 at 1:00 p.m., or when I invite it after we 7 finish the technical comment. 8 9 The hearing will be conducted 10 under the Water Quality Act and the 11 Commission's Rulemaking procedures, and 12 20.1.6 of the New Mexico Administrative 13 Code. 14 Testimony and Comment is taken under oath and is subject to 15 16 Cross-Examination. 17 All matters relevant to the hearing can be found on the Docketed 18 19 Matters web page at the Environment 20 Department website. 21 If you have questions about 22 anything relating to the status of the 23 case, or the documents filed in the case, 24 or you have a Public Comment you would 25 like to submit by e-mail or in writing,

1 Pam Jones, the Commission Administrator, 2. who is sitting back here in the blue 3 sweater. 4 The Commission may choose to deliberate once we've closed the 5 6 evidentiary record, or they may choose to 7 deliberate at a subsequent meeting. 8 Okay. Let's take our Opening 9 Statements. 10 Ms. Scott. 11 MS. SCOTT: Good morning, Madam 12 Hearing Officer, Chair Thomson, and 13 members of the Commission. Thank you for 14 being here today: 15 My name is Brecken Scott, and I 16 represent the Surface Water Quality Bureau within the Water Protection Division of 17 18 the New Mexico Environment Department. 19 NMED is not the Petitioner in 20 this Rulemaking, but the Department is 21 here today in support of the Petitioners' 22 proposed amendments to the New Mexico 23 Administrative Code, which are 24 specifically --25 Are you hearing this?

1	Okay. Just making sure.
2	to the New Mexico
3	Administrative Code, which are
4	specifically to 20.6.4.900 NMAC.
5	My goal in this Opening
6	Statement is to briefly provide some
7	regulatory context and help situate you in
8	this proceeding docketed at WQCC 24-31.
9	The Petitioners will address the substance
LO	of their proposed Rule amendment.
11	The Water Quality Control
12	Commission or the WQCC is directed and
L3	required to adopt Water Quality standards
L4	for Surface Waters of the State under the
L5	New Mexico Water Quality Act. The Water
L6	Quality Act states.
L7	"The standards shall, at a
L8	minimum, protect the public
L9	health or welfare, enhance the
20	quality of water, and serve the
21	purposes of the Act.
22	"Furthermore, in making the
23	standards the Commission shall
24	give the weight it deems
25	appropriate to all facts and

circumstances, including the 1 2. use and value of the water for water supplies, propagation of 3 4 fish and wildlife, recreational 5 purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other 6 7 purposes." Water Quality standards include 8 9 Site-Specific Water Ouality Criteria, 10 which are the basis of Petitioners' 11 proposed Rule amendment today for 12 specified waters in the Pajarito Plateau. 13 The WQCC may adopt site-14 specific numeric criteria in accordance with 20.6.4.10F NMAC. Any person may 15 16 Petition the WOCC for adoption of such 17 Site-Specific Criteria subject to certain requirements under the NMAC. 18 19 For example, the Petitioner of 20 Site-Specific Criteria must include a 21 description of methods used to notify and 22 solicit input from potential stakeholders 23 and the general public in the affected 24 area, and present and respond to public 25 input received.

1	Any person who initiates a
2	Rulemaking shall also follow the New
3	Mexico State Rules Act and associated
4	regulations regarding public
5	participation.
6	Between Petitioners and NMED we
7	insured all public input, Public Notice,
8	and Public Comment requirements were met,
9	which brings us to today's Public Hearing
10	as the final step in the Rulemaking
11	process.
12	NMED's Technical Testimony will
13	provide more detail on all of the above.
14	NMED respectively requests that the WQCC
15	deliberate immediately following the close
16	of the technical case.
17	NMED further requests that a
18	Hearing Officer Report not be requested by
19	the Commission in this matter. The
20	parties anticipate circulating a Statement
21	of Reasons, a concise explanatory
22	statement later this week or early next
23	week should the WQCC adopt the proposed
24	Rule amendment.
25	Thank you for your time and

1 consideration in WQCC 24-31. 2. HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 3 Let's see. It will be 4 Ms. Dolan. 5 All right. 6 MS. DOLAN: Thank you, Madam 7 Hearing Officer, Chairman Thomson, and Commission: 8 9 Again, my name is Maureen 10 I am representing Triad National Dolan. 11 Security, L.L.C., co-Petitioners in this 12 matter. With me on the platform is Maxine 13 McReynolds, also representing Triad. 14 As the Commission is aware Triad has been a co-Petitioner in 2 15 16 third-party Petitions before the WOCC 17 recently. Since the relationships among different entities at LANL can be 18 19 confusing, I wanted to take this 20 opportunity to provide a brief summary of 21 Petitioners' respective roles at the 22 outset: 23 LANL is a Federally funded 24 research and development center, or FFRD 25 managed and operated by Triad on behalf of

1 the National Nuclear Security 2. Administration, or NNSA. 3 Triad is a Delaware Limited 4 Liability Company authorized to do business in New Mexico. It is comprised 5 of 3 --6 7 I'm sorry; this microphone is difficult. 8 9 -- 3 nonprofit entities; 10 Battelle Memorial Institute, the 11 University of California, and the Texas 12 A&M University system. 13 NNSA is a semi-autonomous 14 agency within the Department of Energy responsible for enhancing national nuclear 15 16 security through the military application of nuclear science. 17 NNSA is run from headquarter sites, as well as through 18 19 Field Offices co-located with each of its 20 contractor-operated national laboratories. 21 The NNSA Field Offices are responsible for 22 ensuring compliance with the Federal 23 contracts issued to manage and operate 24 these national Labs. NNALA is the NNSA Field Office 25

1 responsible for ensuring Triad's 2. compliance with the Laboratory's 3 management and operating contract. While 4 NNSA and NNALA are not participants in this hearing, NNALA does support the 5 6 proposed Rulemaking. 7 Since 2018 the legacy and remediation at LANL has been overseen not 8 9 by NNSA, but by DOE's Office of 10 Environmental Management, or DOEM, through 11 the separate Field Office, the EMLA. Αt 12 LANL this mission is managed and performed 13 by Newport News Nuclear BWXT-Los Alamos. 14 In this matter, Triad is a co-Petitioner with both N3B and D0EM's Los 15 16 Alamos office. Triad supports this 17 proposed Rulemaking. As Petitioners' witnesses will 18 19 show, its foundations is the EPA-20 recommended modeling yield Copper criteria 21 based on Site-Specific Water Chemistry. 22 The proposed standards for the Pajarito 23 Plateau are more accurately tailored to 24 local conditions and better reflect 25 potential impacts to Aquatic Life set out

1 in New Mexico's Hardness-Based Water 2. Quality criteria for Copper. 3 With that I'll turn it over to 4 Ms. Olson. 5 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 6 MS. OLSON: This chair is very low. 7 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: There is one 8 you can switch it out for. 9 MS. OLSON: Oh, here it is; I'll raise this a little bit. I do need these 10 11 microphones. 12 Good morning, Kari Olson Okav. 13 again from Spencer, Fane, Montgomery & 14 Andrews on behalf of Petitioner N3B. 15 We're here this morning before 16 the Commission on Petitioners' Proposal to 17 amend 20.6.4.900 NMAC to incorporate a 18 Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria for 19 copper for Pajarito Plateau Surface 20 Waters. 21 Is this cutting in and out? 2.2 I'll try to sit back a little bit. 23 This Proposal was developed from EPA's 2007 Copper Biotic Ligand 24 Model. You will see that reflected as 25

1 "BLM" throughout the papers, and has 2. Site-Specific Water Quality and 3 Site-Specific Water Quality Chemistry for Surface Waters on the Pajarito Plateau. 4 5 Counsel for NMED has already 6 laid out the legal framework for this 7 Commission's adoption and review of Surface Water Quality standards. As she 8 9 pointed out, 20.6.4.10F NMAC authorizes 10 any person to Petition the Commission to 11 adopt Site-Specific Criteria and sets 12 forth the requirements that must be 13 satisfied for adoption. The uncontested 14 proposed Site-Specific Water Quality 15 Criteria for copper for the Pajarito 16 Plateau Surface Waters satisfies these 17 requirements. 18 I apologize; I don't have any 19 tips for ... 20 As detailed in the 21 Demonstration Report, which was included 22 with our Petition, and is also provided as Petitioners' Exhibit 1, as well as the 23 24 Technical Testimony presented from Petitioners' witnesses Dr. Amanda White 25

1 and Barry Fulton, the proposed site-2. specific Water Quality criteria was a 3 result of a multiyear collaborative effort 4 with NMED, stakeholders, tribes, and 5 members of the public, to develop a 6 BLM-based Copper Criteria for the Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters. 7 The proposed criteria relies on 8 9 a scientifically defensible method and 10 sites water quality data and analysis. Ιt reflects the best available science in 11 12 EPA's current recommendations for Copper 13 Criteria, is fully protective of Aquatic 14 Life Uses on the Pajarito Plateau to the 15 same extent that as EPA 2007 Copper 16 Criteria, and if adopted will provide a 17 more accurate assessment of copper bioavailability and toxicity for Pajarito 18 19 Plateau Surface Waters than the current 2.0 New Mexico Hardness-Based calculation. 21 Again, the basis and 22 justification for this Proposal is fully 23 detailed in the Demonstration Report, and Petitioners' testimony and exhibits. 24 Τ 25 would like to just briefly summarize the

1	key points, for context, to the
2	presentations you will hear today:
3	As the Commission is likely
4	aware New Mexico's current statewide
5	Aquatic Life water quality criteria for
6	copper, set forth at Part 4900 NMAC, is
7	based on outdated 1996 EPA Hardness-Based
8	recommended Copper Criteria. That
9	criteria only accounts for the affect of
LO	water Hardness on bioavailability and
11	toxicity and does not explicitly consider
L2	the effects of other water quality and
L3	water chemistry parameters which we have
L4	since learned affect copper
L5	bioavailability and toxicity.
L6	In 2007, EPA issued nationally
L7	recommended fresh water "Aquatic Life
18	Criteria for copper" based on the BLM.
L9	That's provided as Petitioners' Exhibit
20	10.
21	Reflecting our advances and
22	understanding of water chemistry, EPA's
23	2007 BLM-based Copper Criteria departs
24	from the sole reliance on Hardness and
25	incorporates the latest and best available

scientific information for setting Copper 1 2. Criteria by accounting for the effects of 3 multiple water chemistry parameters that 4 affect copper bioavailability and toxicity 5 to Aquatic Life. 6 The EPA 2007 criteria reflects 7 the best available science and provides a more accurate assessment of copper 8 9 bioavailability than New Mexico's current 10 Hardness-Based calculation. This is not 11 in dispute. 12 During the last Triennial 13 Review of Part 4 the Environment 14 Department Surface Water Quality Bureau 15 was not ready to adopt the EPA's updated 16 Copper BLM for statewide "Aquatic Life 17 Criteria for copper" based primarily on 18 scarcity of data. However, consistent 19 with recommendations from EPA, NMED 20 committed at that time to continue 21 evaluating adoption of the BLM-based 22 Copper Criteria on a segment-specific 23 basis. 24 Again, as detailed in our 25 papers, extensive monitoring and sampling

1 of BLM parameters in the Pajarito Plateau 2. stream since 2005 provided sufficient BLM 3 water chemistry data to support 4 development of a BLM-based criteria for 5 the Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters. 6 Petitioners have worked extensively with 7 the Environment Department over many years to develop the criteria for Pajarito 8 9 Plateau Surface Waters presented today. 10 The Proposal also incorporates 11 substantial input received from 12 stakeholders, tribes, and members of the 13 public through the multiyear engagement 14 process detailed in the Public Involvement 15 Plan provided with the Demonstration 16 Report and summarized in the Direct 17 Testimony of Dr. White. 18 The Copper Criteria for the 19 Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters is 20 proposed as a multiple linear progression. 21 You will see that reflected as "MLR" in 22 the papers, an equation that accurately 23 replicates EPA's BLM-based Copper Criteria 24 using Dissolved Organic Carbon; you will 25 hear that referred to at "DOC," "pH," and

"Hardness." 1 We noticed through the robust 2. data collection and analysis of the BLM 3 water chemistry data from the Pajarito 4 Plateau Surface Waters -- which you will hear described by Dr. White and 5 6 Mr. Fulton. 7 EPA recognizes that MLR equations are a scientifically defensible 8 9 approach to calculate metal criteria for 10 Aquatic Life. They provide greater 11 transparency and usability over the Copper 12 BLM software. Notably, because the MLR 13 equations resemble the Hardness-Based 14 metals criteria, they can easily be incorporated into 20.6.4.900 in an 15 16 equation form that is already familiar to 17 users and the public. If adopted by the WOCC, the 18 19 proposed copper Site-Specific Water 20 Quality Criteria will provide a more 21 accurate assessment of copper conditions 22 for Aquatic Life Uses and level of 23 protection in Pajarito Plateau Surface 24 Waters in accordance with EPA's current 25 quidance and recommendations, and the New

1 Mexico Water Quality standards. 2. We appreciate the Commission's 3 careful consideration of this Proposal and request that, pursuant to 20.1.6.306 of 4 the Commission's Rulemaking procedures, 5 6 the Commission proceed with deliberation 7 at the conclusion of this hearing and adopt the proposed uncontested 8 9 Site-Specific Water Ouality Criteria for 10 copper for Surface Waters on Pajarito 11 Plateau as amendments to Part 4. Thank 12 you. 13 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you, 14 Ms. Olson. 15 Will there be any further 16 opening statement from the Petitioners? 17 MS. OLSON: No, Madam Hearing 18 Officer. 19 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 20 Are you going to call your first witness? 21 22 MS. OLSON: Before I call her I would like to just briefly address 23 24 exhibits: 25 Is it the Commission's pleasure

1	to introduce exhibits one by one through
2	witnesses, or to have me walk through the
3	exhibits, other than the Prefiled Direct
4	Testimony, at this time? How would you
5	like to handle that?
6	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: My memory
7	from an e-mail that I saw, I think, from
8	Ms. Scott is that Mr. Maxwell requested
9	that foundation be laid through the
10	testimony, and then we can talk about
11	admission.
12	You can even, you know, lay the
13	foundation and do it one at a time, or at
14	the end, but it doesn't sound as though we
15	have consensus on doing it all at the end.
16	MS. OLSON: Understood.
17	Just for clarification, as
18	you're well aware there is no foundation
19	requirement because the Rules of Civil
20	Procedure do not apply in this proceeding.
21	I'm happy to have our witnesses
22	identify the relevance, which I think is
23	laid out in the testimony, or if
24	Mr. Maxwell wants to identify any specific
25	exhibits that he was unclear about

relevance to save time, I can limit it to 1 just those exhibits, whatever would be 2. 3 your preference. 4 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 5 Mr. Maxwell, were there certain 6 exhibits that you had concerns about as to 7 whether they were relevant? Not specifically, but 8 MR. MAXWELL: I reserve my objection to the admission of 9 10 them though. 11 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 12 Even a brief description of how the exhibits are relevant. 13 14 Understanding that the Rules of 15 Civil Procedure don't apply, one of the 16 reasons we usually step through that 17 exercise regardless, even if it's brief, 18 is just to make sure that the Boards and Commissions are relying on reliable 19 2.0 documents. 21 Understood. MS. OLSON: I'm happy 2.2 to discuss relevance to the proceedings. 23 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 24 I need to swear in Dr. White. Do you swear or affirm to tell 25

1	the truth?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
4	
5	AMANDA B. WHITE, PH.D.,
6	after having been first duly sworn,
7	was examined and testified as follows:
8	
9	EXAMINATION
10	BY MS. OLSON:
11	Q. Okay. Dr. White, thank you for
12	being here this morning.
13	Will you please state your full
14	name for the record and spell it.
15	A. Sure. Amanda White; A-M-A-N-D-A
16	W-H-I-T-E.
17	Q. Dr. White, what is your current
18	profession?
19	A. I am the Tech2 Solutions Water
20	Program Director, and that is a
21	subcontractor to N3B.
22	Q. Do you have before you what has
23	been identified as Petitioners' Exhibit 3?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Do you recognize this as your

1 Prefiled Direct Technical Testimony? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Was that Technical Testimony 4 drafted by you or under your direct 5 supervision? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Do you have any corrections to your 8 testimony? 9 A. No. 10 Q. Is the testimony that you prepared 11 true and accurate to the best of your 12 knowledge and belief? 13 A. Yes. 14 O. If you were asked these same questions today would you give the same 15 16 answers under oath? 17 A. Yes. Madam Hearing Officer, 18 MS. OLSON: 19 N3B offers Petitioners' Exhibit 3. 20 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Ι will pause for a moment in the event there 21 2.2 are objections. 23 Exhibit 3 is admitted. 24 (Water Quality Control 25 Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 3

1 was received in evidence.) MS. OLSON: While I have the mic, 2. 3 let me offer 2 things. 4 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Those of you 5 at the table have the option of using the handheld mic if that's easier. 6 If you don't use a handheld mic, please don't 7 8 turn your head while you're speaking. 9 Thank you. 10 MS. OLSON: Thank you for that 11 reminder. 12 O. Okay. Moving on to some of the 13 other exhibits that were referenced in 14 your testimony do you have before you what's been identified as Petitioners' 15 16 Exhibit 5? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Do you recognize that document as 19 your Resumé? 2.0 A. Yes. 21 O. Is that Resumé true and accurate to 2.2 the best of your knowledge and belief? 23 A. Yes. 24 MS. OLSON: Madam Hearing Officer, 25 or Hearing Officer, we would move to admit

1 Petitioners' Exhibit 5. 2 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 3 I'll pause for a moment in the 4 event there are objections. Exhibit 5 is admitted. 5 6 (Water Quality Control 7 Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 5 was received in evidence.) 8 9 O. BY MS. OLSON: Dr. White, do you 10 also have before you what has been identified as Petitioners' Exhibit 2? 11 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Do you recognize that as 14 Petitioners' Proposed Changes to Part 4? 15 A. Yes. O. Were you involved in the 16 17 development of this document? 18 A. Yes. 19 Madam Hearing Officer, MS. OLSON: N3B offers Petitioners' Exhibit 2. 2.0 21 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause 2.2 for a moment in the event there are 23 objections. 24 Exhibit 2 is admitted. 25 (Water Quality Control

1 Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 2 2. was received in evidence.) 3 Q. BY MS. OLSON: Dr. White, do you 4 have before you what's been identified as Petitioners' Exhibit 7? 5 6 A. Yes. Q. Do you recognize that as a Notice 7 of Public Meetings and Comment Period for 8 9 the Draft Demonstration Report? 10 A. Yes. 11 O. What is the relevance of that 12 Notice document to the Proposal and 13 Petition? 14 A. Sure. 15 The Demonstration Report lays 16 the foundation of the proposed change, and this was a notification of a Public 17 18 Meeting on the Demonstration Report, as 19 well as the kickoff of the Comment Period, 20 the 45-day Comment Period. 21 Madam Hearing Officer, MS. OLSON: we would move for admission of 2.2 23 Petitioners' Exhibit 7. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause 25 for objections.

Exhibit 7 is admitted. 1 2 (Water Quality Control 3 Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 7 4 was received in evidence.) 5 O. BY MS. OLSON: Finally, Dr. White, do you have before you what's been 6 identified as Petitioners' Exhibit 8? 7 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Do you recognize that as the 10 response to comments received during that 11 Comment Period? 12 A. Yes. 13 O. What's the relevance of including 14 the response to comments in the record? 15 A. During the 45-day Public Comment 16 period on the Demonstration Report the 17 written comments that were received were 18 from Communities For Clean Water, and 19 these are DOEMLA's and N3B responses to 2.0 those comments. 21 MS. OLSON: Madam Hearing Officer, 2.2 we would finally move to admit 23 Petitioners' Exhibit 8. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 25 I will pause in the event there are

1	objections.
2	Exhibit 8 is admitted.
3	(Water Quality Control
4	Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 8
5	was received in evidence.)
6	MS. OLSON: Thank you. I will
7	reserve addressing the rest of the
8	exhibits with our next witness.
9	At this time, Dr. White has
10	prepared a summary of her Prefiled
11	Technical Testimony, and so I would pass
12	it to her to provide that summary.
13	Just as a reminder; everybody
14	received via the Dropbox link a copy of
15	the presentation that accompanies that
16	summary. I do have a couple of paper
17	copies if anyone did not receive that.
18	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Would any
19	Commissioner want to see a paper copy?
20	All right. Thank you very
21	much.
22	MS. OLSON: Okay. Ms. Jones, if
23	you could give, I believe it's identified
24	as Petitioner's witness permission to
25	share the screen.

1	MS. JONES: You have it.
2	THE WITNESS: All right.
3	Is everyone able to see that?
4	Okay. All right. Thank you,
5	and good morning, Chair Thomson and
6	members of the Commission:
7	I appreciate you allowing me to
8	present. My name is Amanda White, as I
9	stated previously, and I am here to
10	discuss the Petition to Amend the
11	standards for Interstate and intrastate
12	Surface Water, 20.6.4 New Mexico
13	Administrative Code.
14	The purpose of my testimony
15	today is to provide background information
16	on Surface Waters within the Pajarito
17	Plateau to which the proposed copper
18	Site-Specific Water Quality would apply.
19	I will also summarize the
20	reasons for developing the proposed copper
21	Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria for
22	the Surface Waters and describe the data
23	collection used to support it.
24	I will summarize Petitioners'
25	outreach and extended engagement with

1 NMED's Surface Water Quality Bureau, EPA, 2. stakeholders, and tribes, in developing 3 these proposed copper Site-Specific Water 4 Quality Criteria. 5 Okay. I wanted to provide a 6 geographic backdrop of the Pajarito 7 Plateau: If you look in the upper 8 9 right-hand corner you will recognize the 10 State of New Mexico outline, and Los 11 Alamos is indicated there. 12 In the lower right-hand corner 13 you can see Los Alamos County situated 14 between Sandoval County and Santa Fe 15 County. 16 If you look at the map on the 17 left-hand side you will see the Laboratory, which is the yellow-shaded 18 19 boundary, and that is Los Alamos National 20 Laboratory. I'll most likely refer to it 21 as "LANL" or "the Laboratory." You can 22 see the landholders ownership. 23 To the south is Bandelier 24 National Monument. To the north-northwest is Santa 25

1	Fe National Forest.
2	To the north-northeast and east
3	is the Pueblo San Ildefonso, as well as
4	the Los Alamos town site to the north, and
5	White rock to the east.
6	All right. I wanted to
7	describe the Surface Waters within the
8	Pajarito Plateau:
9	The Pajarito Plateau is defined
10	as the "outer boundary," which is the
11	watershed. It's the delineation of the
12	watershed that delineates the boundary, so
13	it is that outer brown area that is the
14	Pajarito Plateau as we are defining it.
15	The Surface Waters within the
16	Pajarito Plateau that we are incorporating
17	into it are the 20.6.498, which is the
18	deep blue areas.
19	Located to the north, so that's
20	Water Canyon up there, Pueblo Canyon. In
21	the headwaters to the west of the
22	Laboratory property are these
23	classifications, which are intermittent
24	unclassified waters.
25	The next classification is

1 20.6.4.121, which is a perennial stream in 2. Frijoles Canyon to the south and 3 perennial. It is in Bandelier National 4 Monument. We have 20.6.4.126, which are 5 6 perennial reaches within Los Alamos 7 National Laboratory. They are the red and little bits and pieces here, which are 8 9 stream segments, and they are either 10 spring-fed or effluent-fed. 11 20.6.4.127 is the light green 12 area to the northwest, and that is Los 13 Alamos Reservoir, and the stream from Los 14 Alamos Reservoir downstream to the ice 15 rink if you're familiar with Los Alamos. 16 By and large 20.6.4.128, which 17 are the darker green segments are 18 ephemeral intermittent streams. 19 large these are the most common streams 20 that are in the Laboratory and across the 21 Pajarito Plateau. They are ephemeral or 22 intermittent streams. 23 We have 20.6.4.140 which are 24 the purple sections, and they are 25 intermittent.

1	All right. Just to drive that
2	point home, we have intermittent waters,
3	we have perennial waters, we have
4	ephemeral and intermittent waters, and
5	different hydrologies that are represented
6	across the Pajarito Plateau.
7	All right. Knowing the
8	hydrologic Water Quality Standards
9	conditions and the geographic setting that
10	we're looking at, Water Quality Management
11	Planned to discuss the Copper Criteria,
12	the current criteria and the proposed
13	criteria.
14	The current criteria is
15	Hardness-Based and only accounts for the
16	affects of Hardness toxicity to Aquatic
17	Life. It does not consider other water
18	parameters, such as pH or water carbon,
19	and are under-protective or not stringent
20	enough, or overprotective or too stringent
21	depending on Site-Specific Water
22	Chemistry.
23	The proposed criteria is a
24	Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria for
25	copper in surface waters within the

1 Pajarito Plateau. It uses the EPA's 2. Biologic Ligand Model, or BLM software 3 that accounts for multiple water chemistry 4 parameters on bioavailability and toxicity 5 of copper to Aquatic Life. The proposed 6 equations accurately replicate the BLM 7 software criteria. I would like to note that the 8 9 EPA, in their 2007 recommendations on the 10 Copper Criteria, recommended using the 11 BLM, which incorporates the effects of 12 multiple water chemistry parameters and 13 imparts the latest scientific knowledge on 14 appreciation and bioavailability. 15 All right. That's the 16 criteria. Now I want to talk about the 17 very robust data set that we started 18 collecting 20 years ago: 19 In 2005 we started to collect 20 the parameters needed for the BLM model 21 across the Laboratory. You can see, 22 again, the Pajarito boundary outlined in 23 yellow this time, and the gauging stations 24 are indicated with green triangles. 25 are USGS-style gauging stations.

1	We monitor streamflow at all of
2	those different locations, and we also
3	sample at those locations when there is
4	flow. Again, these are ephemeral, so
5	you're familiar with arroyos and when they
6	flow, so this is precipitation, frozen
7	snow melt, sometimes if we're lucky.
8	The red triangles are reference
9	locations, so they are considered
10	background locations either upwind or not
11	on Laboratory property. At all these
12	locations we have sampled across the
13	Pajarito Plateau, so spatially and
14	temporally this dataset is very robust.
15	I wanted to get into a little
16	bit about the areas that we have
17	collected, and now I want to talk about
18	how we collected the samples.
19	For the sample collection
20	process we have field collection. Because
21	we have storm water, again, they are
22	mostly ephemeral streams and intermittent,
23	so we are using automated samplers.
24	The pump is triggered in the
25	sampler when there is streamflow. If

1 there is streamflow, you start sampling. 2. The arm starts swinging inside the 3 automated collection, and you start 4 collecting samples, and that triggers. 5 When a sample is collected we 6 go to the field and retrieve it, so we 7 have the sample inspection and sample retrieval form, which initiates the Chain 8 9 of Custody process. The Chain of Custody is exactly what it says; an unending chain 10 11 documenting the custody as a record of 12 maintaining custody. 13 From there the samples are 14 delivered to the storm water processing 15 facility. The Chain of Custody is 16 relinquished to the processing facility, a 17 storm water sample processing log is created, and sample filtration or 18 19 preservation are performed as required for 20 the analysis. 21 Chain of Custody analysis 22 request forms are then completed and the 23 shipping form is created. Then the sample 24 and those forms are transferred to the 25 Sample Management Office and the Chain of

1 Custody is relinquished to the SMO, or 2. Sample Management Office, and the samples 3 are shipped to the analytical laboratory. 4 I wanted to get into the 5 collection process of the samples, and now 6 I'm going to discuss a little bit about 7 the Quality Assurance and Quality Control associated with the analytical data: 8 The Chain of Custody forms 9 10 track the collection and delivery of 11 samples to laboratories. These are 12 third-party analytical laboratories or contract laboratories. They follow 13 14 standard OA/OC procedures for analysis and data reporting, and are accredited under 15 16 the Department of Energy Consolidated 17 Audit Program, otherwise known as DOECAP for the analytes of interest. 18 19 Detection reporting limits are 20 provided with the samples from the third-21 party analytical laboratory. Non-22 detections are flagged at the laboratory and checked by independent data 23 24 validaters. Analytical data is also 25

1 validated by N3B chemists' quidelines 2. based on EPA QA/G-8 guidance on 3 Environmental Data Verification and Data 4 Validation, Department of Defense/ 5 Department of Energy Consolidated Quality 6 System Manual for Environmental 7 Laboratories, and EPA's national functional guidelines for data validation. 8 9 All of these things combined together to 10 create a very robust data set 11 hydrologically, temporally, spatially, and 12 it is high quality. 13 Now I want to move a little bit 14 into touching on the point of our communications and interactions with the 15 16 regulators over the course of the past 7 17 years: We've had numerous interactions 18 19 and NMED Surface Water Ouality Bureau, as 2.0 well as the EPA has been involved, kicking 21 off with a January 25, 2018, meeting in 22 Santa Fe to provide overview of the Copper 23 BLM and discuss its application to the 24 Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters. 25 I will not go through all of

1 these, but the general rhythm of them is 2. we met and we discussed what we were going 3 to do with the regulators. They provided 4 comments. We wrote the draft document 5 incorporating their comments. We provided the draft to the regulators. 6 They 7 provided comments; we incorporated the 8 comments. 9 Then we provided a final 10 document, so we developed a Work Plan as 11 well as the Demonstration Report. The 12 final conference/teleconference to discuss 13 the Draft Petition for the Copper 14 Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria was 15 in April 2024. 16 Okav. You can see that we have had a lot of interaction with the 17 18 regulators. We've also had guite a bit of 19 interaction with the public, stakeholders, 20 tribes, and members of the public. 21 In December 2020 it was, you 2.2 know, the middle of the pandemic. We had 23 the individual NPDES Storm Water Permit public meeting, and that was targeted 24 25 towards the general public. We presented

1	our Demonstration Report, which was in
2	draft form at that point.
3	During our Public Meeting in
4	May 2021 we were invited to present to the
5	Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory
6	Board or NMCAB meeting, and the
7	stakeholders there were the City of Santa
8	Fe, Los Alamos County, various Pueblos and
9	Tribes, as well as Universities and NGOs
LO	and private entities. Lots of different
l1	stakeholders there.
L2	In June 2021 we presented again
L3	in our Individual Permit Public Meeting to
L4	discuss changes that had been made based
15	on regular communications.
L6	You can see an ongoing theme
L7	through here:
L8	We presented at the IP Public
L9	Meeting, to keep the public abreast of any
20	changes that were made to the standard as
21	we went along.
22	In November 2021 we were
23	invited to present at the Accord Pueblo
24	Technical Exchange meeting with the Pueblo
25	San Ildefonso, Pueblo Jemez and Pueblo

1	Santa Clara.
2	In November 2021 the Eastern
3	Jemez Resource Council meeting. We were
4	invited to present there, and that has
5	with various federal, state, and local
6	entities, as well as private and
7	universities.
8	In November 2021, we again
9	presented at the IP Public Meeting.
10	In March 2022 we were invited
11	to present at the Los Alamos County Board
12	of Public Utilities Working Session
13	meeting. That was Los Alamos County and
14	the general public, because it was open to
15	the public, and we presented to them.
16	In March 2023 we held our
17	Public Meeting on the Demonstration
18	Report. That is the notification that was
19	discussed in the exhibit, and that was
20	open to the general public.
21	We noticed that in various
22	assorted newspapers in Los Alamos, Santa
23	Fe, Española, and it was held in September
24	2023. As I stated previously it kicked
25	off the 45-day Comment Period for the

1 Demonstration Report, a Public Comment Period in which we received in writing 2. 3 comments from Communities For Clean Water. 4 In summary I wanted to present 5 to you an overview of the geographic 6 setting, the robust data set that we 7 developed hydrologically, spatially, and 8 temporally. 9 It's a very high quality data 10 set that was gathered. It was 18 years of 11 data that was included in this analysis in 12 development of this proposed change. 13 wanted to discuss our interactions with 14 not only regulators, but the public and stockholders. 15 16 With that, I believe that ends 17 my presentation. 18 MS. OLSON: Thank you, Dr. White. 19 Madam Hearing Officer, I don't 20 have any further questions for this 21 witness, so at this time I would tender 22 her for Examination and questioning by 23 yourself and the Commissioners. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you 25 very much, Dr. White and Ms. Olson.

1	Mr. Scott, do you have
2	questions of Dr. White?
3	MR. MAXWELL: No questions.
4	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay.
5	Mr. Maxwell, do you have
6	questions for Dr. White?
7	MR. MAXWELL: I do not have
8	questions for Dr. White. Thank you.
9	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
10	Let me start, then, with
11	Commissioner Moander.
12	Do you have questions for
13	Dr. White?
14	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: I do not;
15	thank you.
16	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
17	Vice Chair Zemlick.
18	VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: No, thank
19	you, I do not.
20	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
21	Commissioner Dominguez.
22	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: No
23	questions, Madam Hearing Officer.
24	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right.
25	Chair Thomson.

1	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yeah, I have one
2	question:
3	///
4	///
5	///
6	EXAMINATION
7	BY CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
8	Q. You have a very impressive data set
9	going back to 2005, and I appreciate that.
10	This is all Water Quality data.
11	You don't have any toxicology data. Is
12	that true?
13	A. That is untrue.
14	I'm going to defer to
15	Mr. Fulton on that question if that's
16	okay.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. I'll ask
18	him then. Thank you.
19	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Thank
20	you.
21	Commissioner Velasquez.
22	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: Thank you.
23	
24	EXAMINATION
25	BY COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ:

1 Q. Thank you Dr. White. 2 First of all I want to thank 3 you for the stakeholder outreach. It is 4 clear that was a priority for this plan. Being a resident of the 5 6 Pojoaque Basin it was very clear we had 7 the opportunity, and so I want to just say that I think that's good government and 8 9 just good work for our public and I 10 appreciate that. 11 My only other question -- and 12 that was a comment. 13 My question is in the BLM 14 sampling Plan, as you went from 2019 to 15 2020 was there any interruption in the 16 Plan due to the COVID pandemic being in 17 place, or did the intent of the Plan carry through with no interruptions from 2019 18 19 through the recovery period and people 20 getting back after the pandemic? 21 A. Sure, yeah. 22 Thanks to this amazing 23 technology we have we held everything 24 online that was required, any meeting. 25 fact, several of those meetings were held

1	online, especially the early-on ones, the
2	2020/2021, but the newer meetings were
3	held hybrid as well as in person.
4	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: Thank you,
5	Mr. Chair.
6	Q. I'm getting to more of the on-the-
7	ground sampling, the schedule of measuring
8	the on-the-ground status. Was that
9	interrupted in any way or did that carry
LO	through as planned?
l1	A. No, we took a brief, very brief
L2	hiatus for, I think, 2 months and were
L3	back in the field from March 15 I don't
L4	even think it was 2 months. It had been
L5	very brief before it was decided that
L6	field work was safe as far as the
L7	transmission of COVID was concerned.
L8	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: Thank you.
L9	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Thank
21	you.
22	Commissioner Brancard.
23	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Thank you.
24	
25	EXAMINATION



1 BY COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: 2. O. Thank you for the presentation. 3 don't understand a lot of the science, but 4 since you introduced the proposed 5 regulatory changes, let me try to ask some 6 questions of you about those: I'm confused, but then again I 7 keep thinking the BLM is a federal agency, 8 9 so... 10 Under this provision, 10.4, 11 20.6.4, when we adopt Site-Specific 12 Criteria one of the things we have to do 13 is find that these criteria fully protect 14 the designated uses; okay? 15 A. Yes. 16 O. We have in our stream standards 17 here a whole long list of basins, et cetera, that are defined and that have 18 19 designated uses. 20 I think, as you have sort of 21 indicated, you are not applying this to 22 specific basins that are currently in our 23 standards, you're creating an entirely new 24 geographic concept here called the 25 Pajarito Plateau.

1 A. They will apply to the stream 2 segments that I discussed. 3 Q. But you're not making any changes 4 to those segments. A. It was decided that instead of 5 putting it in each and every one of those, 6 and that was in cooperation with NMED, 7 that it would make more sense to include 8 9 it in the overarching .900 part: 10 I'm looking, say, at: 0. Okay. "20.6.4.128: Rio Grande 11 12 Basin." 13 A. Uh-huh. 14 Q. These are lands managed by DOE. Under "Criteria" it says: 15 16 "The use-specific criteria 17 of 20.6.4.900 NMAC are applicable to the designated 18 19 uses except that the following 20 segment-specific criteria 21 apply: 2.2 "The acute total ammonia 23 criteria set forth in 24 Subsection L of 20.6.4.900"; okay? 25

1	I mean would it be useful for
2	each of these segments to also have a
3	cross-reference like that in there?
4	A. Sure.
5	I will defer to the NMED on
6	that. I think we discussed various
7	different ways of incorporating the
8	standards into it, but this was the
9	preference, I think, by all of the parties
10	involved.
11	Q. Okay. You have identified the
12	different stream segments
13	A. Uh-huh.
14	Q that are within this larger
15	Pajarito Plateau concept here, and each of
16	them has different designated uses. I
17	would assume that means that we, as the
18	Commission, need to make a finding that
19	what you're proposing protects each of
20	those designated uses within those 6
21	different segments. Is that correct?
22	A. That's correct.
23	If you look at the equations
24	proposed, there is one for "Aquatic
25	Acute," as well as "Chronic Aquatic Life,"

so those should capture what you're 1 2. proposing. 3 Q. I see: "Limited Aquatic Life"; 4 and: "Secondary Contact." 5 6 A. Uh-huh. 7 Q. I see: "Cold Water Aquatic Life." I see: "Primary Contact." 8 9 A. Uh-huh. 10 Q. Is "Primary Contact" being 11 protected by these? 12 A. (No audible response.) 13 Q. I mean is there evidence in your 14 presentation that says that "Primary 15 Contact is being protected? A. Sure. 16 17 Mr. Fulton's presentation will 18 get a little bit more into the details of 19 the protectiveness, as well as the details 20 of the methodology of the Proposal. 21 Q. I would just think that when we do 2.2 prepare a --23 A. Sure. 24 Q. -- Statement of Reasons, we're 25 going to have to check off a whole lot of

1 boxes here about all these different stream segments that are within this 2. 3 larger segment that you're creating, but 4 you're not making one of our stream 5 segments. 6 A. That's right. 7 Q. Okay. I quess I'm just struggling a 8 9 bit with that knowing all the blood, 10 sweat, and tears that has gone into the 11 many Triennial Reviews that this 12 Commission has gone through to set forth 13 all these stream segments, and we are now 14 coming up with this entirely new concept 15 of the Pajarito Plateau here, which is not 16 a stream segment. 17 I hope somebody can explain how this works in our rules for us here. 18 19 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: We have 2 20 more witnesses to hear from, including the 21 NMED. 2.2 COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I would 23 love to hear from them. 24 O. I was a little confused in the 25 changes you proposed, if I can find them,

```
1
    and I probably can't now, but in J(2)
 2.
    of.900 -- and you may not be the best
    witness to answer this question, but
 3
 4
    that's great. Let me see if I can find
 5
    what I was looking for here.
 6
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Page 50
 7
    maybe.
          COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I was
 8
 9
    looking at the Petition here, page 3 of
10
    the Petition.
11
          MS. OLSON: I believe it's Bates
12
    number Petitioner 0411 of Exhibit 2 for a
13
    cross-reference.
14
       O. BY COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: You have
15
    "Use-Specific Numeric Criteria J," and
16
    then "(2)" is:
17
                  "Notes applicable to the
18
              Table..."; okay?
19
              It says: "(a): When the
20
              letter 'a' is indicated, the
21
              criteria is based on receiving
2.2
              water characteristics," et
23
    cetera.
24
              Now is that based only on
25
    copper?
```

1 A. Yes. 2. O. Okay. Well that Table has a whole 3 lot of "(a)'s" in it which are little. 4 A. No it's: "(a): Copper; Chromium"; 5 various assorted metals. It was modified, I believe to 6 7 the best of my knowledge, to remove the "Hardness" specificity because we'll be 8 switching to using other parameters 9 10 besides just "Hardness." 11 Q. All right. But I thought we were 12 just talking about copper here. 13 A. Uh-huh. 14 Q. Now we are applying this to all the 15 other metals. 16 A. No, that's not what I'm saying. 17 Q. Okay. But that little letter "a" --18 19 A. Sure. 20 Q. -- appears next to a whole bunch of 21 other metals in that Table. 2.2 A. Uh-huh. 23 It was just to remove the 24 specificity because our criteria will be 25 based on other parameters besides just

<u></u>

1 It won't modify the other "Hardness." 2. ones. 3 Q. Okay. Okay. 4 A. To make it more generic. 5 O. Just here's a little nib: 6 In J1 you refer to the end of 7 that sentence. Subjection (a) through (i), (k), (l), and (m) of this Section I 8 9 think are brethren. They State Records 10 Center doesn't like you to use this 11 Section anymore, they want you to put the 12 actual number of the Section, but that's a 13 holdover from a long time ago in this 14 I hate for them to reject our Rule. 15 submittal --16 That's an interesting MS. OLSON: 17 point, Commissioner Brancard, because we 18 are not proposing to modify that language; 19 that's the existing language in the 20 regulation. 21 COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Right. 2.2 MS. OLSON: I don't know what the 23 State Records -- you know, when you modify a Section, if they propose changes to 24 25 other not-modified language; I guess we'll

1	find out.
2	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: You're
3	forewarned that they may.
4	MS. OLSON: That's an interesting
5	point.
6	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I don't see
7	that as a substantive change, so thank
8	you.
9	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Thank
10	you.
11	Commissioner Vigil.
12	COMMISSIONER VIGIL: I have no
13	questions; thank you.
14	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
15	On the platform, Commissioner
16	Frey.
17	COMMISSIONER FREY: Thank you.
18	
19	EXAMINATION
20	BY COMMISSIONER FREY:
21	Q. I have a few questions that they
22	really relate to the changes in the
23	Administrative Code. Should I try them
24	with you, or do we want those questions to
25	be directed to one of the other witnesses?

<u></u>

A. It depends on what the question is. 1 2. O. Okay. Well my first question I 3 4 suspect is going to be best answered by the next witness, but since Commissioner 5 6 Brancard brought this up, on that same 7 Section -- what is the number -- J, and I think it's J(2)(a), it's changing the 8 9 language from "the criterion is 10 Hardness-Based, " so on and so forth, to 11 the criterion "as based on receiving water 12 characteristics." 13 What does that phrase mean; 14 "receiving water characteristics"? 15 A. Sure. 16 For example, with our NPDES 17 Permit, the individual Permit, it would be 18 the "receiving waters" of that Permit. 19 O. I still don't get it, I'm sorry. 20 You mean the water received to 21 accept the Permit, or during the Permit? 22 A. So the water from each of our 23 outfalls, if you will, is "received" by a 24 stream downstream. 25 Q. Okay.

<u></u>

1 A. And the -- yeah, okay. 2. O. Okay. That helps. Thank you. 3 A. Sure. 4 Q. I suspect my other question -- I 5 can't find it, so that's all my questions. 6 Thank you. 7 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 8 Thank you. 9 Commissioner Harms. 10 COMMISSIONER HARMS: I have no 11 questions; thank you. 12 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 13 Thank you. 14 Ms. Olson, do you have any 15 Redirect? 16 MS. OLSON: I do not have any Redirect for this witness. 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 18 19 Well this is an excellent time 20 to stop for lunch. When we return at 21 1:00, prior to moving to our next 2.2 technical witness, I will invite Public 23 Comment and accept any that is to be 24 given. If there is none to be given, or 25 when we have completed Public Comment, we

1 will return to the Technical case. 2. Let's come back at 1:00. Thank 3 you. 4 (The Water Quality Control 5 Commission Technical Hearing recessed from 6 11:56 a.m. 1:09 p.m.) 7 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. Let's prepare to begin again, please. 8 9 We are back after our lunch 10 break in WOCC 24-31. We have come to the 11 time we have reserved in the event there 12 is Public Comment to be given. 13 Let me ask first if there is anyone in the room who is here to offer 14 15 Non-Technical Public Comment; please just 16 raise your hands. 17 No. Is there anyone on the platform 18 19 who is with us at this time to offer 2.0 Public Comment? 21 Please turn on your camera, 22 raise your hand, or otherwise indicate 23 through chat that you would like to offer 24 comment. 25 No.

<u></u>

1	Lisa, would you say something,
2	please?
3	INTERPRETER O'GRADY: Yes, Spanish
4	interpretation services are available.
5	If you are on line, if you want
6	to choose your language channel, there is
7	a globe at the bottom left corner of your
8	screen, and you can click that and choose
9	"English" or "Spanish."
10	(Speaking Spanish.)
11	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you
12	very much.
13	INTERPRETER O'GRADY: There is
14	Spanish Interpreter services for who is
15	present if anybody would like it.
16	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you
17	very much.
18	All right. It appears that we
19	do not have anyone here to offer Public
20	Comment either in the room or on the
21	platform. I will ask once more before we
22	adjourn, which may or may not be before
23	5:00 p.m. Please listen for that
24	opportunity.
25	Let's return to the Technical

1	case.
2	Ms. Olson.
3	MS. OLSON: Thank you, Madam
4	Hearing Officer. We would like to call
5	our next witness, Barry Fulton.
6	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Mr. Fulton,
7	do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
9	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you
10	very much.
11	Go ahead Ms. Olson.
12	
13	BARRY FULTON,
14	after having been first duly sworn,
15	was examined and testified as follows:
16	
17	EXAMINATION
18	BY MS. OLSON:
19	Q. Thank you Madam Hearing Officer.
20	Mr. Fulton, can you please
21	state and spell your name for the record.
22	A. Yeah, my name is Barry Fulton;
23	B-A-R-Y F-U-L-T-O-N.
24	Q. What is your current profession?
25	A. I am an environmental consultant

1 and owner of Benchmark Environmental, an 2. affiliate of Windward Environmental. 3 Q. Do you have before you what has 4 been identified as Petitioners' Exhibit 4? 5 A. Yes. O. Do you recognize that document as 6 7 your Prefiled Technical Testimony? 8 A. I do. 9 Q. Was that testimony drafted by you 10 or under your supervision? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Do you have any corrections to your 13 testimony? 14 A. I do. I have one correction to 15 make: 16 On page 14, line 20, there is a 17 reference to an exhibit, and the reference 18 to that exhibit on line 20, page 14, to be 19 changed to "Exhibit 13." 2.0 MS. OLSON: Just for the benefit of the Court Reporter, that's Bates number 21 2.2 Petitioners 0446, and so we're striking 23 the number "14" and replacing it with the 24 number "13." 25 O. With that correction is the

1 testimony that you prepared true and 2. accurate to the best of your knowledge and 3 belief? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. If you were asked those same questions today under oath would your 6 7 answers be the same? 8 A. Yes. 9 Madam Hearing Officer, MS. OLSON: 10 N3B offers Petitioners' Exhibit 4. 11 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pause for 12 objections. 13 Exhibit 4 is admitted. 14 (Water Quality Control Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 4 15 16 was received in evidence.) 17 MS. OLSON: Then I'll take a quick minute to walk through the rest of our 18 19 exhibits. 20 Q. Mr. Fulton, do you have before you 21 what's previously been marked as 2.2 Petitioners' Exhibit 6? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Do you recognize that as your 25 Resumé?

1 A. Yes. 2 O. Is that a true and accurate copy of 3 your Resumé? 4 A. It is, yes. 5 MS. OLSON: Madam Hearing Officer, N3B offers Petitioners Hearing Exhibit 6. 6 7 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause for objections. 8 9 Exhibit 6 is admitted. 10 (Water Quality Control 11 Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 6 was received in evidence.) 12 13 Q. BY MS. OLSON: Moving to Exhibit 1, 14 do you have before you what's been identified as Exhibit 1? 15 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Can you identify what that document 18 is. 19 A. It's referred to as the 20 "Demonstration Report," and it provides 21 the Technical and regulatory foundation 2.2 for the proposed Site-Specific Water 23 Quality Criteria. 24 O. Were you involved in the 25 preparation of this document?

1 A. Yes, I was. 2 Madam Hearing Officer, MS. OLSON: 3 N3B offers Petitioners' Exhibit 1. 4 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause 5 for objections. Exhibit 1 is admitted. 6 7 (Water Quality Control Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 1 8 9 was received in evidence.) 10 O. BY MS. OLSON: Do you have before you what has previously been identified as 11 12 Petitioners Exhibit 9? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Can you please identify that 15 document? A. Exhibit 9 is the Work Plan for 16 17 developing the proposed Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria. It just describes 18 19 the planning, coordination, and the time line behind developing such proposed 20 21 amendments. 22 Madam Hearing Officer, MS. OLSON: 23 N3B offers Petitioners' Exhibit 9. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause 25 for objections.

Exhibit 9 is admitted. 1 2 (Water Quality Control 3 Commission Technical Hearing N3B Exhibit 9 4 was received in evidence.) 5 O. BY MS. OLSON: Do you have before you what's been identified as Petitioners' 6 7 Exhibit 10? A. Yes, I do. 8 9 Q. Can you identify what that document 10 is. 11 A. Exhibit 10 is EPA's 2007 Copper 12 criteria, and it is the basis for the 13 proposed Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria. 14 15 MS. OLSON: Madam Hearing Officer, 16 N3B offers Petitioners Exhibit 10. 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause for objections. 18 19 Exhibit 10 is admitted. 20 (Water Quality Control Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 21 2.2 10 was received in evidence.) 23 O. BY MS. OLSON: Do you have before 24 you what's been identified as Petitioners' 25 Exhibit 11?

1 A. Yes. 2. O. Can you identify what that document 3 is. 4 A. Exhibit 11 is EPA's 1996 Copper 5 criteria commonly referred to throughout the testimonies as the "Hardness-Based" 6 7 criteria. O. What's the relevance to our 8 9 Petition? 10 A. It sort of forms the rationale for 11 why we're proposing an update of 12 Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria 13 because it is the current statewide 14 criteria from which we're changing. 15 MS. OLSON: Madam Hearing Officer, 16 N3B oars Petitioners Exhibit 11. 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pause for 18 objections. 19 Exhibit 11 is admitted. 20 (Water Quality Control Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 21 2.2 11 was received in evidence.) 23 O. BY MS. OLSON: Mr. Fulton, do you 24 have before you what's been identified as 25 Petitioners Exhibit 12?

1 A. Yes, I do. 2 O. Can you identify what that document 3 is. 4 A. Exhibit 12 is Technical Testimony from the New Mexico Environment Department 5 during the prior Triennial Review hearing. 6 MS. OLSON: For the record, that's 7 WOCC 20-51R. 8 9 O. Were you a witness in that 10 proceeding? 11 A. I was. 12 O. What is the relevance of this 13 exhibit to the Petition? 14 A. It includes the Department's Petition for why we, the Petitioners, are 15 16 doing this or proposing Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria on a Site-Specific 17 18 basis. 19 Madam Hearing Officer, MS. OLSON: we move to admit Petitioners' Exhibit 12. 20 21 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause 2.2 for objections. 23 Exhibit 12 is admitted. 24 (Water Quality Control Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 25

12 was received in evidence.) 1 2. O. BY MS. OLSON: Do you have before 3 you what's been identified as Petitioners 4 Exhibit 13? 5 A. Yes, I do. O. Can you identify what that document 6 7 is. A. Exhibit 13 is an EPA Approval 8 Letter for another jurisdiction in Georgia 9 10 describing the Approval of Site-Specific 11 Water Quality Criteria for copper. 12 O. What's the relevance to this 13 Petition? 14 A. It just provides additional 15 precedence for the approach that we've 16 taken for developing Site-Specific Water 17 Quality Criteria. MS. OLSON: N3B would offer 18 19 Petitioners Exhibit 13. 20 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pause for 21 objections. 22 Exhibit 13 is admitted. 23 (Water Quality Control 24 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 13 was received in evidence.) 25

Finally do you have 1 O. BY MS. OLSON: 2 before you what's been identified as 3 Petitioners Exhibit 14? 4 A. Yes. 5 O. Can you describe what that document 6 is. 7 A. Exhibit 14 is a 2018 Data Quality Objective, or "DOO," and Data Quality 8 9 Assessment, or "DQA" Report. 10 Q. Why is this document relevant to 11 the Petition? 12 A. It describes in detail the Quality 13 Assessment procedures that the Petitioners 14 conducted to ensure quality data to contribute to the proposed amendments. 15 16 MS. OLSON: Madam Hearing Officer, we move to admit Petitioners' Exhibit 14. 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: 18 We will pause for objection. 19 20 Exhibit 14 is admitted. 21 (Water Quality Control 2.2 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 23 14 was received in evidence.) 24 MS. OLSON: I believe that constitutes admission of all of our 25

1	exhibits.
2	Mr. Fulton has also prepared a
3	summary of his Direct Testimony. You all,
4	I believe, received the corresponding
5	demonstrative PowerPoint through Dropbox.
6	I will pass it to him to present that
7	summary.
8	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
9	MS. OLSON: We're having technical
LO	issues.
11	We're going to rejoin the
L2	meeting.
L3	Ms. Jones can let us back in
L4	the meeting? Just one second.
L5	MS. JONES: Okay. You should be
L6	able to Share Screen.
L7	THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
L8	Thank you, Madam Hearing
L9	Officer, Chair Thomson, and members of the
20	Committee:
21	Thanks for your time today, and
22	I appreciate also the opportunity to
23	present my testimony in front of you guys
24	today:
25	Again my name is Barry Fulton.

1 I am an environmental consultant with Benchmark Environmental, an affiliate of 2. 3 Windward Environmental. I played a role, 4 as I will discuss today, in developing the 5 proposed Site-Specific Water Quality 6 Criteria. 7 To start off with just the topics for discussion today that's covered 8 9 in my Direct Testimony, my written 10 testimony, as well as the slides that will 11 summarize my written testimony, I'll begin 12 with just an introduction, including my 13 role in the proposed amendments, and a 14 description and summary of the rationale and the regulatory background for 15 16 developing the proposed Site-Specific 17 Water Quality Criteria. 18 COMMISSIONER MOANDER: Mr. Fulton, 19 can you go full screen on that for us? 20 Thank you. 21 THE WITNESS: Unfortunately, 2.2 Commissioner --23 MS. OLSON: I have a copy of it. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: The Slide 25 show may be --

```
It shows up on his
 1
          MS. OLSON:
 2.
    screen; it won't...
 3
          COMMISSIONER MOANDER:
                                  Don't worry
 4
    about it, Mr. Fulton; I found a
 5
    workaround.
                 Thank you.
 6
          THE WITNESS: After getting into
 7
    and describing the rationale and the
    regulatory background for the proposed
 8
 9
    amendments, I'll talk in detail about just
10
    the development of the copper
11
    Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria that
12
    is proposed for the geographic area
13
    referred to as the "Pajarito Plateau," and
14
    kind of conclude with recommendations to
15
    the Commission with regard to adoption of
16
    the proposed Site-Specific Water Quality
17
    Criteria.
              An introduction for myself:
18
19
              Again my name is Barry Fulton.
20
    I have undergraduate degrees in Ecology
21
    and Environmental Science, as well as a
22
    Masters Degree in Environmental
23
    Toxicology.
24
              My professional experience
25
    includes 20 years as a research scientist,
```

as well as environmental consultant with a 1 2. particular focus on water quality 3 standards, and specifically water quality 4 criteria for metals. 5 My Resumé is provided as 6 Exhibit 6. 7 My role in the current proposal include the Technical lead for the 8 9 development of the proposed copper Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria for 10 11 the Pajarito Plateau, which included 12 authorship of the Work Plan for the 13 Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria and 14 authorship of the Demonstration Report, which again kind of provides the Technical 15 16 and regulatory foundation for the 17 proposal, as well as participation in presentations to various stakeholders, 18 19 including NMED, the public, and tribes, as 20 summarized previously in Dr. White's 21 testimony, which is provided as Exhibit 3. 22 The overall rationale I'd sav 23 for the proposed Site-Specific Water 24 Quality Criteria is to ensure that the 25 Copper Criteria applicable to the Pajarito

1	Plateau is based on the best available
2	science and current EPA recommendations.
3	Our objective here was to
4	incorporate copper Site-Specific Water
5	Quality Criteria for the Plateau,
6	according to EPA's most current
7	recommended national criteria for copper
8	published in 2007, as well as in
9	accordance with procedures set forth in
LO	20.6.4.10 NMAC for developing Site-
11	Specific Water Quality criteria in the
L2	State of New Mexico.
L3	This Slide kind of further
L4	describes the rationale for developing the
15	proposed Site-Specific Water Quality
L6	Criteria via a comparison of the current
L7	Statewide criteria shown on the left-hand
18	side of the Slide, relative to how that
L9	differs from the proposed Site-Specific
20	Water Quality Criteria.
21	The current statewide Water
22	Quality criteria for copper are outdated
23	EPA criteria published back in 1996. They
24	are referred to commonly as "Hardness-
25	Based" criteria because they only take

1	into account the effect that water
2	Hardness which is really just the sum
3	of calcium and magnesium in the water
4	has on the bioavailability and toxicity of
5	copper to Aquatic Life.
6	EPA has since concluded, since
7	it has published the Hardness-Based
8	criteria and moved on to what is referred
9	to the "Biotic Ligand Model" criteria,
10	that the older Hardness-Based criteria can
11	be either overprotective or
12	underproductive based on the particular
13	water chemistry of a given water body.
14	For those reasons, and based on
15	decades of research in aquatic toxicology
16	and chemistry, EPA, in 2007, published the
17	copper Biotic Ligand Model. That is the
18	basis of their current recommended Copper
19	Criteria. It is also the basis for the
20	proposed Site-Specific Water Quality
21	Criteria in front of the Commission today.
22	Our proposed criteria, instead
23	of just incorporating water Hardness, also
24	considers the effect of multiple other
25	water chemistry parameters, including

1 Dissolved Organic Carbon or DOC, pH, as 2. well as Hardness. These are the 3 most influential water chemistry parameters 3 with regard to how copper behaves in 4 surface water, and ultimately interacts to 5 6 cause toxicity to Aquatic Life. 7 The proposal utilizes equations, as I'll talk about in my 8 9 testimony, to replicate EPA's software-10 based model, which is the referred to as 11 the Biotic Ligand Model or "BLM," because 12 we were more comprehensively taking into 13 account water chemistry parameters beyond 14 just Hardness. It provides a more scientifically rigorous and up-to-date 15 16 method to establish criteria to protect 17 Aquatic Life. 18 And so, you know, you've heard 19 the term "Hardness-Based" criteria. It is 2.0 the basis of the current Statewide 21 criteria. 22 Just for reference, this is a 23 visual representation of the current 24 statewide Hardness-Based criteria, along 25 with the actual equations from NMAC for

1 the Hardness-Based criteria. It's showing 2. an "Acute" criterion element for shortterm exposures, and a "Chronic" criterion 3 4 element for longer-term exposures. That is consistent with the "Aquatic Life" 5 6 criteria for all constituents. We always have an "Acute" and "Chronic" criterion 7 8 element. 9 On the X axis, or horizontal 10 axis, is Hardness on this particular 11 figure, and the vertical or Y axis is the "Copper" criteria values based on the 12 13 "Hardness" criteria. 14 You can see in the figure that 15 as Hardness increases, so does the magnitude or numeric value of the 16 Hardness-Based criteria, because Hardness 17 18 has an affect on the bioavailability and 19 toxicity of copper. 20 Importantly, however, water 21 chemistry parameters beyond Hardness, 22 including Dissolved Organic Carbon and pH, 23 have equal or greater affect on the 24 toxicity of copper. By not incorporating 25 other water chemistry parameters into the

1 Copper Criteria we end up with criteria 2. that doesn't accurately account for the 3 toxicity of copper in a given water. 4 This Slide just kind of depicts the EPA's history of nationally 5 6 recommended Water Quality criteria for 7 copper going back to 1976, commonly referred to as the Red Book criteria. 8 All9 the way through 1996 EPA recommended 10 Hardness-Based criteria for copper, 11 similar to the equations that I just 12 showed you. That evolved somewhat over time, but they were always just based on 13 14 the input of copper utilizing, you know, 15 an equation that is in a similar format. 16 In 2007 EPA transitioned to 17 what is referred to as the copper Biotic Ligand Model, or BLM-based criteria, again 18 in response to a growing body of 19 20 scientific research that clearly 21 demonstrates multiple water chemistry 22 parameters affect the toxicity of copper. 23 Just a point of clarification 24 here: 25 You will see in this Slide

1 under "1996," I'm referring to the statewide criteria as "1996 EPA criteria." 2. 3 The cover page of that criteria is 4 entitled "1995 Updates," and people commonly refer to it as the 1995 criteria. 5 It was published in January 1996, so that 6 7 is why we are calling it the 1996 criteria. 8 9 Some additional regulatory 10 background: 11 With regard to the 12 Hardness-Based criteria EPA has concluded, 13 for reasons that I've already alluded to, 14 and that I'll go into greater detail 15 throughout my testimony, that the 16 Hardness-Based criteria are potentially 17 underprotective, so not stringent enough, 18 or overprotective, or too stringent 19 depending on the full water chemistry of a 20 particular watt water body. 21 In contrast the EPA has 22 concluded and shown that Copper Criteria 23 calculated using the Biotic Ligand Model 24 will more accurately yield the level of 25 protection needed to protect and maintain

1	Aquatic Life Uses.
2	Some additional regulatory
3	background here:
4	During the last Triennial
5	Review in New Mexico in 2020 EPA had
6	provided comments that recommended that
7	New Mexico adopt the EPA 2007 copper
8	Biotic Ligand Model. In respond the
9	Department, while they recognize the EPA's
10	2007 criteria provides a more accurate
11	assessment of copper bioavailability, they
12	decided not to adopt it statewide at that
13	time primarily because the State lacked
14	such water quality criteria, or water
15	quality data to adopt it on a statewide
16	basis. However they would continue to
17	evaluate it on a segment-specific basis.
18	Importantly though, as
19	Dr. White has testified previously, the
20	Surface Waters on the Pajarito Plateau
21	have been rigorously monitored for all of
22	the BLM parameters necessary to generate
23	BLM-based criteria. It is a suitable
24	setting for adopting criteria that are
25	calculated based on the copper Biotic

Ligand Model.
20.6.4.10(F) NMAC specifies
that:
"Site-Specific Water Quality
Criteria may be developed based
on relevant site-specific
conditions," which are listed
here in this Slide. One such condition is
that:
"The physical or chemical
characteristics of a water body
alter or affect the
bioavailability or toxicity of
a chemical."
That's certainly true of
copper. We know that water chemistry
parameters, other than Hardness, have an
important affect on copper bioavailability
and toxicity.
20.6.4.10(F) NMAC also states
that a derivation of Site- Specific Water
Quality criteria needs to rely on a
scientifically-defensible method. It
lists several potential methods, one of
which is the copper Biotic Ligand Model.

1	As I mentioned, that's the
2	basis of EPA's current recommended
3	criteria, and the basis of the criteria
4	that's proposed by the Petitioners.
5	I want to provide some
6	background on what the copper Biotic
7	Ligand Model actually is:
8	The BLM itself is a software
9	tool used in aquatic toxicology to
LO	evaluate the bioavailability of metals in
11	Surface Water, or in the aquatic
L2	environment, and the affinity of metals to
L3	accumulate and therefore cause toxicity to
L4	Aquatic Life. It is based on the best
15	available science, and again, it is the
L6	basis of this EPA 2007 criteria.
L7	The schematic shown here in
18	this Slide highlights the 3 primary
L9	mechanisms by which water quality or water
20	chemistry has an effect on the
21	bioavailability and toxicity of copper.
22	I'll start by just kind of describing what
23	is a "Biotic Ligand."
24	An example of this would be
25	like the gill of a fish or an aquatic

1 It is the site of uptake in invertebrate. an organism. It is a site where a given 2. 3 element, in this case copper, could bind 4 to the organism and therefore be 5 accumulated or incorporated, and thus be able to elicit a toxic affect. 6 The 3 mechanisms are depicted 7 in this schematic. Those mechanisms are 8 9 commonly referred to as "Competition," 10 "Speciation," or "Complexation." 11 Let's start with what is 12 referred to as the "Competition pathway." 13 That's shown by this green oval where you 14 see: 15 "Ca; Mq." 16 That's stands for "calcium" and 17 "magnesium." That is representing water 18 Hardness. 19 The way in which water Hardness 20 has an impact mechanically with water 21 toxicity is they interact with copper for 22 binding sites on the gill of a fish or the 23 gill of an aquatic invertebrate. That's 24 why, in the case of the Hardness-Based 25 criteria, as Hardness increases, the

<u></u>

1 Copper Criteria increases and copper is becoming less bioavailable, less toxic as 2. 3 you have more Hardness, because more 4 calcium and magnesium ions in solution to 5 compete with copper for uptake. 6 That's the "Competition 7 Pathway." Again the Hardness-Based criteria is only reflecting that pathway. 8 9 Equally, or more important 10 pathways include Speciation or 11 Complexation. 12 Speciation is represented here 13 by "pH." "pH" is kind of how acetic or 14 how basic a Surface Water is. 15 pH has a significant affect on 16 metal solubility, and therefore 17 bioavailability, including copper. Acetic 18 pHs, or as pHs drop below 7 or 6, more 19 free copper is available. Copper 20 disassociates in Surface Water, and the 21 free copper, or copper ion, dominates in 22 the water column. That means it's more 23 soluble or more available for uptake to an 24 organism. 25 That's the Speciation pathway.

1 That's why we see, in really acetic water, 2. copper is more bioavailable or more toxic 3 to organisms. 4 Conversely, as pH increases 5 above 7, the solubility of copper 6 deceases. As pH increases above 7, 7 alkalinity also increases. That forms more carbonates that are available to bind 8 9 with copper and become less bioavailable. 10 So the pH, that's the 11 Speciation pathway. 12 The final pathway would be 13 referred to as the "Complexation Pathway." 14 That's indicated here with the blue oval that has "DOC" in it. 15 16 "DOC" is Dissolved Organic 17 Carbon. That's just organic material that's dissolved in water that's 18 19 impermeable to biological membranes. 20 The significance here is that 21 Dissolved Organic Carbon or Dissolved 22 Organic Material in the water has a high 23 affinity to bind with copper. When copper 24 is in the water along side DOC, copper 25 really likes to bind to DOC. Once bound

to DOC it's not available to bind to the 1 2. Biotic Ligand Model, and therefore it's 3 not available for uptake into the 4 organism. 5 As a result, as DOC in the water increases, more copper is bound to 6 7 the DOC and less copper is available for 8 uptake, so copper toxicity deceases as 9 Dissolved Organic Carbon increases. 10 The proposed Site-Specific 11 Water Quality Criteria today is 12 incorporating these 3 mechanisms. It is 13 incorporating Dissolved Organic Carbon to 14 account for the Complexation pathway, pH 15 to account for the Speciation pathway, and 16 of course calcium and magnesium to account 17 for the Competition pathway. It does account for a more scientifically rigorous 18 19 method for calculating Copper Criteria, 20 and certainly an improvement over the Hardness-Based criteria. 21 22 Continuing on with the BLM it 23 itself, I mentioned it is software. 24 is just a screenshot of the user interface to the BLM software. 25

1	If one were to run the BLM
2	software they would take their water
3	chemistry parameters and they would plug
4	it into the software, but they would first
5	go through the training to figure out how
6	to use the software. They would then plug
7	their water chemistry parameters into the
8	software, run the software, and the
9	software would spit out a Copper Criteria
10	value.
11	What's really important,
12	however, is that the software has 10 input
13	parameters to run the BLM model. What's
14	important is that not all 10 of these
15	parameters have an important impact on the
16	BLM-based criteria, or have an important
17	impact on the toxicity or bioavailability
18	of copper. For that reason the BLM
19	software itself can be simplified into an
20	equation consistent in format with other
21	equations for water quality criteria.
22	In doing so, or simplifying the
23	BLM into an equation format does offer
24	several advantages over utilizing the
25	Copper BLM software itself:

1	One is that an equation is
2	familiar and can be readily incorporated
3	into Water Quality Standards.
4	It's transparent as well.
5	Folks can see an equation and they can run
6	and calculate what the Copper Criteria
7	would be rather than having to have
8	special access to the software and the
9	special training required to run the
10	software.
11	Dr. White mentioned or gave a
12	brief overview of the lengthy kind of
13	public outreach we did in this process.
14	Early in that process the feedback we got
15	was the BLM is kind of this Black Box
16	because you can't see what's going on
17	inside of it. It's hard to have access
18	to. You have to have special training to
19	run it, and so it's not very transparent.
20	That is another advantage to expressing
21	the BLM software criteria in an equation
22	format.
23	Of course equations don't
24	require special training to run, like the
25	software does. Equations focusing on the

1 3 key parameters, rather than the 10 parameters, streamlines monitoring 2. 3 assessment because they are really focused 4 on the key parameters that are controlling 5 Copper Criteria, and the bioavailability 6 and toxicity of copper in Surface waters. 7 This Slide just sort of 8 overviews the process that we undertook to 9 develop the proposed Site-Specific Water 10 Ouality Criteria. We applied an EPA 11 process referred to as the Data Quality 12 Objective/Data Quality Assessment process 13 or DQO/DQA process. Again, that's an EPA 14 It's designed to go through a 15 systematic review of data to ensure that 16 the data is of good quality for the 17 intended purpose. After going through that 18 19 process we ended up with a total of 517 20 samples of sufficient quality data that 21 contained all the parameters necessary to 22 calculated Copper Criteria utilizing the 23 BLM software. 24 We then took all of those 517 25 samples that were validated and run

1 through the DQO/DQA process, input them 2. into the BLM software itself, and then ran 3 the software model to generate BLM 4 software criteria. We then conducted statistical 5 6 evaluations of those BLM software criteria 7 to determine which parameters are really controlling the BLM criteria across, in 8 9 this case, the Pajarito Plateau. 10 evaluation showed, and I'll show these in 11 subsequent slides, that a combination of 12 Dissolved Organic Carbon, DOC, pH, and 13 Hardness had the most significant overall 14 impact on the BLM software criteria. 15 Therefore we developed what is 16 called Multiple Linear Regression 17 Equations, or "MLR Equations," with 3 independent variabilities -- DOC, pH, and 18 19 Hardness -- that were shown to accurately 2.0 calculate BLM-based criteria across the 21 range of conditions that are observed 22 along the Pajarito Plateau. 23 This Slide here is kind of 24 showing the output of the process that we 25 went through, most of which Dr. White

1 described earlier in terms of the sampling 2. locations, the number of samples, the time 3 period. 4 On the right it's showing the spatial distribution of the samples. 5 is a map that was presented previously by 6 Dr. White, and is shows the locations of 7 where those 517 samples came from. 8 9 The figure on the left is 10 showing the number or the count of samples 11 by year going back to 2005. It is a bar 12 chart, and the stacks to the bar chart are 13 color-coded by watershed. 14 You can see by kind of 15 combining the figure to the right that 16 shows partially where those locations are, 17 and the figure to the left that shows kind of frequency and duration from which we 18 19 collected samples, that we have a very 20 spatially and temporally robust data set 21 that went into developing these proposed 22 equations. 23 An example of kind of what it 24 is that we're proposing versus what the 25 current statewide criteria is, the current

statewide criteria is kind of illustrated 1 2. here in the top row of this schematic 3 where the copper Water Quality Criteria, 4 or "WOC," is calculated solely as a 5 function of Hardness; again going back to that older EPA 1996 criteria. 6 7 The proposed Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria for the Pajarito 8 9 Plateau is in equation format including 3 10 parameters, pH, DOC, and Hardness, that 11 were developed to replicate the EPA 2007 12 criteria. 13 These are the actual proposed equations that we're proposing as 14 15 amendments: 16 There is an "Acute" and a 17 Chronic criteria element. These are just the numerical equations for both those 18 19 criteria elements. 20 As I'll show, in subsequent 21 slides here, we validated and determined 22 that these equations performed really 23 What I mean by "performed well," is 24 it accurately calculated BLM software 25 criteria regardless of hydrologic regime.

1 It worked well or performed well across ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial 2. 3 streams on the Pajarito Plateau. 4 Therefore it can be applied to surface 5 waters on the Pajarito Plateau regardless of whether or not they are ephemeral, 6 intermittent, or perennial. 7 The next Slide here is 8 9 illustrating the accuracy with which our 10 equations are calculating the BLM software 11 criteria. There is a figure on the left 12 for the Acute comparison, and a figure to 13 the right for the Chronic comparison. 14 On each figure, on the horizontal axis is our MLR-based criteria, 15 16 so our proposed equation, and the vertical axis is the BLM software criteria. 17 18 is a solid diagonal line here, that's not 19 a regression line. That's a line 20 representing a 1-to-1 fit or perfect 21 agreement between the software and the 22 proposed equations. 23 You can see that the sample 24 points -- these are our 517 samples that I 25 mentioned previously -- are tightly bound

1 along that solid line representing perfect agreement, with no systematic bias in 2. 3 terms of overprediction or underprediction. You can see here there 4 is an adjusted R2 of 0.98. 5 That indicates 6 a combination of DOC, pH, and Hardness are 7 accounting for 98% of the variation in the BLM-based software across the range of 8 9 conditions for the Pajarito Plateau. 10 is a highly accurate and precise set of 11 equations to generate this software 12 criteria. 13 As a further step or additional 14 step to further validate our equations we looked at different combinations and 15 concentration ranges of key parameters. 16 17 This is a difficult graph to evaluate in detail just given the size of the slides, 18 19 but I can kind of walk through the method 2.0 here and the outcome. 21 We looked at different 22 concentration ranges for pH, DOC, and 23 Hardness, and combinations of those. 24 is what is represented in the 3 panels. The BLM criteria are shown as dashed lines 25

1 and open circles. 2. The Site-Specific Water Quality 3 Criteria equations are shown as solid 4 lines and triangles. You will see a series of 5 6 different plots, blue, red, and green 7 plots, which represent the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentile for each parameter of the 8 9 site-specific BLM data set. 10 On the X axis, the horizontal 11 axis of each graph we're showing the 5th 12 and 95th percentile of each parameter in 13 the site-scientific data set. 14 The key takeaway here is that it's hard to differentiate a dashed line 15 16 from a solid line, and that's because they 17 are plotting on top of one another 18 generally. That is just indicating that 19 regardless of the concentration range, or 20 the combination of parameters, the 21 equations are replicating, with high 22 accuracy, the BLM software. 23 The one where that maybe 24 diverges a little bit is the panel on the 25 bottom where we're comparing the 2 models

across different Hardness concentrations 1 2. on the x axes. 3 You can see on the bottom here 4 the solid lines are falling below the 5 dashed and open-circle lines. Those solid 6 lines and solid triangles, those are the Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria. 7 Those are below what the BLM software are 8 9 predicting, so they are more conservative 10 than what the BLM software would generate. 11 I spent some time here kind of 12 talking through both the BLM software and 13 then the methods and the process that we 14 went through to develop equations to 15 generate BLM software criteria. I just 16 want to touch on kind of in general the 17 use of these MLR or Multiple Linear 18 Regression Equations to generate criteria, 19 and there is precedence out there for 20 doing this. 21 EPA recommended "Aquatic Life 22 Criteria, " for example, for ammonia and 23 copper, they are based on Multiple Linear Regression Equations. 24 The equation for aluminum 25

1 utilizes DOC, pH, and Hardness, like we're 2. proposing. EPA has, in other 3 4 jurisdictions, approved equations similar 5 to ours that are simplifying or accurately 6 calculating the BLM-based software in an 7 equation format. And finally EPA has come out 8 9 and really made the point that these MLR 10 equations are scientifically defensible 11 approaches to calculate metal criteria for 12 Aquatic Life. 13 I have kind of touched on the 14 advantages of equations versus software for calculating criteria, and you will see 15 16 here again, and I'll just reiterate them 17 very quickly: 18 Equations are transparent. 19 They are familiar to folks. They can be 20 readily and easily incorporated into the 21 Water Quality Standards. 22 Software is pretty complex and 23 pretty complex to implement and incorporate into Water Quality Standards. 24 25 Equations don't require

1 training or special access to software. 2. Equations also avoids potential issues 3 with different versions of that software. 4 Finally, expressing Site-5 Specific Water Quality Criteria as 6 equations based on 3 parameters really 7 does streamline how we monitor and how we would assess copper, because again we're 8 9 focusing on the 3 parameters that are 10 really controlling the Copper Criteria 11 values. 12 So wrapping up here with this 13 Slide, and I think I have one more Slide 14 after this, for recommendations to the 15 Commission: 16 What we would recommend for 17 spatial boundaries for the Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria is shown here in 18 19 this figure. It is Surface waters within 20 the Pajarito Plateau watershed. 21 I want to clarify from 22 Commissioner Brancard, I think he had some 23 questions previously. I want to clarify 24 that we're not creating a new segment of water bodies within NMAC. We're just 25

1	defining
2	Part of the process for
3	developing Site-Specific Criteria is
4	defining the boundary for the sites, or
5	defining the boundary for which the
6	Site-Specific Criteria would apply.
7	So the proposed boundary in
8	this case is essentially the Surface
9	Waters from which we collected the samples
LO	and developed the equations, the
11	Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria
L2	equations. That boundary is kind of
L3	listed here in italic font:
L4	"From Guaje Canyon in the
15	north, to the Rito de los
L6	Frijoles watershed in the
L7	south, from their headwaters to
18	their confluence with the Rio
L9	Grande, and all tributaries and
20	streams thereto"
21	The final recommendation to the
22	Commission is I would recommend the
23	adoption of the proposed Site-Specific
24	Water Quality Criteria, these equations,
25	as they are based on the best available

1 science, current EPA recommendations, and 2. were really developed based on a robust 3 site-specific study that's outlined in the 4 Demonstration Report, as well as a robust 5 Site-Specific Water Quality data set. 6 Thank you. That concludes my 7 Slides, and I thank you again for your 8 time. 9 O. BY MS. OLSON: Thank you, 10 Mr. Fulton. 11 In light of some of the 12 questioning that we received this morning 13 I just wanted to go over a couple of 14 points that were covered in your slides: 15 I think the Commission has 16 raised questions about the requirement 17 under 10F(2): "The Site-Specific Criteria 18 19 must fully protect the 20 designated uses to which it 21 will apply." 2.2 Can you just reiterate for the 23 Commission what the designated use for which this Site-Specific Copper Criteria 24 25 will apply?

1	A. Yes.
2	The Site-Specific Water Quality
3	Criteria would only apply to the Aquatic
4	Life Use.
5	Q. And is the Proposal that's
6	presented in this Petition fully
7	protective of that designated Aquatic Life
8	Use for Surface Waters within the Pajarito
9	Plateau?
LO	A. Yes.
11	Being based on the best
L2	available science and current EPA
L3	recommendations, the proposed
L4	Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria would
15	be fully protective of Aquatic Life Uses
L6	to which they would apply.
L7	Q. And are there other designated uses
18	for Pajarito Plateau stream segments?
L9	A. Yes, there are.
20	Q. Does the adoption of a
21	Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria for
22	copper impact any of those other
23	designated uses?
24	A. No, it would not.
25	Q. And can you explain to the

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

(CA)

Commission why it has no impact on other designated uses for waters within the Pajarito Plateau? A. Yeah. So again the Proposal is for Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria to protect just the Aquatic Life Uses. designated uses on the Plateau have only Copper Criteria to protect that designated use. For example, drinking water supply would be an example of a designated There is a different Copper Criteria to protect that designated use, but we're not proposing any changes to that drinking water supply criteria. This Proposal is limited in scope to just the Aquatic Life Use for copper. O. When the Commission is evaluating whether or not this particular proposal satisfies that legal requirement under 10F(2), do they need only look at the Aquatic Life designated use and whether this changed to the Site-Specific Water Quality standard for copper applicable to

1 that use continues to be protective? 2. A. That's correct. 3 In that context the primary concern would be does the proposed 4 5 amendments protect the designated use to which it applies. In other words is what 6 7 we're proposing going to protect Aquatic Life Uses? 8 9 MS. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Fulton. 10 Madam Hearing Officer, that 11 concludes our presentation of Mr. Fulton's 12 testimony. We would Tender him for 13 questioning and examination. 14 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you, 15 Mr. Fulton and Ms. Olson. 16 Ms. Scott, do you have 17 questions for Mr. Fulton? 18 MS. SCOTT: No questions. 19 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 20 Mr. Maxwell, do you have 21 questions of Mr. Fulton? 2.2 MR. MAXWELL: I do not have 23 questions for Mr. Fulton. Thank you. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 25 Thank you.

```
Let's start on this side this
 1
 2.
    time:
 3
              Commissioner Vigil.
                                I have no
 4
          COMMISSIONER VIGIL:
    questions, thank you.
 5
 6
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner
 7
    Brancard.
 8
 9
                    EXAMINATION
10
    BY COMMISSIONER BRANCARD:
11
       Q. Okay. So I'm looking at the --
12
    sorry.
13
              I'm looking at the language
14
    proposed, 900L(4).
15
       A. Yeah.
16
       O. In the first paragraph there it
17
    doesn't mention anything about Aquatic
    Life. I see the 2 examples in (a) and (b)
18
19
    are both Aquatic Life, but it doesn't
2.0
    mention this is limited to Aquatic Life.
21
              Just trying to be as clear as
2.2
    possible about what exactly you're
23
    proposing would be helpful, that's all.
24
       A. I appreciate the question,
    Commissioner Brancard:
25
```

1 Yeah, I believe it is... 2. Yeah, so Subsection (4), or 3 Footnote 4 there, "Copper Criteria for 4 Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters." The 5 first part there is describing the kind of 6 geographic region to which the criteria would apply, and then notes (a) and (b), I 7 think the intent there is to specify it is 8 "Acute Aquatic Life Criteria" and provides 9 10 the equation, and "Chronic Aquatic Life 11 Criteria" and the equation there is 12 provided. 13 O. So this would apply, or those 2 14 equations would apply to all the various subcategories of Aquatic Life that are 15 16 listed above under H? 17 A. Those 2 equations would apply to the subcategories of Aquatic Life Uses 18 19 that exist within the Pajarito Plateau. 2.0 O. There is a number of different 21 Aquatic Life Uses. I assume that these 22 equations would apply to all of them. A. Well yeah, they would apply 23 24 according to the subcategory of Aquatic 25 Life Use. For example, in ephemeral

1 Surface Waters, only the Acute criteria apply, and so the ephemeral waters would 2. 3 be a limited Aquatic Life Use. 4 specifies Acute only criteria, so in such 5 instances the Acute criteria would apply to those particular waters. 6 7 Q. Okay. And I don't know. 8 Again, I 9 asked a previous witness about this, and 10 I'm still scratching my head about it: 11 Looking down at Subsection J, 12 and the change at the bottom of the Table there, J(2), are you familiar with that? 13 14 A. Yes, I am, Commissioner. 15 Q. It says: 16 "When a letter A is 17 indicated in the cell, the criteria and hardnesses 18 19 eliminated and replaced based 20 on receiving water 21 characteristics." 2.2 As I look at the table above, A 23 is used for a number of different metals 24 where there are still Hardness criteria; 25 right?

1	A. Correct.
2	Commissioner, just to clarify,
3	are you reviewing or do you have in front
4	of you the supplement to our Petition?
5	Are you looking at the redline amendments?
6	Q. Yeah, I'm looking at the redline
7	amendments that's in your Exhibit 2.
8	A. Okay. I think the intent there in
9	that 2a states, and just again:
LO	"Where the letter A is
11	indicated in a cell, the
L2	criterion is based on receiving
L3	water characteristics and can
L4	be referenced in Subsection I
15	of 20.6.4.900."
L6	Then we end up with with that
L7	letter A, to your point, being present for
18	elements other than just copper.
L9	Q. Right. Other metals.
20	A. Other metals, yeah.
21	I think the intent there is
22	that Hardness is a receiving water
23	characteristics, as is pH/DOC, and the
24	parameters that we required, Hardness, pH,
25	DOC.

1	I think the intent here is that
2	for metals, the numeric value of the
3	criteria for those metals are calculated
4	based on a receiving water body
5	characteristic, which could include
6	Hardness for waters that are not on the
7	Pajarito Plateau for copper, but for
8	copper, the receiving water
9	characteristics would include those 3
LO	parameters.
11	Q. Okay. And where are the receiving
L2	water characteristics set forth?
L3	A. I'm sorry, Commissioner. Could you
L4	repeat that question?
L5	Q. Well the language that you're
L6	proposing to add is the phrase "receiving
L7	water characteristics," and then it says
18	it can be referenced in Subsection I of
L9	Section .900."
20	Where are the "receiving water
21	characteristics" in Subsection I of
22	Section .900?
23	A. In Subsection I of .900, Subsection
24	I is providing for Hardness-Based metals
25	criteria, and Subsection I is providing

1 the equations, the Hardness-Based 2. equations. 3 Then further down in Subsection 4 I for the Pajarito Plateau, it's providing 5 the equations for the 3 parameters in addition to the Hardness. 6 O. Okay. If I understand what you're 7 saying, and maybe I'm taking a leap here, 8 9 that the phrase "receiving water 10 characteristics, " includes the Hardness criteria combined with the additional 11 12 Pajarito Copper Criteria. That would be what you would call "receiving water 13 14 characteristics"? 15 A. Correct. 16 For Surface Waters outside of 17 the Pajarito Plateau, Hardness would be the "receiving water characteristic" for 18 19 the metals. Then within the Pajarito 20 Plateau for copper, the "receiving water 21 body characteristics" would be those 3 22 parameters. 23 O. Okay. Thank you. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner 25 Velasquez.

1	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: No
2	questions.
3	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Chair
4	Thomson.
5	
6	EXAMINATION
7	BY CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
8	Q. Thank you very much. I appreciate
9	your work.
LO	Did you write or are you the
11	principal author of the Windward reports?
L2	A. Yes, Chairman Thomson.
L3	Q. Thank you.
L4	It's a very nice piece of work,
15	and it appears about 5 different places in
L6	the written testimony, and I've become
L7	quite familiar with it.
18	So in Table 5-3 of the Windward
L9	report, which I think is on page 36, it's
20	a Table that shows the statistical
21	correlation with different parameters.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. You make the point, and the Table
24	makes the point that alkalinity is a more
25	important parameter in the linear

1 regression than DOC. My question is why was alkalinity not included in the model, 2. 3 but DOC was? 4 A. I think these are the Spearman Correlation. 5 6 Thank you for the question 7 first, Chairman: 8 These are the Spearman 9 Correlation analyses, and so these are 10 kind of univariant just comparing a 11 couple, or 2 variables in this case to one 12 another. 13 I think when you take it to a 14 MLR, a multivariant step, alkalinity ended up not being a significant contributor as 15 16 DOC to the BLM-based criteria. 17 Further more, pH and alkalinity 18 are highly correlated with one another, so 19 pH is accounted for and also the affect of 20 alkalinity. 21 Q. Yeah, actually pH and alkalinity 22 can be shown to be quite independent of 23 one another, but that's another 24 conversation, particularly in the really 25 soft waters that they have up in some of

1 these watersheds. 2. Okay. So the Spearman is just 3 the by-variant comparison, whereas with 4 the multilinear regression, multiple variable linear regression showed that DOC 5 6 is more important. A. That's correct, Chair Thomson. 7 I would also agree with your 8 9 comment there that pH and alkalinity can 10 diverge from one another. 11 Q. I'm a alkalinity nerd. 12 A. I think for this particular data 13 set, however, they were highly correlated 14 with one another, which, as you probably 15 know, creates an issue to incorporate 16 multiple variables that correlate with one 17 another. 18 O. Sure. I agree in one watershed, so 19 they are correlated, yeah. 20 Thank you. I appreciate that. 21 This proposed standard is 22 intended to protect invertebrates and 23 invertebrate species, but not plant 24 species, algae, or macrophytes, or 25 anything like that.

1	A. Thank you, again, for the excellent
2	question, Chairman Thomson:
3	The criteria will protect all
4	Aquatic Life, which includes aquatic
5	plants.
6	Again, obviously they are
7	developed to replicate the BLM software
8	criteria, and so when EPA develops
9	criteria for Aquatic Life, including the
10	BLM software for copper, there is an
11	evaluation to ensure that any numeric
12	criteria developed for the Copper BLM in
13	this case would also protect, although
14	it's most directly the calculations are
15	most directly focused on aquatic
16	invertebrates and fish, there is a
17	demonstration that those criteria would
18	also be protective of aquatic plants.
19	Q. Thank you.
20	I scanned the EPA 2007 report,
21	but I just ran out of time, but there is
22	some protection against the plants.
23	That's good. Thank you.
24	Because some plant species are
25	especially sensitive to copper, although I

<u></u>

1 created a spreadsheet, and the copper 2. concentrations predicted by this model for 3 the water in the Pajarito Plateau are 4 quite low. 5 So DOC is used as a surrogate 6 for humic acid. Is that the intent? 7 A. It is used as a surrogate for dissolved organic matter, so organic 8 9 material that's dissolved in water. 10 acid is a fraction of the total amount of 11 dissolved organic matter in the water. 12 O. But most organic matter has very 13 little complex ability. Isn't that true? 14 A. I would say that the -- it depends on the composition of the organic matter 15 16 in that it kind of depends on your definition of complex and which metal 17 18 we're talking about. 19 What we are getting towards is 20 the affinity towards a given organic 21 matter to bind with copper in this 2.2 The empirical data shows and the example. 23 empirical data that went into developing 24 EPA's Copper BLM show that even pretty low concentrations of Dissolved Organic 25

1 Carbon, using that as a surrogate for 2. Dissolved Organic Material, has a strong 3 affinity for copper binding, and that's 4 borne out and proved out in empirical toxicity studies where they evaluate the 5 6 toxicity of copper at varying 7 concentrations of Dissolved Organic Carbon. 8 9 O. Okay. I'll accept that. 10 My problem is, and I'm not all 11 that familiar with the protocols that 12 Surface Water Quality Bureau uses in their 13 assessments, but collecting samples for 14 DOC and analyzing it is somewhat 15 challenging and a little bit expensive, 16 and it requires special sample vials, no head space present, and things like that. 17 In the perfect world we'd use a surrogate 18 19 for DOC, but your work is pretty 20 convincing. 21 Let me go to my last Okay. 2.2 line of questioning. Let me see if I can 23 find it. Yeah, here it is: 24 25 I celebrate the fact that I'm

1 one of the last licensed engineers in the 2. State of New Mexico that knows how to use 3 a Slide Rule. I think in terms of 3 4 significant figures. When you give me an equation with 5 significant figures, I 5 6 think that's what I had, 22.914. 7 implies confidence that I don't think is justified either in the BLM or in the 8 9 individual toxicity tests, or in the 10 regression. 11 I would ask if you think that 12 the proposed standard would be weakened if 13 we stuck to 3 significant figures. 14 A. Chair Thomson, I really appreciate 15 that question: 16 The reason for sticking with 17 the number of significant digits that we 18 did for criteria purposes is because it's 19 built into EPA's original guidelines for calculating numeric criteria for Aquatic 2.0 Life. That's why we've kind of carried it 21 22 forward through the development of these 23 equations. 24 But I would not disagree with 25 you that it would be unjustified to change

<u></u>

the level or number of significant digits. 1 2. O. One of the things that I did do was 3 I looked at the regression curves in the 2007 EPA guidance and, you know, there is 4 5 a lot of scatter. They are coming up with R2s of .7, .8, .9, and when you have that 6 much scatter, 5 figures seems just fine. 7 I also created a spreadsheet 8 9 and ran several sample calculations with 3 10 significant figures instead of 2, and the 11 difference is about 3%, which again, we're 12 comparing a BLM which is a statistical model with an MLR, which is another 13 14 statistical model, and I think 3% is 15 probably way more accurate than the 16 original data justifying it. 17 I like the work you did. Ι would encourage the Commission to think in 18 terms of 3 significant figures instead of 19 20 5. 21 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Thank you. Nice 2.2 piece of work. 23 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. 24 Commissioner Dominguez. 25 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Thank you,

1	Madam Hearing Officer.
2	
3	EXAMINATION
4	BY COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ:
5	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Fulton. Thank
6	you for your testimony today.
7	My line of questioning shall be
8	a little bit broader in scope than my
9	colleague to your right. If my questions
LO	get outside the scope of your testimony,
11	I'm sure that Ms. Olson will object.
L2	With that leg out, if I heard
L3	you correctly, you provided testimony at
L4	the prior Triennial Review, or you were at
L5	or attended the Triennial Review. Is that
L6	correct?
L7	A. That's correct, Commissioner
L8	Dominguez.
L9	Q. So you probably recall there was a
20	point in time where there was a fair
21	amount of discussion about the best
22	available science and what constitutes
23	best available science.
24	The Copper Criteria that's
25	being proposed in this Petition, in your

professional opinion, is this the best 1 2. available science? 3 A. Yes. In my best professional 4 opinion the Proposal in front of the 5 Commission today, Site-Specific Water 6 Quality Criteria for copper, was developed and reflects the best available science. 7 8 0. Okay. Thank you. 9 Dr. White talked about, you 10 know, there was 18-plus years of very 11 robust data sets that were used to arrive 12 at what you have arrived at. Is the 2007 13 EPA guidance best suited for Site-Specific 14 Criteria development partially due to just the sheer volume of data that's necessary 15 16 to actually get to an end point? 17 A. That's a really good question; I 18 think one can make that argument or come 19 to that conclusion. 20 You know, there's a number of 21 sites that probably have non-detect 22 copper, and so copper is just no concern. 23 You know, why would that particular site 24 want to spend all the resources that is 25 required in the Copper BLM?

1	As you saw today it takes
2	effort to collect the data necessary to
3	evaluate the BLM and to analyze the data
4	necessary to evaluate the BLM.
5	Conversely, other states have
6	fully adopted the BLM, but that's a
7	complex process because it's, for some of
8	the reasons I mentioned in my testimony, a
9	complex piece of software. Adopting
10	software creates challenges, and fully
11	adopting the complex software requires
12	pretty robust implementation guidance, and
13	statewide implementation guidance.
14	In that regard there is
15	probably something to be said for adopting
16	it on a segment-specific basis.
17	Q. Thank you for laying a foundation
18	to my next question:
19	If a state was going to look at
20	adopting something statewide, is it more
21	realistic to utilize the software versus
22	developing equations like you have for
23	these specific sites?
24	A. Well as you saw today there is a
25	lot of work that went into developing

1 those equations. However, there is obvious benefit to it because of the 2. 3 reasons I've mentioned; it is fewer 4 It's very transparent to look parameters. 5 at an equation. I can see, you know, the appeal for statewide adoption of similar 6 7 equations. However I think that other 8 9 states have shown that the software can 10 effectively be adopted statewide. I think 11 the question of adopting the software 12 statewide, you know, depends on whether it 13 could be streamlined by making assumptions 14 for missing parameters. 15 For example, what does a site 16 do if they don't have DOC, or a given Cad 17 ion or N ion; would they use some 18 reference value? I think it's entirely 19 possible to do both. I think that just 20 adopting the software version statewide 21 requires a different set of analyses and 22 uncertainties than we faced for the Plateau given the, you know, robustness 23 24 and availability of data that we had for the Plateau. 25

Thank you for that answer. 1 0. Okay. 2 Part of where this line of 3 questioning is coming from is, of course, 4 EPA came out with this around 2007. That 5 was probably about the time I started on this Commission, and I've sat through more 6 Triennial Reviews than I care to remember, 7 and there is a common thread through all 8 9 of them that the amount of resources that 10 it takes to adopt the 2007 quidance from 11 EPA, this State has never really had the 12 resources to do that. It's been a common 13 theme up until the point where you guys 14 have Petitioned for the site-specific. My hat is off to the 15 16 Petitioners for the amount of work that 17 went into this site-specific, because I think we have to move towards the best 18 19 science available. 20 I think that's what the public 21 expects this Commission to do for 2.2 protection of waters is to utilize the 23 best science available, so I applaud the 24 effort in moving that direction, realizing 25 this is a fairly small step in the big

1	scheme of things statewide, but I think
2	it's a proper step, so thank you.
3	That's all the questions I
4	have.
5	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
6	Vice Chair Zemlick.
7	
8	EXAMINATION
9	BY VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK:
10	Q. Thank you for your testimony.
11	They have asked a lot of my
12	questions, but the one remaining is along
13	the lines of what my colleagues asked:
14	Do you have a sense for what
15	sort of threshold there may be in terms of
16	the amount of data required to develop
17	these site-specific thresholds for other
18	locations in the state?
19	A. Yeah, good question. Thank you,
20	Commissioner, for the question:
21	At a minimum, you know, any
22	time we talk about Site-Specific Water
23	Quality Criteria generally speaking, the
24	objective is to capture the variation that
25	may be expected within a given water body,

and that variation could be seasonal. 1 T t. 2. could be related to different types of 3 flow, so base flow and high flow. 4 general rule of thumb you want to capture 5 multiple seasons for a given location. 6 You know, providing a 7 particular number of samples I think is just difficult to do without knowing how 8 9 big of a site we are talking about. 10 one particular stream or is it a big 11 watershed? 12 But as a general position I 13 would encourage anyone evaluating Site-14 Specific Criteria to capture seasonal 15 variability and any variability that might 16 be expected associated with that 17 particular site. 18 O. Thank you. 19 One thing you didn't mention, 2.0 which I guess I would just throw out here, 21 too, is because of the period of sample 22 collection you also have incorporated 23 post-fire response, too, which I think all 24 across New Mexico we don't have those 25 kinds of data sets. I just wanted to

point that out and say for that alone it's 1 2. very interesting. 3 A. Great point. Thanks for that. 4 VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: Thank 5 you. 6 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. 7 Commissioner Moander. COMMISSIONER MOANDER: After that 8 9 thorough examination I don't have anything 10 to ask you. Thank you again for your time 11 today. 12 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okav. Let's 13 go to the platform. 14 Commissioner Frey. COMMISSIONER FREY: Thank you. 15 16 /// 17 EXAMINATION 18 BY COMMISSIONER FREY: 19 Q. Thanks for your testimony, 20 Mr. Fulton, and thanks for all the work 21 that you and your team has put into this. 22 It's impressive. 23 I wanted to ask you, you 24 brought up Figure 5-1 in your PowerPoint. 25 I was just curious, because the Jemez

1 River only shows up in 2017. I don't know 2. if it's because there was so little data 3 on the other years, or was that just 1 4 year that Jemez was looked at? I also don't see it on the map. 5 A. Thank you, Commissioner, for the 6 7 question: I'm just pulling up Figure 5-1 8 in the report so I can make sure I'm 9 10 responsive to your question. 11 Just so I understand the 12 question is why is there so few data 13 points for the Jemez River? 14 O. Yeah. Was it just like 1 year that they actually looked at it and what would 15 16 be the reasoning? 17 A. Yeah, I believe that location... 18 I'm trying to refer myself to 19 the map of sampling locations: 20 I believe that location is not 21 necessarily part of some of the routine 2.2 monitoring that's required under the 23 existing regulatory programs, and so that's why it likely showed up as just 24 25 that particular year.

1	Q. Yeah, it almost
2	I don't see it on the map, so
3	it almost seems like, I don't know, they
4	are using another control or something. I
5	don't know.
6	Okay. I was also looking at
7	Figure 5-6, that's where you have the
8	acute Copper Criteria again; Hardness, pH
9	and DOC.
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. You talked a little bit about the
12	last or bottom set of figures. I'm
13	wondering if you can clarify:
14	If you can relate that to
15	and I'm looking at my other computer
16	screen, otherwise I wouldn't be able to
17	have all of this up to look at.
18	In the proposed changes, in,
19	let's see, it's I(4), it states:
20	"In waters that contain DOC
21	concentrations greater than
22	29.7 mg/L, a value of 29.7 mg/L
23	shall be used in the equation."
24	It is the same thing for
25	Hardness. There is an upper limit of "207

1 mg/L" for use in the equations. 2 Is that based on that figure? 3 Because it almost looks like it is. A. Thank you for the question; that's 4 5 a great question: 6 Those limits specified in the 7 proposed amendments, those were the maximum values from which we were able to 8 9 develop those equations. As we, you know, 10 walked through the process, we calculated BLM software criteria and then we 11 12 developed these MLR models. Those models 13 were developed over a particular range of 14 water chemistries and validated over that 15 same range, and so those values that you just referred to are the maximum values by 16 17 which we developed and validated the 18 equations. 19 It's a conservative step to 20 avoid extrapolating a model beyond the 21 range from which you develop it. 2.2 Q. What happens if your water exceeds 23 that? 24 A. (No audible response.) 25 O. I mean it seems like a lot of New

1 Mexico water -- and I don't know the area in question very well, but it seems like a 2. 3 lot of New Mexico waters would be in 4 exceedance of the Hardness of 207 mg/L. Is that limit set for the area or could 5 that be applied to any waters above that 6 7 Hardness level? A. No, and thank you again for the 8 9 question; I think that is the limit in 10 this particular area for this proposal. 11 As I discussed, as we increase 12 Hardness, it reduces toxicity, so increase 13 in the Hardness results in greater 14 criteria. 15 If you have a particular water 16 that had Hardness greater than "207 mg/L," 17 which was the upper limit of our data set, we don't -- it is -- we are not 18 19 recommending applying our model to such 2.0 waters, and so we are recommending you 21 would cap it at "207," much like you do 22 the current Hardness-Based criteria at 23 "400," because we have not validated the 24 performance of that model above that 25 range.

O. Would that also -- again going back 1 2 to Figure 5-6 -- oh, shoot, I just lost 3 it. 4 You see, above a hardness of "200," you see more of a divergence 5 between the 2 methods of calculating it. 6 7 Would that have something to do with setting that limit there? 8 9 A. Yeah, I think that divergence there 10 that you're referring to, I mean that's 11 where it diverges outside of kind of that 12 range that I'm describing. It's outside 13 of that site-specific chemistry range that 14 we used to develop the model. 15 Q. Okay. Thank you. 16 COMMISSIONER FREY: That's all my 17 questions. Thank you again. Thank you. 18 THE WITNESS: 19 COMMISSIONER FREY: Very 20 interesting. 21 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner 2.2 Harms, any questions? 23 COMMISSIONER HARMS: Hi there. 24 Thank you. I do have a couple questions 25 mostly on slides 14 and 15 of the

1	presentation.
2	
3	EXAMINATION
4	BY COMMISSIONER HARMS:
5	Q. The first one, Slide 14, is really
6	just my curiosity, but it tags onto
7	another question that was asked:
8	It says these:
9	"Equations were demonstrated
10	to accurately calculate BLM-
11	based criteria across the range
12	of surface water conditions
13	observed on the Pajarito
14	Plateau."
15	Can you give us a sense?
16	A. (No audible response.)
17	Q. This is kind of an open-ended
18	question, but can you give us a sense of
19	the intra-annual versus interannual
20	changes and variability that you see in
21	those conditions?
22	A. Thank you for the question. I mean
23	I can give a general sense and some
24	general examples:
25	I mean the variation

1 variability that we see across the 2. conditions, one example would be in that 3 bar chart that's presented also in the 4 slides. You know, there was 1 year, for 5 example, where no samples were collected because it was a high drought year, and so 6 7 that would have been 2012. If you look at Slide 15, you 8 9 can kind of see the distribution of 10 samples collected across the watersheds 11 over the years. In 2012 we don't have any 12 samples. 2012 was a high drought year, and so conversely, comparing that to 2015, 13 14 where we have a substantial number of 15 samples, likely due to it just containing 16 more precipitation events and therefore 17 more Surface Water samples collected. 18 Speaking more specifically in 19 terms of the inter versus intra-annual 20 variability and water chemistry, I think 21 it's difficult to provide too many 22 specifics without having --23 O. Just on the 3 that were the driving 24 force, so the pH, the DOC, and the 25 Hardness, would that help? Those are kind

1 of the factors that I'm most curious about and how much those change over time and 2. 3 between years. 4 A. Yeah, I think they vary to a 5 reasonable degree over time just depending on the season that we're in. For example, 6 is it base flow in a perennial stream or 7 are we in a monsoon season? 8 I think the extent and 9 10 magnitude of that variation over the years 11 is somewhat just based on flow and season 12 and is condition-dependant, but I would a 13 say it also varies spatially across the 14 watershed depending on a given subwatershed's characteristics. 15 16 O. Okay. Thank you. 17 Staying on Slide 15, and I'm 18 sorry if this is in the materials and I 19 just didn't see it, but the BLM model was 2.0 basically created with data from 2005 to 21 2019, which is a great and long data set. 2.2 Was there data taken after 2019 and would 23 the MLR equations be updated accordingly 24 in the future? 25 A. Yeah, thanks for the question:

The reason that the proposed
amendments were developed utilizing data
from 2005 to 2019 is because as you heard
from Dr. White's testimony, we had a
lengthy public outreach process.
This has been a multiyear
process. We started that process, and we
had to draw the line somewhere for how
much data is enough data. We started the
process back then, and so that's why we
utilized the data up through 2019.
The answer to the second part
of your question, "Are data still
collected," you know, "post 2019," and the
answer is yes, data are still collected
pursuant to various regulatory programs
and permits that exist on the Plateau.
Will the MLR Equations be
updated with additional data? No, that's
not the intent. That's because the MLR
Equations are developed with such a robust
data set that we have kind of captured
just the range of conditions that one
could reasonably expect to occur on the
Plateau, and that's indicated several

1 times in the Demonstration Report. 2. I think this is one of the more 3 robust applications of BLM data that 4 exists out there, and I would not 5 recommend continually updating it, you know, over a specified, you know, time 6 7 period based on additional data. O. Okay. 8 Okay. Great. That makes 9 sense. 10 I guess from a regulatory 11 perspective what I'm understanding is this 12 is sort of a "Set and Forget" situation. 13 Is that your understanding, too? With the 14 MLR Equations and adopting these. A. Yeah, I think that from a 15 regulatory perspective, you know, we've 16 17 got to ask the question as to whether it is scientifically defensible, and I think 18 the answer is yes. We feel confident that 19 20 the equations are defensible and 21 appropriate for the Plateau, and moving 22 forward those are the equations that can 23 be in place for future assessments of 24 copper and its protectiveness of the 25 Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters.

Q. I'm just thinking ahead, and maybe 1 it's too far ahead, but 15, 20 years, you 2. 3 know, say drought conditions change with 4 climate, and EPA says, "Hey, we need to 5 take a look at this," is there any mechanism to revise the equations? 6 7 A. To my knowledge, as the regulations currently stand, that mechanism would be 8 9 going through another Rulemaking to change 10 it, because if adopted these would be 11 codified in Surface Water Quality Bureau 12 standards. In using your example of 15, 13 20 years from now changing them, then we 14 are a changing water quality standards, 15 which would require a Rulemaking. 16 O. That's all. Thank you very much. 17 My last question had to do 18 with... 19 My last question is more just 20 out of curiosity, but looking at Slide 15, 21 the "Natural Background Point" in "White 2.2 Rock," I just wanted to know a little more 23 information about how that was chosen, 24 because I was trying to figure out where 25 exactly it was and whether it was Upstream

1	potentially, or uphill from the drainage
2	to the south.
3	I mean why that one point? Was
4	it just convenient because it was in White
5	Rock, and why aren't there other
6	downstream points? Can you just enlighten
7	us on the selection of that location for
8	the "Natural Background"?
9	A. Yeah, thank you for the question:
10	I would actually have to maybe
11	confer with my colleague, Dr. White, or
12	maybe even defer to her, as I just was not
13	directly involved with the selection of
14	particular Surface Water locations back
15	then. I apologize, but I don't know that
16	I am able to give you a direct and
17	accurate answer on that.
18	COMMISSIONER HARMS: Okay. Thank
19	you. I'll just take a look back at the
20	information to see if I can find it.
21	That is all my questions.
22	Thank you very much.
23	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
24	Chair Thomson.
25	



CONTRACT OF THE PARTY OF THE PA

1	FURTHER EXAMINATION
2	BY CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
3	Q. I would like to follow up on
4	questions from Commissioner Frey; I
5	flagged it and forgot to ask:
6	On the redline markup, 20.6.4
7	.900.I(4), this is the Copper Criteria.
8	Taking a look at this again, it states:
9	"For the purposes of this
10	Section, Dissolved Organic
11	Carbon (DOC) is in units of
12	milligrams carbon per liter
13	(mg/CL) [when containing] DOC
14	concentrations greater than
15	29.7 mg/L"
16	Let's change that to "30."
17	There is no measurable difference between
18	"29.7" and "30." That's going to be an
19	amendment I suggest when we consider the
20	final document.
21	Let me ask first whether that
22	will have any affect on the standard. Is
23	there any measurable affect on the
24	standard if we change that from "29.7" to
25	"30"?

A. No significant impact on the 1 2 numeric value of the data standard, yeah. 3 Is that 0.3 mg/L DOC? 4 Q. Actually my question wasn't 5 "significant," it was "measurable." it be possible to measure the difference? 6 7 A. (No audible response.) O. I'll ask it: Would it be possible 8 9 to measure the difference between "29.7" 10 and "30," and the affects? 11 A. Well I think "29.7" versus "30" is 12 within the measurement error of the 13 analytical method itself. 14 Thank you. O. I agree. Then I have an editorial: 15 16 In that same sentence it says: 17 "In waters that contain DOC 18 concentrations greater than 19 29.7 mg/L, a value of 29.7 mg/L20 shall be used in the equation." 21 I think that should be 2.2 corrected in the following equations. 23 A. I would agree. 24 O. Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: No more

```
1
    questions.
 2.
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                  Thank you.
              Ms. Olson, do you have any
 3
 4
    Redirect?
 5
          MS. OLSON: I do not have any
 6
    Redirect, Madam Hearing Officer, and I
 7
    believe that concludes our case.
                                  Thank you,
 8
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
 9
    very much.
10
          COMMISSIONER FREY: Madam Hearing
11
    Officer, in light of what the Chairman
12
    asked may I ask a couple follow-up?
13
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                  Yes, go
14
    ahead.
15
    ///
16
    ///
17
               FURTHER EXAMINATION
18
    BY COMMISSIONER FREY:
19
       O. Mr. Fulton, as I recall the EPA,
20
    and of course the NMED, have been looking
21
    over these suggested changes and going
22
    through your report. Do you think, just
23
    in terms of significant figures, would you
24
    want to go back to the EPA to have them
25
    review those changes? What's your
```

1 thought? 2. A. Thank you for the question. 3 Just to be clear, you're 4 referring to the changes to the significant figures? 5 6 Q. Yes, that Chair Thomson just was 7 discussing; instead of "29.7," using "30." A. To me I don't think that would 8 9 warrant or be necessary to trigger a re-10 review with EPA. 11 I would also be curious to hear 12 what the Department thinks, but in my 13 opinion that is not substantive or not 14 significant enough to trigger a re-review with the EPA. 15 16 On the other significant figure 17 question, when it comes to a criteria 18 value, I understand Chairman Thomson's 19 comments there absolutely, but if we are 20 speaking about significant digits for a 21 criteria, my recommendation would be to 22 leave as is only because that probably 23 would be something the EPA would comment 24 on. 25 COMMISSIONER FREY: Okay. Thank



<u></u>

```
1
    you.
 2.
              Thank you Madam Hearing
 3
    Officer.
              No more questions.
 4
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right.
 5
    Thank you.
 6
              Thank you, Ms. Olson and
 7
    Mr. Fulton.
              I think we need a short break.
 8
 9
    Let's come back at 3:00. It's now 10 of
10
    3:00, and we'll come back at 3:00 and hear
11
    from Mr. Baca.
12
              (The Water Quality Control
13
    Commission Technical Hearing recessed from
    2:49 p.m. to 3:02 p.m.)
14
15
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay.
                                         Wе
16
    are back after a short break for important
17
    reasons; one of our Counsel participating
    today has to be on break from 3:45 to
18
19
    4:15, and we will be taking another longer
2.0
    break then, but we'll see what we can
21
    accomplish here in 45 minutes.
22
              Ms. Scott.
23
          MS. SCOTT:
                      Madam Hearing Officer,
24
    Chair Thomson, and members of the
25
    Commission:
```

1	I would like to call NMED's
2	Technical witness.
3	Please state and spell your
4	full name for the record.
5	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Madam
6	Hearing Officer, Chair Thomson, and
7	members of the Commission:
8	My name is Michael Baca; that's
9	M-I-C-H-A-E-L, and "Baca" is spelled
10	B-A-C-A.
11	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you,
12	Mr. Baca.
13	Do you swear or affirm to tell
14	the truth?
15	THE WITNESS: I do.
16	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
17	Go ahead.
18	
19	MICHAEL G. BACA,
20	after having been first duly sworn,
21	was examined and testified as follows:
22	
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. SCOTT:
25	Q. Where are you employed?

<u></u>

Τ	A. I'm employed with the New Mexico
2	Environment Department.
3	Q. How long have you worked for NMED?
4	A. I have worked for the Department
5	since February of 2005 in the
6	Environmental Health, Air Quality, and now
7	with the Surface Water Quality Bureau.
8	Q. And what is your current role?
9	A. I'm with the Monitoring, Assessment
10	and Standards Section, or MASS, and serve
11	as a Standards and Outreach Team
12	Supervisor, and the Water Quality
13	Standards Coordinator for the Department.
14	Q. What are your current job duties?
15	A. In this position I lead the
16	development, review, and revision and
17	maintenance of Surface Water Quality
18	standards, and supervise a staff of 4; 2
19	Water Quality Standard Scientists, our
20	Quality Assurance Officer, and our
21	Volunteer Monitoring and Outreach
22	Specialist.
23	Q. Please describe your educational
24	qualifications?
25	A. I graduated in 2004 with a Bachelor

<u></u>

1 of Arts in Chemistry from Carleton 2 College. 3 Q. Did you submit a copy of your 4 Resumé as NMED Exhibit 2 in this matter? 5 A. I did. 6 O. Do you have before you what has 7 been identified as NMED Exhibit 2? 8 A. I do. 9 Q. Do you recognize that document as 10 your Resumé? 11 A. I do. 12 Q. Is it a true and correct copy of 13 your Resumé? 14 A. It is. 15 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, 16 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 2. 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause for objections. 18 19 Exhibit 2 is admitted. 20 (Water Quality Control Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 21 2.2 2 was received in evidence.) 23 O. BY MS. SCOTT: Did you submit written Direct Testimony as NMED Exhibit 1 24 in this matter? 25

1 A. I did. 2 O. Do you have before you what has 3 been identified as NMED Exhibit 1? 4 A. Yes, I do. 5 Q. Do you recognize that document as your submitted written Direct Technical 6 7 Testimony? A. Yes, I do. 8 9 O. Was your written testimony drafted 10 by you or under your supervision? 11 A. Yes, it was. O. Is it true and accurate to the best 12 13 of your knowledge and belief? A. Yes, it is. 14 15 Q. Did you submit written Rebuttal 16 Testimony in this matter? A. No, I did not. 17 18 Q. Do you have any corrections or 19 changes to your written Direct Testimony? 2.0 A. Yes, I do; I have a couple of: 21 I have some additional 2.2 information and exhibits regarding Public 23 Notice. Otherwise I do not. 24 Q. Do you adopt the remainder of your written Direct Testimony here today? 25

1	A. I do.
2	MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer,
3	NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 1.
4	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause
5	for objections.
6	Exhibit 1 is admitted.
7	(Water Quality Control
8	Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit
9	1 was received in evidence.)
LO	Q. BY MS. SCOTT: You cited and
11	attached several exhibits to your written
L2	Technical Testimony and we'll work through
L3	those one at a time:
L4	Do you have before you what has
L5	been identified as NMED Exhibit 5?
L6	A. I do.
L7	Q. Do you recognize that document as:
L8	"EPA 1995 Updates: Water
L9	Quality Criteria Documents for
20	the Protection of Aquatic Life
21	in Ambient Water"?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. What is the relevance of including
24	this document into the record?
25	A. This document is the basis for New

1 Mexico's current Copper Hardness Water 2 Quality Criteria. 3 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, 4 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 5. 5 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause 6 for objections. 7 Exhibit 5 is admitted. (Water Quality Control 8 9 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 10 5 was received in evidence.) 11 Q. BY MS. SCOTT: Do you have before 12 you what has been identified as NMED 13 Exhibit 6? 14 A. I do. 15 Q. Do you recognize that document as 16 EPA: "Aquatic Life Ambient Fresh 17 Water Quality Criteria - Copper 18 19 2007 Revision"? 2.0 A. I do. 21 Q. What is the relevance of including 2.2 this document into the record? 23 A. This is just a fact sheet of the 24 2007 Recommended Copper Criteria. This 25 provides some very easily digestible

1 information regarding copper's background 2 and EPA's recommendation to use the BLM in 3 developing Copper Criteria. 4 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 6. 5 6 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I'll pause 7 for objections. NMED Exhibit 6 is admitted. 8 9 (Water Ouality Control 10 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 6 was received in evidence.) 11 12 O. BY MS. SCOTT: Do you have before 13 you what's been identified as NMED Exhibit 14 7? 15 A. I do. 16 O. Do you recognize that document as: 17 "EPA Aquatic Life Ambient Fresh Water Quality Criteria -18 19 Copper"? 2.0 A. I do. 21 O. What is the relevance of including 2.2 this document in the record? 23 A. This is the latest recommendation 24 from EPA for Copper Criteria development, 25 and this is the BLM recommendation.

1	MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer,
2	NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 7.
3	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pausing for
4	objections.
5	Exhibit 7 is admitted.
6	(Water Quality Control
7	Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit
8	7 was received in evidence.)
9	Q. BY MS. SCOTT: Do you have before
10	you what has been identified as NMED
11	Exhibit 8?
12	A. I do.
13	Q. Do you recognize that document as:
14	"EPA Metals Cooperative
15	Research and Development
16	Agreement (CRADA) Phase I
17	Report"?
18	A. I do.
19	Q. What is the relevance of including
20	this document in the record?
21	A. This document identifies EPA's
22	intent to develop MLR Equations or
23	MLR-based equations for metals criteria in
24	the future. It kind of sets us up to say
25	where the science is leading and where EPA

1 is heading for recommended criteria 2 development for metals. 3 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, 4 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 8. 5 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pausing for 6 objections. 7 Exhibit 8 is admitted. (Water Quality Control 8 9 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 10 8 was received in evidence.) 11 Q. BY MS. SCOTT: Do you have before 12 you what has been identified as NMED 13 Exhibit 9? 14 A. I do. 15 Q. Do you recognize that document as: 16 "WOCC 24-31 NMED Provided to 17 the Public Documentation"? 18 A. I do. 19 O. What's the relevance of including 2.0 this document in the record? 21 A. It shows some of the actions that 2.2 the Department took to help the Commission 23 to provide Public Notice to the public. 24 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 9. 25

1 Pausing for HEARING OFFICER ORTH: 2 objections. 3 Exhibit 9 is admitted. (Water Quality Control 4 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 5 9 was received in evidence.) 6 7 Q. BY MS. SCOTT: Do you have before vou what has been identified as NMED 8 9 Exhibit 10? 10 A. I do. 11 Q. Do you recognize that document as: 12 "WOCC 24-31 Public Notice 13 Documentation"? A. I do. 14 O. And what's the relevance of 15 16 including this document in the record? 17 A. This demonstrates some of the 18 additional actions that the Department 19 took to provide Public Notice in this 2.0 matter. 21 Madam Hearing Officer, MS. SCOTT: 2.2 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 10. 23 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pause for 24 objections. 25 Exhibit 10 is admitted.

1 (Water Quality Control 2 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 3 10 was received in evidence.) 4 O. BY MS. SCOTT: Do you have before you what has been identified as NMED 5 6 Exhibit 11? 7 A. I do. O. Do you recognize that document as 8 9 the "Affidavit of Publication" for the New 10 Mexico Register? 11 A. I do. 12 O. And what's the relevance of 13 including this in the record? 14 A. This shows that Public Notice was published in the New Mexico Register on a 15 16 certain date. 17 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 11. 18 19 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pause for 20 objections. Exhibit 11 is admitted. 21 2.2 (Water Quality Control 23 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 24 11 was received in evidence.) 25 O. BY MS. SCOTT: You also have 3

1 additional exhibits to introduce today 2. which have been previously circulated to 3 all parties to the Hearing Officer, and to the Commission Administrator. 4 5 Do you have before you what has 6 been identified as NMED Exhibit 12? 7 A. I do. O. Do you recognize that document as 8 9 the "WOCC Public Notice of Rescheduled 10 Public Hearing for this matter in English 11 and Spanish? 12 A. Yes, I do. 13 O. What is the relevance of including 14 this in the record? 15 A. This provides the content of the 16 Public Notice that was posted and 17 published in the various locations. 18 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, 19 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 12. 2.0 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pausing for 21 objections. 2.2 Exhibit 12 is admitted. 23 (Water Quality Control 24 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 12 was received in evidence.) 25

1 Do you have before O. BY MS. SCOTT: 2 you what has been identified as Exhibit 3 13? A. I do. 4 5 Q. Do you recognize that document as 6 the "WOCC Public Notice of Rescheduled 7 Public Hearing" for this matter in both English and Spanish as published in the 8 9 New Mexico Register? 10 A. Yes, I have. 11 Yes, I do. 12 O. What is the relevance of including 13 this in the record? 14 A. This shows that the Public Notice 15 was published in the New Mexico Register 16 and it provides the content of that Notice 17 that was published. MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, 18 19 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 13. 2.0 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pause for 21 objections. 2.2 13 is admitted. 23 (Water Quality Control 24 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 13 was received in evidence.) 25

And lastly, do you 1 Q. BY MS. SCOTT: 2 have before you what has been identified 3 as NMED 14? 4 A. I do. 5 Q. Do you recognize that document as the "Affidavit of Publication for the Los 6 7 Alamos Daily Post of the WQCC Public Notice of Rescheduled Public Hearing"? 8 9 A. I do. 10 O. And what is the relevance of 11 including this in the record? 12 A. This shows that Public Notice was 13 published in a newspaper of local 14 circulation. MS. SCOTT: 15 Madam Hearing Officer, 16 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 14. 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pausing for 18 objections. 19 Exhibit 14 is admitted. 20 (Water Quality Control 21 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit 2.2 14 was received in evidence.) 23 MS. SCOTT: I just want to make 24 sure I hit all of those. I might have... 25 Let me, just for purposes of

1 clarity, go back to Exhibit 11. I don't 2. think I completely titled that. Actually I might want to catch 3 4 something. Let me see what we filed 5 really quickly. I want to make sure we 6 have another "Affidavit of Publication," 7 because I'm only showing 1 page for Exhibit 11. 8 9 I'm just going to go back and 10 change how I worded that just to be clear: 11 Do you have before you what 0. Okay. 12 has been identified as NMED Exhibit 11? 13 A. I do. 14 O. Do you recognize that document as the "Affidavit of Publication" for both 15 the "Albuquerque Journal" and for the "New 16 17 Mexico Register"? 18 A. I do. 19 O. All right. What is the relevance 20 of including both of these in the record? A. This shows that notice was 21 2.2 published in the "Albuquerque Journal" as 23 well as the "New Mexico Register," and it 24 was published in those newspapers in 25 October.

1	MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer,
2	NMED moves again to admit NMED Exhibit 11.
3	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pausing for
4	objections.
5	Exhibit 11 is admitted.
6	MS. SCOTT: Okay. Then I have 2
7	copies of each of those premarked NMED
8	Exhibits 12, 13, and 14 for the Commission
9	and for the Hearing Officer.
10	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
11	MS. SCOTT: May I approach?
12	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Sure.
13	Thank you.
14	Q. BY MS. SCOTT: Can you provide a
15	summary of your testimony starting with
16	providing a summary of the regulatory
17	context?
18	A. My testimony will provide a
19	framework for quality standards including
20	Site-Specific Criteria, outlining the
21	administrative processes and procedures
22	for establishing amendments, and the
23	collaboration and coordination efforts
24	with Petitioners to review their Criteria
25	Development Proposal and Stakeholder

1	Engagement Plans, as well to provide
2	Public Notice of the Rulemaking Hearing:
3	State and Federal statutes and
4	regulations outline the Requirements and
5	Regulatory Framework for Quality
6	Standards, and authorize states to adopt
7	public standards to protect public health
8	and welfare, enhance water quality, and
9	serve the purpose of the law.
10	The goal of the Federal Clean
11	Water Act, as stated in Section 101(a)(2)
12	is to provide:
13	" that wherever
14	attainable, water quality
15	for the protection and
16	propagation of fish, shellfish,
17	and wildlife, and recreation in
18	and on the water."
19	Federal regulations direct
20	states to adopt preset designated uses and
21	criteria to protect those uses consistent
22	with this goal.
23	New Mexico's Water Quality
24	Standards are codified at 20.6.4 NMAC.
25	The designated uses as set forth in

1	Section .900 include:
2	Fish culture;
3	Public water supply;
4	Industrial water supply;
5	Domestic water supply;
6	Irrigation and irrigation
7	storage;
8	Primary and secondary contact;
9	Livestock watering;
10	Wildlife habitat; and,
11	Aquatic Life.
12	These standards establish water
13	quality criteria that protect the
14	designated uses of a water body, and these
15	can be general narrative criteria that
16	apply to all waters, or these can be
17	numeric criteria that apply to a specific
18	designated use or water quality segment.
19	New Mexico's current Dissolved
20	Copper Criteria are based on the U.S.
21	Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA's
22	1995 Hardness-Based Water Quality Criteria
23	documents.
24	In 2007, EPA updated their
25	Copper Criteria recommendations to use a

1 Biotic Ligand Model or BLM. The Copper 2. BLM is a metal bioavailability model that 3 requires 10 water quality input parameters 4 to predict copper toxicity and calculate applicable criteria based on this 5 6 toxicity. 7 New Mexico has not adopted the Copper BLM approach during prior Triennial 8 9 Reviews due to programmatic constraints 10 with limited staff and funding that 11 prohibits consistent, reliable, and 12 concurrent data collection of sufficient 13 quality for use in our programs. 14 The BLM requires concurrent 15 monitoring, or a database of default 16 values based on high quality historical 17 monitoring data. The standards allow any person to Petition the Commission to 18 19 adopt, amend, or appeal a Water Ouality 20 Standard, including Site-Specific 21 Criteria. 22 The Petition must: 23 1: Identify the specific 24 waters to which the Site-Specific Criteria 25 would apply;

1	Explain the rationale for
2	proposing the site-specific criteria;
3	Describe the stakeholder
4	engagement process;
5	Present and respond to the
6	public input received; and,
7	The Petition must present and
8	justify the derivation of the proposed
9	Site-Specific Criteria.
10	In addition, the derivation of
11	Site-Specific Criteria must be based on:
12	Scientifically defensible
13	methods;
14	Clean Water Act Section 304(a)
15	guidance, or modified 304(a) guidance to
16	reflect site-specific conditions.
17	The condition may adopt
18	Site-Specific Water Quality Criteria based
19	on relevant site-specific conditions like
20	physical, biological, or chemical
21	characteristics at a site that alter the
22	toxicity, bioavailability, or
23	bioaccumulation of the chemical to fully
24	protect the designated use to which it
25	applies.

1	The Petitioners streamlined
2	EPA's BLM approach to propose Multiple
3	Linear Regression, or MLR Equations, with
4	pH, Dissolved Organic Carbon, or DOC, and
5	Hardness input values to generate
6	applicable acute and chronic criteria
7	equations. This approach is consistent
8	with EPA's intention to develop and
9	propose MLR models for 8 metals using pH,
10	DOC, and Hardness input values as the main
11	drivers for criteria development.
12	NMED supports the scientific
13	basis behind EPA's proposed MLR approach,
14	and will assess the feasibility of
15	adoption and implementation in New Mexico
16	after EPA issues a final report and
17	recommendation.
18	Rulemaking before the
19	Commission begins when a person files a
20	written Petition and Statement of Reasons
21	to Adopt, Amend, Or Repeal a Regulation in
22	accordance with 20.1.6.200 NMAC. If the
23	Commission grants a hearing, Notice of the
24	Rulemaking must be provided to the public
25	in accordance with State statute and

	Ţ
1	regulation.
2	The Agency must distribute
3	Rulemaking information and provide Public
4	Notice by publishing:
5	In the newspaper and the New
6	Mexico Register;
7	Posting information on Agency
8	websites; and,
9	Contacting interested and
10	affected parties.
11	The Public Notice of Rulemaking
12	must include:
13	The subject;
14	A summary and purpose of the
15	proposed Rule;
16	The legal authority for the
17	Rule and its adoption;
18	The Technical basis for the
19	proposed Rule and how to find Technical
20	information;
21	Governing laws of procedure and
22	information on how to present information
23	and participate in the hearing;
24	Examine documents; and,
25	Download information.

1	Although a Work Plan is not
2	required for a Site-Specific Criteria
3	Demonstration pursuant to 20.6.4.10F NMAC,
4	the Department worked with the Petitioners
5	to discuss expectations, development of a
6	common understanding, and coordinate
7	timelines and resources. The Department
8	and EPA provided feedback and comments
9	throughout the planning and Technical
10	Demonstration Development process.
11	Based on this early engagement,
12	an initial Draft Demonstration was
13	developed and submitted to the Department
14	for review. NMED provided formal comments
15	on the Draft Demonstration on March 31,
16	2023. The Petitioners addressed the
17	comments in a subsequent Draft
18	Demonstration and Response to Comments
19	dated August 2023.
20	Throughout the process the
21	Petitioners solicited input from the
22	Department, EPA, stakeholders, and the
23	general public, and they responded to all
24	the input, feedback, and comments they
25	received in their final Demonstration

1	Report provided with their Petition.
2	The Public Notice for the
3	hearing was drafted and published by the
4	Petitioners in the Albuquerque Journal and
5	the New Mexico Register. The content of
6	the Notice itself, which is the same
7	version published in the New Mexico
8	Register, are part of the updates I have
9	to my written Direct Testimony. Those
LO	additional exhibits are NMED Exhibit 12
l1	for the concept of the Notice in English
L2	and Spanish; and,
L3	NMED Exhibit 13 for the
L4	publication in the New Mexico Register.
L5	The Petitioners' also published
L6	Notice in the Los Alamos Daily Post, which
L7	I am also presenting today as Exhibit 14.
18	It is the "Affidavit of Publication" from
L9	the Los Alamos Daily Post.
20	The Department assisted the
21	Petitioners and Commission with
22	notification requirements and provided
23	Rulemaking information to the public by
24	posting a Notice of Rulemaking to the
25	Commission's website;

1	The New Mexico Sunshine Portal;
2	and,
3	NMED's District and Field
4	Offices.
5	We posted the Notice of
6	Rulemaking by sending e-mails with the
7	Public Notice of Rulemaking to the Surface
8	Water Quality Bureau listserve
9	subscribers; and,
10	To the Legislative Counsel
11	Service.
12	Additionally the Department
13	posted Public Notice and Rulemaking
14	information on its Event Calendar;
15	The Surface Water Quality
16	Bureau website;
17	The NMED Public Notice website;
18	and,
19	We created an entry on the
20	Department's Public Comment portal.
21	In conclusion, the Commission's
22	regulations allow for the adoption of
23	Site-Specific Criteria based on relevant
24	Site-Specific Water Quality conditions and
25	scientifically defensible methods when

<u></u>

1 Site-Specific Criteria fully protect the 2. designated use. Adoption of Site-Specific 3 Water Quality Criteria does not change the 4 designated use of the water body. 5 The Department and Petitioners 6 worked collaboratively on a Work Plan for stakeholder engagement and Technical 7 Report Development, and NMED considers the 8 Petitioners to have properly complied with 9 10 the provisions of 20.6.4.10F NMAC for 11 Site-Specific Criteria. 12 NMED recommends that the 13 Commission adopt the proposed amendments. 14 If the Commission so adopts the proposed 15 amendments, the Surface Water Quality 16 Bureau would submit the revised Water 17 Quality Standards as published in the New Mexico Register to EPA for formal review 18 19 and final approval action under Section 20 303(c) of the Clean Water Act. 21 That concludes my testimony 22 today. 23 MS. SCOTT: Mr. Baca is available 24 for questions. 25 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you,

1 Ms. Scott and Mr. Baca. 2. Ms. Olson, do you have 3 questions. 4 MS. OLSON: I do not. 5 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 6 Mr. Maxwell, do you have questions? 7 MR. MAXWELL: I have no questions for Mr. Baca today. Thank you. 8 9 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 10 Thank you. Commissioner Moander. 11 12 COMMISSIONER MOANDER: I do not have anything for the witness. 13 14 Thank you. HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Vice Chair 15 Zemlick. 16 VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: Thank 17 18 I do not have any questions at this you. 19 time. 2.0 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner 21 Dominguez. 22 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: 23 questions, Madam Hearing Officer. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Chair 25 Thomson.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Thank you. 2. Thank you for your work, and 3 your testimony is very helpful: 4 5 EXAMINATION 6 BY CHAIRMAN THOMSON: 7 Q. Let me follow up on Commissioner Dominguez' comments regarding Number 6: 8 9 "Significant Figures in the 10 Proposed Model." 11 Commissioner Dominguez thinks 12 EPA would object to reducing the number of 13 significant figures from 5 to 3. 14 have any opinions or thoughts or experience with limiting the number of 15 16 significant figures in the modeling? 17 A. I do not have significant 18 experience with that. I do have 19 experience with submitting things to EPA 20 for review, and I think that the changing 21 of significant figures in the equations 22 would create some difficulty in getting it 23 approved. I think it would cause another 24 thorough review of the equations and I think another review may be warranted. 25

1 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Thank you. 2 Commissioner Dominguez, 3 apparently I misrepresented his comment. 4 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Yeah, 5 Madam Hearing Officer or the record, I 6 never said that EPA would object to 7 proposed revisions. 8 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Thank 9 you. 10 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. Thank 11 I apologize for misunderstanding you. 12 that. 13 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. 14 Commissioner Velasquez. 15 COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: No 16 questions, thank you. 17 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner 18 Brancard. 19 COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: No 20 questions. 21 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner 22 Viqil. 23 COMMISSIONER VIGIL: No questions. 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: On the 25 platform, Commissioner Frey.

1 COMMISSIONER FREY: Thank you, 2. I have a real quick question: Mr. Baca. 3 4 EXAMINATION 5 BY COMMISSIONER FREY: 6 O. You're familiar with the 7 Petitioners' package, and of course I lost my place in there, dad gummit. 8 9 They have the response to 10 the -- oh, my goodness; let me see if I 11 can find it here. 12 Here it is, the Response to 13 Clean Water, where they gave detailed responses. Are you familiar with the 14 15 questions asked by the Communities for 16 Clean Water and the responses from 17 Petitioner? A. I have read through this document. 18 19 Q. Okay. Was NMED a party to these 20 comments and the responses throughout the 21 procedure? 2.2 A. No. We have provided our formal 23 comments in a separate enclosure; I 24 believe they provided that. This was a 25 separate, I think, effort by the

1 Petitioners to reach out to interested and affected parties where they sent this copy 2. 3 once they received input from us. 4 sent this to interested parties for 5 comment. 6 I believe --7 Q. Okay. A. -- they sent this -- the 8 9 demonstration that they sent that to CCW 10 or Communities For Clean Water was after 11 they received input from NMED and EPA. 12 O. Okay. But I think NMED was 13 somewhat involved in some of the Public Comments and the -- how can I put 14 15 it -- the effort to get those comments. 16 Is that correct? 17 A. We were part of maybe helping to identify some of the stakeholders that 18 19 this may need to go to. We were cc'd on 2.0 the letter that was sent to the 21 Communities for Clean Water. I would say 2.2 that we didn't solicit public input, but 23 we were adjacent to the process. 24 Q. Okay. But it sounds like from your 25 testimony that you feel they did a good

1	job or adequate job.
2	A. That is correct. I do believe that
3	they addressed adequately all comments
4	that they received from CCW.
5	Q. All right. Thank you very much.
6	COMMISSIONER FREY: As Chair
7	Thomson said, I think your testimony was
8	very valuable. Thank you.
9	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right.
10	Commissioner Harms.
11	COMMISSIONER HARMS: I don't have
12	any comments.
13	Thank you for your
14	presentation; I appreciate it.
15	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right.
16	Thank you.
17	Ms. Scott, any Redirect?
18	MS. SCOTT: None. No Redirect.
19	Thank you.
20	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right.
21	Mr. Maxwell, would you like to
22	make a statement?
23	MR. MAXWELL: I have no statement
24	for the record in this matter. Thank you.
25	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.

1	Is there any reason to do
2	Closing Statements?
3	MS. OLSON: No.
4	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Thank
5	you.
6	In that case let me ask one
7	more time in the event there is anyone in
8	the room or on the platform who would like
9	to offer Non-Technical Public Comment.
10	I see no hands, fleshy or
11	otherwise.
12	In that case, let's close the
13	evidentiary record.
14	Chair Thomson, the floor is
15	yours.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Thank you.
17	Okay. As was discussed at the
18	beginning of the hearing it was hoped that
19	we would be able to reach a conclusion on
20	this proposal today.
21	The first question before the
22	Commission, I think, is do we want to
23	request a report from the Hearing Officer?
24	I see heads shaking, so
25	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: Mr. Chair, I

<u></u>

1 think we have a quorum present today. I'm 2. pretty confident we can discuss all of 3 this in an educated fashion. 4 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okav. We 5 will not request a report from the Hearing 6 Officer. Fine. Then I guess the next question 7 is are there any points that Commissioners 8 9 would like to discuss based on the 10 testimony and the exhibits that were 11 submitted? 12 Commissioner Dominguez. 13 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: 14 apologize. I didn't look at the Scheduling Order, so it's more of a 15 16 question for the Hearing Officer. 17 I'm assuming there was not 18 built in anything as far as post-hearing 19 reports from the parties. Is that 2.0 correct? 21 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: That's 22 correct, Commissioner Dominguez. 23 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Okay. 24 just wanted to make sure we checked all 25 the boxes.

1 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Yes. 2. Commissioner Brancard. 3 COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Mr. Chair, 4 I don't have any concerns with the scope 5 of the Rulemaking, and I certainly don't have any concerns with the science, 6 7 because I don't understand it. I am concerned about the 8 9 language in the Rule in terms of how it 10 fits within our existing standards. 11 just think that we could have some better 12 language to clarify exactly what's going 13 on here. I don't think that... 14 The Petitioner has created this 15 whole new concept of Pajarito Plateau 16 Surface Waters, which is not in our 17 permeables, and I think we need to do a 18 better job defining what that is because 19 it does directly implicate things that are 2.0 in our rules, certain stream segments that 21 are already defined in our rules. 22 I don't want to change the 23 scope of the proposal, I just want to make 24 clearer language so anyone reading it who 25 wasn't involved with the development of

1 the Rule would understand what they meant. 2. CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Could that be 3 done simply by listing specific stream 4 segments in 20.6.4.900I(4)? It references Copper Criteria for Pajarito Plateau 5 6 Surface Waters. Could we put parentheses 7 and list the specific stream segments? COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: 8 Yeah, I'm 9 trying to work with language here that 10 would combine language that is in the 11 proposal with references to the segments 12 that clearly defines what it is. 13 There is other concerns with 14 the language in there, too; again, this 15 whole thing about the aquatic criteria. 16 It's like if this applies to aquatic 17 criteria, let's say it. Let's just be 18 really explicit about what we're doing; 19 So that there is no confusion. 20 You know, I'm concerned about 21 people like me who can't understand "BLM" 22 from the "BLM," and, you know, then of 23 course the lawyers out there who will pick 24 this apart some day and go "Oh, I don't 25 think it says that, " you know? So...

```
1
          COMMISSIONER MOANDER:
                                 Mr. Chair,
 2.
    I'm inclined to agree with Commissioner
 3
    Brancard on this.
 4
              I mean Commissioner Brancard,
    just to clarify as well, I think you were
 5
 6
    focused at one point, I believe it was
 7
    J(2)(a). Perhaps I'm misreading it, but I
    get the impression that change will apply
 8
 9
    wholesale to everything in the above
10
    table, or at least the single table.
11
    That's not necessarily what we're here to
12
    discuss today, so I can see where that can
13
    be extrapolated well beyond its intention.
14
          COMMISSIONER BRANCARD:
                                   If I may,
15
    Mr. Chair, I mean I asked that question of
16
    both witnesses. None of them seem
17
    bothered by their "only" language and the
18
    implications that I saw in it, so I don't
19
    know that I have a better answer to that
20
    than what they provided. I mean obviously
21
    they have an opinion about that language.
22
              I don't know. Commissioner
23
    Frey also raised some questions about that
24
    phrase in J(2), but...
25
          COMMISSIONER FREY: May I jump in
```



```
1
    here at this point?
 2.
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yes, please do.
 3
          COMMISSIONER FREY:
                               I don't mean to
    interrupt you, Commissioner Brancard:
 4
 5
              I also had some thoughts
              I don't think there is probably
 6
    about...
    a significant issue with what Commissioner
 7
    Brancard is suggesting, but I had some
 8
 9
    thoughts about like, what is it, J(2)(a),
10
    the "receiving water" characteristics.
11
              "Receiving water," I suppose if
12
    I had gotten into more of all of the
13
    material we were given, I might know
    better what that means, but I realize, you
14
15
    know, I didn't know what "receiving water"
16
    meant.
17
              I passed it by some of my
18
    colleagues from our Water Program here at
19
    the Bureau of Geology, and they didn't
20
    know what this meant either, so I would
21
    propose something so basic as putting that
22
    in the definitions.
23
              Let's see where the
24
    definitions --
25
              Oh, shoot, I lost my place
```

1	again.
2	For the Administrative Code,
3	include those in the definitions. There
4	is something as simple as "irrigation"
5	defined in there, and I think most people
6	have some idea of what "irrigation" is.
7	The fact that I have, you know, some
8	people that I consider experts that I work
9	with who don't know what this is, I think
LO	it's important to define that.
11	Then the other thing was so the
L2	material provided, there's 2 EPA documents
L3	included, and I noticed in the Code that
L4	neither of those are included in the
L5	"References." If we're making these kind
L6	of changes, it seems to me that those
L7	should be included.
18	Those are my 2 points. I'll
L9	let Commissioner Brancard continue to
20	address his other concerns as well. I
21	think he's got more experience with those.
22	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Yes, go
23	ahead.
24	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Right.
25	Why don't I just throw

1	something out:
2	In Section .900.I it says, the
3	relevant phrase:
4	" excluding Copper
5	Criteria for the Pajarito
6	Plateau Surface Waters for
7	and the Rio Grande Basin as
8	described in Paragraph (4) of
9	this Subsection."
10	I would put, at this point, a
11	sentence in that follows:
12	"Pajarito Plateau Surface
13	Waters, as used in 20.6.4.900
14	NMAC, means those classified
15	and unclassified waters of the
16	State [those are defined terms]
17	within the Pajarito Plateau,
18	[and then use the language that
19	was already presented before]
20	from Guaje Canyon in the north,
21	to Rito de los Frijoles
22	watershed in the south, from
23	their headwaters to their
24	confluence with the Rio Grande,
25	and all tributaries and streams

<u></u>

```
1
              thereto [and then] including
 2
              segments described in
 3
              20.6.4.121, .126, .127, .128,
 4
              and, .140 NMAC."
              So it's everything within that
 5
    area, so including both classified waters
 6
 7
    and the unclassified waters, an then
    specifically referring to the existing
 8
 9
    segments so it's clear we are modifying
10
    those existing segments.
11
              I think that was the intent of
12
    what was proposed, so I just want to make
13
    really clear what we're doing here.
14
    we don't have to discuss the Pajarito
    Plateau and what it means in the next
15
16
              That phrase can go out, I mean
    Section.
    the "from Guaje Canyon" language can go
17
    out of, I think, I(4).
18
19
              I would change I(4), too.
2.0
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
                              Okay. Thoughts.
                                  I think
21
          COMMISSIONER MOANDER:
2.2
    that's a good idea to get clarity.
23
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
                              I agree.
24
              That defines the boundaries,
    but also identifies the stream segments.
25
```

1	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: If we keep
2	the boundaries that the parties have
3	proposed, that's fine. That's what they
4	want. What is covered is everything
5	basically inside of that, you know, so it
6	doesn't look like we're conflicting with
7	the existing stream segment provisions
8	here.
9	I mean we had discussions about
10	when to go back and modify .126, and I
11	think if we do this, we don't need to
12	necessarily go back and modify those
13	sections.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: All right. I
15	agree.
16	Okay. Further discussion?
17	Based on Mr. Baca's response to
18	my concern about the number of significant
19	figures, I'm willing to concede that we'll
20	keep all 5 in, which, again, I disapprove
21	of, but I will support it.
22	The one issue regarding
23	significant figures, though, let's do
24	change that DOC limit from "29.7" to "30."
25	And then my other issue was an

<u></u>

1 editorial suggestion again in I.(4) that 2. we refer to both equations for acute and 3 chronic toxicity, as now it only refers... 4 It says "the equation," but 5 it's not specific. Those are the 2 6 suggestions that I would argue in favor 7 of. Commissioner Dominguez. 8 9 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Okav. So 10 questions for you on rounding that up: 11 As currently presented is there any negative outcome of using the equation 12 13 as it's currently written? 14 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: I will give you 15 my answer, and we can ask the experts. 16 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: We can't 17 ask them; the record is closed. 18 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okav. 19 I ran the calculation using 20 "30" instead of "29.7," and the difference 21 is in the rounding error. 22 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: 23 concern, and the process is this 24 Demonstration Report has probably been one 25 of the most extraordinarily comprehensive

1 documents that's come before this 2. Commission. I think the "29.7" depicts 3 the finite accuracy that the Petitioners 4 have tried to present to us. 5 I have concern with arbitrarily 6 rounding figures because the courts see 7 that as low hanging fruit of "We're not basing that on anything in the record." 8 9 We're just making a change, and the courts 10 are fairly clear that's arbitrary and 11 capricious because it is just a subjective 12 rounding. 13 I see no value in changing it, 14 and I think that's just a principle 15 approach of how the Commission needs to 16 take a look at it. I would probably say 17 that it gives me pause in supporting the Rulemaking if modified. 18 19 Commissioner CHAIRMAN THOMSON: 20 Frey, go ahead. 21 COMMISSIONER FREY: Thank Okay. 22 you. 23 I agree with the Commissioner, 24 and understanding that... 25 Let's see; what's the value?

1	There you use "29.7" or "30" is
2	not a big difference, then why not stay
3	with the "29.7" since the people who have
4	done this work have made some decision on
5	how many significant figures, or how many
6	decimal places should be used.
7	I would agree that let's just
8	stick with what they have since it's not
9	going to make a huge difference.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Let me respond:
11	I think using too many
12	significant figures implies confidence in
13	the results that are not justified by the
14	experimental data or by the analyses.
15	If you look at virtually all of
16	our drinking water standards, they are
17	mostly 1 significant figure, some of them
18	are 2 significant figures, but none of
19	them that I am aware of are more than 2
20	significant figures.
21	Again these were based on
22	toxicological and epidemiological studies,
23	and they are doing a statistical analysis
24	and rounding to 1 or 2 significant
25	figures.

1	I think we're in a position to
2	do that with this standard, which is not
3	even a number that is used.
4	Well, it is used to calculate a
5	copper limit, and I just was checking. It
6	changes from the example that I used in my
7	spreadsheet. It changes the number, so I
8	did a calculation using "29.7," and it
9	gives me a copper concentration of "67.9."
LO	If I use "30," and it gives me "67.6." I
11	mean the difference is tiny, less than 1%.
L2	Again, I just am fundamentally
L3	opposed to using more significant figures
L4	than is justified by the studies.
L5	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Mr. Chair,
L6	to move on from this whirlpool, or tide
L7	pool, let me just suggest that you take a
18	separate vote on that particular amendment
L9	since you have had a couple other
20	Commissioners speak out. Then you can
21	move on to different topics.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. Fine.
23	COMMISSIONER FREY: May I make one
24	follow-up comment to that?
25	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yes.

<u>6</u>

```
1
          COMMISSIONER FREY:
                              When you use
 2.
    either the "Acute Aquatic Life Criteria"
 3
    equation or the "Chronic Aquatic Life
 4
    Criteria, " how many decimal places should
 5
    you resolve with knowing that -- well
    sorry, not "decimal places," but
 6
    significant figures knowing that 1 of
 7
    their figures is ".045," which I read as 2
 8
 9
    significant figures?
10
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
                             I'll give you my
11
    opinion.
12
          COMMISSIONER FREY: The calculation
    would come out to "68" either way, thus I
13
14
    don't see the importance of changing that,
15
    again because of all the work they have
16
    already put into this. They must have
17
    some reason for having 3 significant
18
    figures on that particular piece.
19
          COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ:
                                    If I may,
20
    Mr. Chair, I'm looking back at the table
21
    of (4), so it would be Table 3 depicting
22
    Hardness and so many grams per liter, and
23
    there are some of those that are carried
24
    out to 3 decimal points. Are we going to
25
    round all of those up to --
```

1	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Not today.
2	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: I'm just
3	saying it's utilized that way and other
4	ways. If we're going to take that path,
5	then we need to revise all of them.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. So the
7	Hearing Officer has suggested that we move
8	on. When we get to the point of the
9	motion, perhaps we'll consider that
10	separately.
11	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Mr. Chair, I
12	think you have Ms. Scott at the table.
13	MS. SCOTT: Yes, Madam Hearing
14	Officer, Chair Thomson. I'm wondering if
15	we could take a break.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Oh, yes.
17	MS. SCOTT: I also want to maybe,
18	before we take a break, I don't want to
19	interrupt the discussion, but I would want
20	to make a motion to reopen the record for
21	the purpose of providing further context
22	to address Commissioner Brancard's
23	concerns, and also to propose alternative
24	language to the proposed amendment that we
25	believe addresses Commissioner Brancard's

```
1
    concerns.
 2.
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                  Okav.
 3
              I think it might be helpful to
 4
    invite her to speak to the alternative
 5
    language so we can reflect on it over the
 6
    break. Is that -- or no?
 7
          MS. SCOTT: We would potentially
    fine tune and polish that alternative
 8
 9
    lanquage.
10
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Over the
11
   break.
12
          MS. SCOTT: Over the break.
13
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                 Just trying
14
    to cut to the chase.
15
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Let's take a
16
    break until I believe 4:15. Is that
17
    correct?
18
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                  Yeah.
19
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
                             Okay. So we are
20
    adjourned until then.
21
              (The Water Quality Control
2.2
    Commission Technical Hearing recessed from
23
    3:54 p.m. to 4:21 p.m.)
24
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. We are
   back in session at 4:20.
25
```

1	Where were we?
2	Ms. Scott, you had some
3	alternative language.
4	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: She was
5	making a motion to reopen the record. I
6	think the Commission needs to agree that
7	it would be beneficial to reopen the
8	record.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Does she make
10	the motion or does it have to be by a
11	Commissioner?
12	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I would say
13	that the Commission and Rebecca,
14	correct me if I'm wrong.
15	The Commission should vote to
16	reopen the record.
17	COMMISSION COUNSEL: Yes, upon
18	their request.
19	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Okay.
20	Mr. Chairman, I voted to close the record,
21	but I would vote to reopen the record.
22	VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: I second.
23	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Role call.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Ms. Jones.
25	MS. JONES: Commissioner Brancard,

1	how do you vote.
2	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Yes.
3	MS. JONES: Commissioner Dominguez.
4	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Yes.
5	MS. JONES: Commissioner Frey.
6	COMMISSIONER FREY: Yes.
7	MS. JONES: Thank you.
8	Commissioner Harms.
9	COMMISSIONER HARMS: Yes.
10	MS. JONES: Commissioner Moander.
11	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: Yes.
12	MS. JONES: Chair Thomson.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yes.
14	MS. JONES: Commissioner Velasquez.
15	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: Yes.
16	MS. JONES: Commissioner Vigil.
17	COMMISSIONER VIGIL: Yes.
18	MS. JONES: Vice Chair Zemlick.
19	VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: Yes.
20	MS. JONES: Thank you.
21	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. I can
22	take it from here.
23	Ms. Scott, it appears you're
24	presenting Ms. Lemon.
25	Ms. Lemon, do you swear or

1 affirm to tell the truth? 2. THE WITNESS: HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you, 4 go ahead. 5 SHELLY LEMON, 6 after having been first duly sworn, 7 was examined and testified as follows: 8 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. SCOTT: 11 Q. Will you please state and spell 12 your name? 13 A. My name is Shelly Lemon; 14 S-H-E-L-L-Y L-E-M-O-N. 15 Q. Where are you employed? A. I'm employed with the New Mexico 16 Environment Department Surface Water 17 18 Quality Bureau. 19 Q. And what's your current role? 20 A. I am the Surface Water Quality 21 Bureau Chief. 2.2 Q. And what are your current job 23 duties? 24 A. My Bureau administers and 25 implements the Clean Water Act and Water

1 Quality Act in the State of New Mexico. 2 O. And how long have you worked for 3 NMED? 4 A. I've worked for NMED for a little 5 over 20 years. 6 O. Okay. 7 Did you submit a copy of your Resumé as NMED Exhibit 3 in this matter? 8 9 A. I did. 10 Q. And do you have before you what has 11 been identified as NMED Exhibit 3? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Do you recognize that document as 14 your Resumé? 15 A. It is. 16 O. Is it a true and accurate copy of 17 your Resumé? 18 A. It is. 19 MS. SCOTT: Madam Hearing Officer, 20 NMED moves to admit NMED Exhibit 3. 21 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Pause for 2.2 objections. 23 Exhibit 3 is admitted. 24 (Water Quality Control 25 Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit

1	3 was received in evidence.)
2	MS. SCOTT: Sorry, we submitted
3	that as Exhibit 4.
4	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay.
5	Exhibit 4.
6	MS. SCOTT: Yeah, so just a
7	correction, clerical correction to move to
8	admit NMED Exhibit 4.
9	(Water Quality Control
10	Commission Technical Hearing NMED Exhibit
11	4 was received in evidence.)
12	Q. BY MS. SCOTT: Okay. Will you read
13	our proposed alternative language and then
14	provide some context as to how NMED and
15	the parties think this addresses
16	Commissioner Brancard's concerns.
17	A. Yes.
18	The parties are proposing to
19	amended language in 20.6.4.900I. In the
20	first paragraph, starting with:
21	"Hardness-dependent Acute
22	and Chronic Aquatic Life
23	Criteria for metals are
24	calculated using the following
25	equations:"

1	This is where the additional
2	language is:
3	" excluding Aquatic Life
4	Criteria for Copper [Criteria
5	for copper, sorry], for the
6	Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters
7	and the Rio Grande Basin as
8	described in Paragraph (4) of
9	this Subsection."
10	If we added "Aquatic Life
11	Criteria for copper" and the descriptor of
12	"in the Rio Grande Basin" to reference the
13	Rio Grande Basin in Section .100, which is
14	where these waters apply.
15	We did not want to include the
16	classified segments that Commissioner
17	Brancard suggested because those segments
18	include additional waters besides Pajarito
19	Plateau waters. They are more broad and
20	we didn't want confusion related to that
21	issue.
22	Referencing "Pajarito Plateau
23	Surface Waters in the Rio Grande Basin" we
24	thought was a good compromise to identify
25	which Basins these waters are found in.

<u></u>

1	Then: "as described in
2	Paragraph (4) [we kept
3	Paragraph (4) the same] Copper
4	Criteria for Pajarito Plateau
5	Surface Waters [and same
6	descriptor] from Guaje Canyon
7	in the north, to the Rito de
8	los Frijoles watershed in the
9	south, from their headwaters to
10	their confluence with the Rio
11	Grande, and all tributaries and
12	streams thereto"
13	We kept everything. We are
14	adding, as recommended by the Commission:
15	"In waters that contain DOC
16	concentrations greater than
17	29.7 mg/L, a value of 29.7 mg/L
18	shall be used in the following
19	equations:"
20	That clarifies that the
21	following equations in (a) and (b) are to
22	be used for these criteria.
23	Q. And in the future how might the
24	Department address clarifying in the
25	specific stream segments that these

<u></u>

1 criteria apply? 2. A. I will -- what am I trying to say? 3 In the future we're required to 4 review our Water Quality Standards every 3 5 years, which is known as the Triennial 6 Review. It is a requirement of the Clean 7 Water Act. It doesn't quite happen every 8 3 years; it's every 3 years from EPA 9 approval. 10 We are initiating the Triennial 11 Review this calendar year in 2025. 12 intend to have a hearing in calendar year 13 2026 so we can address issues and add 14 definitions as needed, to help clarify 15 this proposal if that is needed for the 16 Triennial Review to help clarify things. 17 Adding definitions are, at this 18 time, problematic because those 19 definitions didn't go through the public 20 participation process, and we have to make sure that is followed in order to include 21 22 any language or definitions that may be 23 required to help implement these Water 24 Quality Standards, but that's definitely 25 something we can look at in the upcoming

1 Triennial Review. 2 MS. SCOTT: Okay. Ms. Lemon is 3 open for further questioning. 4 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you, 5 Ms. Scott? 6 Do Petitioners have any 7 questions? MS. OLSON: No. 8 9 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: 10 Mr. Maxwell, do you have any 11 questions of Ms. Lemon? 12 MR. MAXWELL: I have no questions. 13 Thank you. 14 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you. I'll start with Commissioner 15 16 Moander. 17 COMMISSIONER MOANDER: No 18 questions. 19 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Vice 20 Chair Zemlick. 21 VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: No 22 questions. 23 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner 24 Dominguez. 25 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: More of a

1	comment than a question:
2	I had already thought about, if
3	we're really close on workable language,
4	the next opportunity to tweak bigger
5	issues is the Triennial Review. If it's
6	not going to be problematic between now
7	and the Triennial, it's a good step
8	forward, so I agree with your point.
9	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Chair
10	Thomson.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: I agree also
12	with Commissioner Dominguez and I have no
13	questions. Thank you.
14	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you.
15	Commissioner Velasquez.
16	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: No
17	questions. Thank you.
18	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner
19	Brancard.
20	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Thank you.
21	
22	EXAMINATION
23	BY COMMISSIONER BRANCARD:
24	Q. I guess I just still think that
25	opening line of Subsection (4) is not

1	really much of a sentence.
2	What is the objection to
3	including the phrase:
4	"Classified and unclassified
5	waters of the State"?
6	A. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Brancard:
7	Are you referencing Subsection
8	(4), or Paragraph (4), which starts with."
9	"Copper Criteria for the
10	Pajarito Plateau"?
11	Q. Yes, thank you. It starts with
12	that phrase, and there is a Colón, and it
13	goes "from Guaje Canyon" and it says at
14	the end "as follows:" I don't think
15	that's a sentence.
16	I'm more concerned about the
17	phrase that I offered, or the "classified
18	and unclassified" part.
19	A. I don't think the Department has
20	any objection to adding it in Paragraph
21	(4) to state:
22	"Copper Criteria for
23	Pajarito Plateau Surface
24	Waters"
25	Q. (Reading:) " which includes all

<u></u>

1	classified and unclassified
2	waters from Guaje Canyon in the
3	north"
4	A. Okay.
5	Q. That way we know the segments are
6	included and we don't have to name the
7	segments.
8	You may have a problem naming
9	the segments, but anything that's within
10	an existing segment would be included
11	within that "Pajarito Plateau" phrase.
12	It's the concept that we're coming up with
13	here.
14	A. Mr. Chair and Commissioner
15	Brancard:
16	That's why we added in "the Rio
17	Grande Basin" in the first part in .900I,
18	because the Rio Grande Basin is in Section
19	.100.
20	Q. Uh-huh?
21	A. Both can work I believe.
22	Q. I agree with "in the Rio Grande
23	Basin," but I think you're trying to cover
24	waters that are within the existing
25	segments, but I think you're also

<u></u>

1	covering, you know, streams that are not
2	classified; correct? Because you included
3	Section .98 earlier.
4	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner
5	Brancard, does it make a difference that
6	"Surface Waters" is already defined in the
7	definitions?
8	"Copper Criteria for
9	Pajarito Plateau Surface
10	Waters"
11	"Surface Water" has a long
12	definition:
13	" which includes
14	tributaries, wetlands, manmade
15	waterways"
16	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Madam
17	Hearing Officer, I think that would be
18	fine.
19	I mean the assumption is
20	"Surface Waters" covers everything. You
21	could start that provision saying, you
22	know, what is it, "Copper Criteria for
23	Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters,"
24	which
25	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Which it

```
1
    says.
          COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: "... which
 2.
 3
              extends..., "right.
 4
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                 That's what
 5
    it's already proposed as.
          COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I quess I
 6
 7
    don't have the greatest version.
 8
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                  I'm going to
 9
    give you this (indicating).
10
          COMMISSIONER BRANCARD:
                                  Right.
11
              The words "which extends." You
12
    said the words "which extends," which I
13
    think would make it more of a sentence.
14
          THE WITNESS: Mr. Chair,
15
    Commissioner Brancard, Paragraph (4) was
16
    modeled after Paragraph (1) and (2), which
17
    have the title:
                  "Chronic Aquatic Life
18
19
              Criteria for metals."
20
              We are making a similar title,
21
    but I understand your concern that it's
2.2
    not starting off with a sentence.
23
    bolded part, "Copper Criteria for Pajarito
24
    Plateau Surface Waters" is the topic.
25
       O. BY COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: That's
```

```
1
    fine. You can start the sentence with
 2.
    "Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters extend
    from..., " and just make it an entire
 3
 4
    sentence so that the bolded part is not
 5
    part of the sentence.
 6
       A. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Brancard:
 7
              Beginning: "Paragraph (4),
              Copper Criteria for Pajarito
 8
 9
              Plateau Surface Waters:
10
                   "Pajarito Plateau Surface
11
              Waters include classified and
12
              unclassified waters extending
13
              from Guaje Canyon in the north,
14
              to Rito de los Frijoles in the
15
              south..."
16
              Is that...
17
       Q. Gorgeous.
18
          COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Ms. Lemon,
    not to complicate things, but I think
19
20
    we've gone full circle that the term
    "Surface Waters" is already defined and
21
22
    includes everything. Adding "classified
    and unclassified " is redundant to the term
23
24
    Surface Waters.
25
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                  That was my
```

1	point.
2	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: It appears
3	one or the other is sufficient, but having
4	"Surface Waters" and adding "classified
5	and unclassified" seems redundant. I
6	think it would be fine with just "Surface
7	Waters" and strike "classified and
8	unclassified," and just continue the
9	sentence as it currently is.
LO	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Well I
l1	think you can just drop that phrase
L2	because you start the sentence with
L3	"Pajarito Plateau Surface Waters extend
L4	from"
L5	COMMISSIONER FREY: This is
L6	Commissioner Frey.
L7	I think we lost video, and I
18	hope we haven't lost our we have video
L9	again.
20	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Huh.
21	MR. MAXWELL: Commissioner, I
22	second that.
23	COMMISSIONER FREY: Can you guys
24	hear us from the platform?
25	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Yes, and we

1	can see you as well.
2	COMMISSIONER FREY: Yes, whatever
3	happened resolved itself. Thank you.
4	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Have we come
5	to an agreement?
6	MS. SCOTT: Okay. For purposes of
7	clarity and for the record, I'll ask
8	Ms. Lemon to re-read the proposed language
9	in full.
10	THE WITNESS: (Reading:)
11	"20.6.4.900I.(4), Copper
12	Criteria for Pajarito Plateau
13	Surface Waters:
14	"Pajarito Plateau Surface
15	Waters extend from Guaje Canyon
16	in the north, to the Rito day
17	Frijoles watershed in the
18	south, from their headwaters to
19	their confluence with the Rio
20	Grande, and all tributaries and
21	streams thereto"
22	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner
23	Brancard.
24	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I'm fine
25	with that. I don't know if you think you

1 need anything that sets up the 2 Criteria 2. Subparagraphs, or Subsections or 3 Paragraphs. I don't know where we are. 4 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: For the benefit of the folks in the video wilderness, the 5 parties are discussing the language a 6 7 little bit further. 8 MS. SCOTT: We're taking one more 9 moment just to make sure. 10 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Sure. 11 MS. SCOTT: Okay. One more slight 12 clarification: We want to add in or want to 13 14 propose adding in another sentence in the Copper Criteria, or in the body of that 15 Section just to be clear that it's also 16 17 Copper Criteria. 18 Okav. One more time. Ms. Lemon, will you please read the 19 20 proposed language. 21 (Reading:) THE WITNESS: 22 "Paragraph (4), Copper 23 Criteria for Pajarito Plateau 24 Surface Waters: "Pajarito Plateau Surface 25

1	Waters extend from Guaje Canyon
2	in the north, to Rito de los
3	Frijoles watershed in the
4	south, from their headwaters to
5	their confluence with the Rio
6	Grande, and all tributaries and
7	streams thereto
8	"Equations used to calculate
9	Copper Criteria, for purposes
10	of this Section, use Dissolved
11	Organic Carbon (DOC) in units
12	of milligrams carbon per liter
13	(mg C/L); and Hardness is
14	expressed in units of mg/L as
15	CaCO3."
16	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner
17	Brancard, any questions about that.
18	Q. BY COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I tend
19	to get confused because there are 2 levels
20	of criteria here. There is the "Aquatic
21	Life Criteria," and the "Copper Criteria";
22	okay? They are somehow linked, and I
23	think we need to be explicit about that.
24	There are changes to I initially
25	clarifying that.

1 A. Mr. Chair and Commissioner 2 Brancard: 3 My understanding is that 4 because Paragraph (4) is in Section I, it relates to "Aquatic Life Criteria." This 5 6 is specific to 1 pollutant for the whole suite of "Aquatic Life Criteria" that 7 8 exists. 9 Because it's a Subparagraph of Section I, it is "Acute and Chronic 10 11 Aquatic Life Criteria" that we are talking 12 about. 13 COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I'll go with that. I prefer to be redundant, 14 15 but... 16 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 17 Thank you. Commissioner Vigil. 18 19 COMMISSIONER VIGIL: I have no 20 questions. 21 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 2.2 Did any of that discussion 23 cause other Commissioners to have 24 questions? On the platform, Commissioner 25

<u></u>

1 Frey. 2. COMMISSIONER FREY: I think what 3 was discussed is awesome. I did have a 4 question about what I was suggesting for the -- let me see here. 5 6 7 EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER FREY: 8 9 Q. Thank you, by the way, for 10 consideration of my suggestion for a definition. If that should be reviewed 11 down the road, that's fine with me. 12 13 The "Publication Preferences" 14 for the 1995 Water Quality Criteria and 2007 EPA Copper Revision, it seems to me 15 16 those should be in 20.6.4.901, and I'm 17 happy to hear whether or not that's 18 appropriate from Ms. Lemon. 19 A. Mr. Chair and Commissioner: 20 I believe that we can add those 21 references to the "References" Section. Ι 2.2 think that would be something that the 23 Commission would have to request because 24 it was not in the Petition, but it doesn't 25 have any substantive effect on the Water

1 Quality Standards, it's just "Publication 2. References" intended as guidance and 3 available for public review. 4 I believe the Department does not have any objection to adding it to the 5 6 reference Section in .901. 7 COMMISSIONER FREY: Okay. Thank 8 you. 9 That was all. 10 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 11 Thank you. 12 Commissioner Harms. 13 COMMISSIONER HARMS: I don't have 14 any questions. Thank you very much. 15 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 16 Thank you. 17 Ms. Scott, any follow-up? 18 MS. SCOTT: No follow-up. 19 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right. 20 MS. SCOTT: I think this concludes 21 our further testimony in the case. 2.2 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. Thank 23 you. 24 Let me ask if the Petitioners 25 have anything to add while the record has

1	been reopened.
2	MS. OLSON: No; I apologize.
3	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: All right.
4	Mr. Maxwell, anything to add
5	while the record has been reopened?
6	MR. MAXWELL: Nothing further, your
7	Honor.
8	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Thank you
9	very much.
10	We will close the evidentiary
11	record then once again.
12	Chair Thomson, the floor is
13	yours.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. Thank
15	you. I'm glad we got that one resolved.
16	Okay. Are we ready to
17	entertain a motion to act on this Petition
18	or is there further discussion?
19	Commissioner Moander.
20	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: Just a point
21	of Order, Mr. Chair:
22	Are we going to bifurcate this
23	vote to discuss the "29.7" separate from
24	the remainder of what I understand to be
25	the proposal?

<u></u>

1	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: I would like to
2	do that, yes.
3	I think I can make a motion,
4	can't I?
5	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Commissioner,
7	did you have something to add to that?
8	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: No,
9	Mr. Chair. I was trying to think about
10	how to phrase this.
11	If you have something ready to
12	go, I'm happy to entertain.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yeah, my motion
14	will be that in Section I, Subparagraph
15	(4), the sentence that reads:
16	"For the purposes of this
17	Section, Dissolved Organic Carbon
18	(DOC) is in units of milligrams
19	per liter (mg/CL); and Hardness is
20	expressed in units of mg/L as
21	CaCO3 in waters that contain DOC
22	concentrations greater than 30
23	milligrams per liter, a value of
24	30 mg/L shall be used in the
25	following equation:"

<u></u>

1	And so the change would be "30
2	mg/L" instead of "29.7." That's
3	my motion.
4	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: Second.
5	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I second
6	your motion for purpose of a vote.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. Thank
8	you.
9	Discussion:
10	Commissioner.
11	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Just to
12	reiterate my point and place it on the
13	record, I believe the Petitioning party
14	with their extensive Demonstration Report
15	that they submitted at the "29.7" depicts
16	a finite accuracy of the data collection.
17	That rounding up to "30" adds no real
18	value to it, and I believe it's a
19	subjective revision. As such, I probably
20	could not support the entire position of
21	the Petitioner.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay.
23	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: Just as a
24	counterpoint and food for thought, part of
25	the basis for forming Commissions like

1 this is the expertise is usually broad, and sometimes not, among the variety of 2. 3 members. I'm not speaking as an attorney 4 here, just for clarification and ethical 5 purposes as a Commissioner. 6 I think that with the 7 scientific knowledge of the Commission, I think that a change as proposed by the 8 9 Chair shouldn't pose a problem should 10 there be a challenge of some kind because 11 it's been backed by basically Technical thoughts and opinions. I think there is 2 12 13 sides to this coin to be considered before 14 it is passed. 15 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Further 16 discussion: COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: Mr. Chair 17 18 my perspective, from both the expert 19 witnesses and the testimony, is they said 20 that the ultimate goal is to get this 21 through the EPA. The EPA will likely 22 better receive the "29.7" than something 23 we changed in a rounding. If the goal is 24 to get this through EPA, I would vote in favor of keeping the "29.7." 25

1	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Further
3	comments:
4	COMMISSIONER FREY: Commissioner
5	Thomson.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yes, ma'am.
7	COMMISSIONER FREY: I would go back
8	to my freshmen chemistry class where the
9	importance of rounding is in the final
10	number.
11	I think also that the expertise
12	lies with the people who have written this
13	equation and came up with these numbers,
14	so I think we should go with their number
15	with a lack of rounding if you will.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. Further
18	comments.
19	Are we ready to vote?
20	Ms. Jones.
21	MS. JONES: For Chair Thomson's
22	motion, Commissioner Brancard, how do you
23	vote?
24	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: No.
25	MS. JONES: Commissioner Dominguez.

1	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: No.
2	MS. JONES: Commissioner Frey.
3	COMMISSIONER FREY: No.
4	MS. JONES: Commissioner Harms.
5	COMMISSIONER HARMS: No.
6	MS. JONES: Commissioner Moander.
7	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: No.
8	MS. JONES: Chair Thomson.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yes.
10	MS. JONES: Commissioner Velasquez.
11	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: No.
12	MS. JONES: Commissioner Vigil.
13	COMMISSIONER VIGIL: No.
14	MS. JONES: Vice Chair Zemlick.
15	VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: No.
16	MS. JONES: Chair Thomson, the
17	motion fails.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. With that
19	out of the way, the second motion I think
20	we need is whether or not to accept this
21	Petition.
22	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: As amended
23	or is that in the motion?
24	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: It would be the
25	amended language that was presented to us

1	a few minutes ago by NMED staff.
2	Commissioner Dominguez, would
3	you like to make the motion as your last
4	motion?
5	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: I think
6	Commissioner Brancard has his finger on
7	the button.
8	COMMISSIONER FREY: May I make a
9	comment before he does that, which I hope
10	he says yes?
11	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Sure.
12	COMMISSIONER FREY: Ms. Lemon
13	stated that she doesn't think it would be
14	a problem to add the "References," but let
15	me get the numbers again.
16	It's way down here in the
17	"Publication References" which is
18	20.6.4.901. That, I believe, would not go
19	in the motion, that would go in the
20	Chair's letter to the NMED. Is that
21	correct?
22	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: I'm looking to
23	Counsel.
24	I think if we are adding
25	language to a Rule, that would have to be

```
1
    in the motion.
 2.
          COMMISSION COUNSEL: Yeah, in terms
 3
    of the --
 4
              They left the table.
 5
              -- the non-substantive changes
 6
    in...
 7
              Is it the Appendix?
          MS. SHELLY LEMON:
                              "References."
 8
 9
          COMMISSION COUNSEL:
                                "References."
10
    they are non-substantive, but I would add
11
    the language, yes. You can accept them
12
    because they are not substantive, but I
13
    would add the language that you're adding,
14
    correct.
15
              If I'm correct --
16
          COMMISSIONER FREY: I can't hear,
17
    sorry.
          COMMISSION COUNSEL: I don't have a
18
19
    mic, so...
2.0
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Commissioner
    Frey, Commission Counsel confirmed that in
21
2.2
    fact it would be wise to add the language
23
    to the motion that those 2 publications
24
    should be included among the "References."
25
          COMMISSIONER FREY:
                               Okay.
```

1	Then I just had another thought
2	of, you know, since there has not really
3	been a discussion about this, I'm the only
4	Commissioner talking about it. The other
5	Commissioners have not talked about this.
6	Would it be a good idea to have a separate
7	motion for that?
8	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Let me just
9	do a vibe check here:
LO	Would anyone like to register
11	an objection at this time? I think we can
L2	save a few minutes.
L3	It seems good, Commissioner
L4	Frey.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Ma'am, I think
L6	it should be a separate issue.
L7	Personally I think adding
L8	"References" to a particular standard is a
L9	slippery slope because we've got something
20	like 120 criteria. If we had to have a
21	"Reference" for every one, it would be a
22	very, very long Appendix, and it would
23	change frequently. I would prefer that we
24	have that as a separate motion.
25	HEARING OFFICER ORTH: I invite

1	Commissioner Frey to make the motion
2	maybe.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Commissioner
4	Frey, would you like to make a motion to
5	include "References" in the Appendix to
6	the source of the data?
7	COMMISSIONER FREY: We know that
8	I'm not great at that, but I can try it:
9	I will, if I may, point out
10	that within the "References" there is:
11	"Reference I: Colorado
12	River Basin Salinity Control
13	Forum."
14	That would be specific to
15	"Salinity," whereas we're speaking to
16	something that is specific to "Copper," so
17	that would be my comment.
18	If you are ready, I can try to
19	make a motion.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yeah, I think
21	we're ready.
22	COMMISSIONER FREY: Okay.
23	I move to add to 20.6.4.901 the
24	"Publication References," or the 2
25	exhibits I believe that were given in both

parties' exhibits. The first is the "1995 1 2 Water Quality Criteria Update, and the 3 "2007 EPA Copper Revision." 4 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: I'm looking for 5 a second. 6 VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: I'll 7 second it. CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Discussion. 8 9 Commissioner Dominguez. 10 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Because I'm looking at Section .901, the 11 12 "References" listed there are very 13 specific to a particular page number of an 14 individual document. I'm looking quickly here, and 15 16 we have no "References" in other documents 17 to entire documents. I think this follows the Chair's comment that if we are trying 18 19 to include entire documents in our 20 "Reference" section, it is going to go off 21 the charts because each one of these 2.2 references a document, again, or a 23 specific page number. 24 COMMISSIONER FREY: If I may, those 25 are not page number references, I believe

1 those would be total pages in that 2. document, now knowing, from experience, 3 the standard methods for documents over 4 1,000 pages. 5 COMMISSION COUNSEL: I have a 6 question: 7 Are we cutting and pasting a list, or is it like incorporated by 8 9 reference? 10 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: For the benefit 11 of the folks in the audience, the question 12 from General Counsel is are we cutting and pasting a list, or just adopting 13 14 references by --15 COMMISSION COUNSEL: What I mean is 16 are we referring people to this 17 information? CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Referring people 18 19 to the specific "References." 20 Commissioner Frey. 21 COMMISSIONER FREY: Yes, Chair 2.2 Thomson, I'm sorry. Do you have a 23 question for me? 24 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Do you want 25 me to try it?

```
1
              Commissioner Frey, my memory is
 2.
    that you mentioned 2 exhibits that were in
 3
    the record, the titles of which would be
 4
    included among the "References." Do I
 5
    remember that correctly?
 6
          COMMISSIONER FREY: Yes.
                                     There
 7
    would be citations for each of those
    "References" in that "Reference" list.
 8
 9
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                 I don't
10
    remember which exhibits they were, 8 and 9
11
    or --
12
          COMMISSIONER FREY: They were
    Exhibit 5 and 6.
13
14
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                 In the
15
    Petitioners' --
16
          COMMISSIONER FREY: In the NMED
    Exhibit list, Exhibit Numbers 5 and 6.
17
18
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Just the
    titles of those 2 exhibits would be
19
2.0
    included among the "References"; I think
21
    that was your question.
22
          COMMISSION COUNSEL:
                                They are
23
    pointing people to those documents.
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Correct.
24
25
          COMMISSION COUNSEL: I just needed
```

```
1
    clarity.
 2.
          COMMISSIONER FREY: Yes.
 3
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON: One concern I
 4
    have is I believe that "Reference 6," this
    is the "2007 Revision," which refers to
 5
    the BLM, or the Biotic Ligand Model, but
 6
    does not refer to the MLR analysis which
 7
    simplifies it to the 3 parameter model
 8
 9
    that's proposed. The "Reference" does not
10
    reference those 2 equations.
11
              Those 2 equations, as I
12
    understand it, were generated by ...
13
              Is it Benchmark?
14
          MR. FULTON: Windward.
15
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
                              I'm sorry?
16
          MR. FULTON: "Windward."
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON: "Windward."
17
    Thank you.
18
19
              If we wanted to make a proper
20
    "Reference," we should reference
    "Windward," which was -- I don't recall
21
22
    the number.
23
              The problem there would be that
24
    "Reference" is not widely publicly
    available, and it's not a refereed
25
```

1	publication. It's not widely available.
2	COMMISSIONER FREY: I believe
3	standard methods would not be either.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Oh, absolutely.
5	COMMISSIONER FREY: Not the
6	Editions 18 through 20. Edition 23 you
7	could probably still purchase on Amazon;
8	the other 2, not so much.
9	I'll point out, you know, in
10	the paragraph at the beginning of "Public
11	References" it says:
12	"Copies of these documents
13	have also been filed with the
14	New Mexico State Records Center
15	in order to provide greater
16	access to this information."
17	The Code is already considering
18	that people may not have easy access to
19	these, and so they can be provided for
20	public review.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Commissioner
22	Dominguez.
23	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Yeah,
24	Mr. Chair, if I can offer up something
25	that would keep the wheels moving forward:

1	Potentially this could be
2	something the Environment Department could
3	explore, and if there is merit to it, then
4	at the Triennial Review it could be
5	brought back before the Commission. I
6	don't think anything will get lost in the
7	shuffle between now and 2026.
8	COMMISSIONER FREY: I was coming to
9	that conclusion, too. With the amount of
LO	discussion, this sounds like something
l1	along the lines of the "Definitions" that
L2	needs some deeper discussion.
L3	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Commissioner
L4	Brancard.
15	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Mr. Chair,
L6	once again Commissioner Dominguez has come
L7	up with the real solution to the issue,
L8	and this is why we're going to miss him.
L9	I would support a proposal to
20	refer this to the Environment Department
21	for possible inclusion in the next
22	Triennial Review.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Okay. But
24	COMMISSIONER FREY: Would it be
25	within the realm of possibility that I

1	withdraw the motion?
2	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: You made the
3	motion; I believe it's within your purview
4	to withdraw the motion.
5	COMMISSIONER FREY: I withdraw the
6	motion.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Does the person
8	who seconded also need to
9	Okay.
10	VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: I do
11	withdraw my second.
12	COMMISSION COUNSEL: You withdraw
13	your second.
14	VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: I
15	withdraw my second.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: All right.
17	Where do we stand? Is anyone
18	prepared to make a motion to take action
19	on this Petition?
20	Again, I think I would prefer
21	that it be made by Commissioner Dominguez,
22	but Commissioner Brancard, you
23	COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: I will try
24	to channel Commissioner Dominguez here in
25	my wording:

1 I move that the Commission, in 2. the matter of WOCC 24-31, approve the 3 proposal to amend Section 20.6.4.900 as 4 proposed by Triad National Security, et 5 al., and as amended by the New Mexico Environment Department in recent comments. 6 7 Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Thank you. 9 Commissioner Dominguez, would 10 you like to second? 11 COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Mr. Chair, if it would appease you, I will second. 12 13 HEARING OFFICER ORTH: Okay. It's 14 been moved and seconded. Is there further 15 discussion? 16 Are we ready to vote? 17 Ms. Jones, would you call the roll. 18 19 MS. JONES: Yes, sir. 20 Commissioner Brancard, your 21 vote. 22 COMMISSIONER BRANCARD: Yes. 23 MS. JONES: Commissioner Dominguez. 24 MR. DOMINGUEZ: Yes. 25 MS. JONES: Commissioner Frey.

1	COMMISSIONER FREY: Yes.
2	MS. JONES: Commissioner Harms.
3	COMMISSIONER HARMS: Yes.
4	MS. JONES: Commissioner Moander.
5	COMMISSIONER MOANDER: Yes.
6	MS. JONES: Chair Thomson.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: Yes.
8	MS. JONES: Commissioner Velasquez.
9	COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ: Yes.
10	MS. JONES: Commissioner Vigil.
11	COMMISSIONER VIGIL: Yes.
12	MS. JONES: Vice Chair Zemlick.
13	VICE CHAIRWOMAN ZEMLICK: Yes.
14	MS. JONES: Motion passes.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMSON: I would like to
16	thank everyone who participated in this,
17	especially the witnesses and Counsel.
18	It's been enlightening.
19	COMMISSIONER DOMINGUEZ: Mr. Chair
20	to add to that, I would like to point out
21	2 things:
22	Since 2007 EPA has been
23	requesting that NMED and the Commission
24	move forward with adopting those
25	guidelines, and it's only taken us 18

<u></u>

```
1
    years to actually do that.
 2
              The other point that became
 3
    obvious to me, at least during the time
 4
    that I have served on this Commission, is
 5
    I cannot think of another time that LANL
 6
    and the Environment Department were on the
 7
    same side of an issue, so these are 2
    monumental steps that have been taken
 8
 9
    today.
10
          CHAIRMAN THOMSON:
                              Thank you.
11
          HEARING OFFICER ORTH:
                                  Thank you.
12
    That will end the record at this time.
13
               (The hearing concluded at 5:12
14
    p.m.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
               STATE OF NEW MEXICO
 3
         WATER QUALITY CONTROL COMMISSION
 4
 5
     IN THE MATTER OF TRIAD
                                ) Docket No.:
     NATIONAL SECURITY, L.L.C.'S)
     NEWPORT NEWS NUCLEAR BWXT- )
 6
                                    WOCC 24-31
     LOS ALAMOS, L.L.C.'S, AND
 7
     THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMEN)
     OF ENERGY, OFFICE OF
     ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT'S )
 8
     PETITION FOR RULEMAKING
 9
     TO AMEND 20.6.4.900 NMAC.
10
        HEARING RE THE MATTER OF TRIAD
11
    NATIONAL SECURITY, L.L.C.'S NEWPORT NEWS
12
    NUCLEAR BWXT-LOS ALAMOS, L.L.C.'S, AND THE
    UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, OFFICE
    OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT'S PETITION FOR
13
    RULEMAKING TO AMEND 20.6.4.900 NMAC.
14
15
              BEFORE THE HONORABLE:
                 FELICIA L. ORTH
16
17
            TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2025
18
                    10:47 A.M.
              REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
19
        I, DAVID M. LEE, RMR, CRR,
20
    CERTIFICATE NUMBER 50391, NEW MEXICO CCR
    NUMBER 537, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that on
21
    TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2025, the Proceedings
22
    in the above-captioned matter were taken
    before me, and that I did report in
23
    stenographic shorthand the Proceedings set
    forth herein. The foregoing pages are a
2.4
    true and correct transcription, all done
    to the best of my ability.
25
        I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
```



employed by, nor related to, nor contracted with (unless excepted by the rules) any of the parties or attorneys in this case, and that I have no interest whatsoever in the final disposition of this case in any court. DATED at Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 4th day of March, 2025. DAVID M. LEE, RMR, CCR Arizona Certificate Number 50391 New Mexico Certificate Number License Expires: 12/31/2025

Exhibits

N3B Exhibit 1 -Demonstration Rep ort-c 8:14 10:8 28:23

78:13,15 79:3,6,8 160:24 161:3 162:3,6, 8,9

N3B Exhibit 2 -Proposed Rule Cha nge-c 6:24 10:6 40:11, 20,24 41:1 67:12 122:7 160:4.7,16.19.21,22

N3B Exhibit 3 -Direct Testimony W hite FINAL 6:12 12:8 37:23 38:19,23,25 88:21 210:8,11,20,23, 25 211:1

N3B Exhibit 4 -Direct Testimony Fu Iton 8:1 12:10 76:4 77:10,13,15 211:3,5,8, 10.11

N3B Exhibit 5 -Amanda White Resu me 6:20 10:11 39:16 40:1,5,7 162:15 163:4, 7,9,10 241:13

N3B Exhibit 6 -Fulton Resume-c

8:10 10:15 77:22 78:6, 9,11 88:6 163:13 164:5,8,10,11

N3B Exhibit 7 -Newspaper Announ cement-c 7:5 10:19 41:5,23 42:1,3 164:13, 14 165:2,5,7,8

N3B Exhibit 8 -Response to Public Comments wo Demo nstration Report-c 7:11 10:22 42:7 23

7:11 10:22 42:7,23 43:2,4 165:11 166:4,7, 9,10

(CA)

N3B Exhibit 9 -Site Specific Water Quality Criteria Work

Plan6-c 8:21 11:5 79:12,16,23 80:1,3 166:13,25 167:3,5,6

N3B Exhibit 10 -EPA 2007 Copper Cr iteria-c 9:3 11:8 30:19, 20 80:7,11,16,19,21,22 167:9,22,25 168:2,3

N3B Exhibit 11 - EPA 1996 Guidance-

c 9:8 11:11 80:25 81:4, 16,19,21,22 168:6,18, 21,23,24 172:1,8,12 173:2,5

NMED Exhibit 1 WQ CC 24-31 9:13 11:14 81:25 82:4,20,23,25 83:1 169:6,19,22,24,25 181:10

N3B Exhibit 12-Direct Technical Tes timony of-c

N3B Exhibit 13 -EPA approval of Ge orgia WQS Buffalo C

r SSC-c 9:17 11:20 76:19 83:4,8,19,22,24, 25 170:2,3,19,24,25 181:13

N3B Exhibit 14 -Windward_2018_ DQO_DQA Report-c 9:23 12:3 84:3,7,17,20, 22,23 171:16,19,21,22 181:17

NMED Exhibit 2 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 3 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 4 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 5 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 6 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 7 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 8 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 9 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 10 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 11 WQ CC 24-31

NMED Exhibit 12 Not ice of Rescheduled P ublic Hearing Eng an d Sp

NMED Exhibit 13 NM Reg Vol XXXV Iss 20 10.22.

24 Notice of Resche duled Public Hearing Eng and Sp

NMED Exhibit 14 Affi davit of Publication -Los Alamos Daily P ost 11-1-24-c

(

- (1) 220:16
- **(2)** 67:16 220:16
- **(4)** 120:2 197:8 204:21 212:8 213:2,3 216:25 217:8,21 220:15 221:7 224:22 226:4 230:15
- **(a)** 67:19 68:4 69:7 119:18 120:7 213:21
- (a)'s 68:3
- **(b)** 119:18 120:7 213:21
- (i) 69:8
- (k) 69:8
- (I) 69:8
- (m) 69:8

0

0.3 154:3

0.98 109:5

0411 67:12

0446 76:22

045 204:8

1

1 28:23 78:13,15 79:3, 6,8 141:3,14 147:4 160:24 161:3 162:3,6,9 172:7 176:23 202:17, 24 204:7 226:6

1% 203:11

1,000 240:4

1-to-1 108:20

10 30:20 80:7,11,16,19, 22 102:12,14 104:1 157:9 167:9,22,25 168:3 176:3

10.4 62:10

100 212:13 218:19

101(a)(2) 174:11

10:47 13:3

10F(2) 115:17 117:22

10th 110:7

11 80:25 81:4,16,19,22 168:6,18,21,24 172:1, 8,12 173:2,5

11:56 73:6

12 81:25 82:4,20,23 83:1 169:6,19,22,25 173:8 181:10

120 237:20

126 198:3 199:10

127 198:3

128 198:3

13 76:19,24 83:4,8,19, 22,25 170:3,19,22,25 173:8 181:13

14 13:2 76:16,18,23 84:3,7,17,20,23 145:25 146:5 171:3,16,19,22 173:8 181:17

140 198:4

15 61:13 145:25 147:8 148:17 151:2,12,20

18 57:10 243:6

18-plus 134:10

1976 93:7

1995 94:4,5 162:18 175:22 227:14 239:1

1996 30:7 81:4 89:23 93:9 94:1,2,6,7 107:6

1:00 18:16 19:7 72:21 73:2

1:09 73:6

2

2 14:23 18:6,7 24:15 39:3 40:11,20,24 41:1 61:12,14 66:19 67:12 110:25 119:18 120:13, 17 122:7 126:11 132:10 145:6 159:18 160:4,7,16,19,22 173:6 196:12,18 200:5 202:18,19,24 204:8 224:1 225:19 232:12 236:23 238:24 241:2, 19 242:10,11 243:8

20 49:18 76:16,18 87:25 151:2,13 210:5 243:6

20-51R 82:8

20.1.6 19:12

20.1.6.200 178:22

20.1.6.306 34:4

20.6.4 14:6 44:12 62:11 153:6 174:24

20.6.4.10 89:10

20.6.4.10(F) 96:2,20

20.6.4.10F 22:15 28:9 180:3 183:10

20.6.4.121 47:1 198:3

20.6.4.126 47:5

20.6.4.127 47:11

<u></u>

20.6.4.128 47:16 63:11

20.6.4.140 47:23

20.6.4.900 13:17 21:4 27:17 33:15 63:17,24 122:15 197:13

20.6.4.900I 211:19

20.6.4.900I(4) 193:4

20.6.4.900l.(4) 223:11

20.6.4.901 227:16 235:18 238:23

20.6.498 46:17

200 145:5

2004 159:25

2005 32:2 49:19 59:9 106:11 148:20 149:3 159:5

2007 27:24 29:15 30:16,23 31:6 49:9 80:11 89:8 90:16 93:16 95:7,10 97:16 107:11 128:20 132:4 134:12 137:4,10 163:19,24 175:24 227:15 239:3 242:5

2012 147:7,11,12

2015 147:13

2017 141:1

2018 26:7 53:21 84:7

2019 60:14,18 148:21, 22 149:3,11,14

2020 54:21 60:15 95:5

2020/2021 61:2

2021 55:4,12,22 56:2,8

2022 56:10

2023 56:16,24 180:16, 19

2024 54:15

2025 13:2 214:11

2026 214:13 244:7

207 142:25 144:4,16,21

22.914 131:6

23 243:6

24-31 14:14 21:8 24:1 73:10 166:16 167:12

25 53:21

29.7 142:22 153:15,18, 24 154:9,11,19 156:7 199:24 200:20 201:2 202:1,3 203:8 213:17 229:23 231:2,15 232:22,25

2:49 157:14

2a 122:9

3

3 16:14 25:6,9 37:23 38:19,23,25 67:9 88:21 91:2 97:18 98:7 101:12 104:1 105:17 107:9 109:24 113:6,9 123:9 124:5,21 131:3,13 132:9,19 147:23 168:25 185:13 204:17, 21,24 210:8,11,20,23 211:1 214:4.8 242:8

3% 132:11.14

30 153:16,18,25 154:10,11 156:7 199:24 200:20 202:1 203:10 230:22,24 231:1,17

303(c) 183:20

304(a) 177:14,15

31 180:15

36 125:19

3:00 157:9,10

3:02 157:14

3:45 157:18

3:54 206:23

4

4 31:13 34:11 40:14 76:4 77:10,13,15 120:3 159:18 211:3,5,8,11

400 144:23

45 157:21

45-day 41:20 42:15 56:25

4900 30:6

4:15 157:19 206:16

4:20 206:25

4:21 206:23

5

5 39:16 40:1,5,7 125:15 131:5 132:7,20 162:15 163:4,7,10 185:13 199:20 241:13,17

5-1 140:24 141:8

5-3 125:18

5-6 142:7 145:2

50 67:6

50th 110:7

517 104:19,24 106:8 108:24

5:00 18:23 19:1.2 74:23

5th 110:11

6

6 64:20 77:22 78:6,9,11 88:6 99:18 163:13 164:5,8,11 185:8 241:13,17 242:4

67.6 203:10

67.9 203:9

68 204:13

7

7 41:5,23 42:1,3 53:16 99:18 100:5,6 132:6 164:14 165:2,5,8

8

8 42:7,23 43:2,4 132:6 165:11 166:4,7,10 178:9 241:10

Index: 9..ahead

9

9 79:12,16,23 80:1,3 132:6 166:13,25 167:3, 6 241:10

900 63:9 123:19,22,23 175:1

900.I 197:2

900.I(4) 153:7

9001 218:17

900L(4) 119:14

901 228:6 239:11

90th 110:8

95th 110:12

98 219:3

98% 109:7

Α

A&m 25:12

A-M-A-N-D-A 37:15

a.m. 13:3 73:6

ability 129:13

abreast 55:19

absolutely 156:19 243:4

accept 18:13,24 71:21 72:23 130:9 234:20 236:11

access 15:3 103:8,17 113:1 243:16,18

accompanies 43:15

accomplish 157:21

Accord 55:23

accordance 22:14 33:24 89:9 178:22,25

account 90:1 91:13 93:2 101:14,15,16,18

accounted 126:19

accounting 31:2 109:7

accounts 30:9 48:15 49:3

accredited 52:15

accumulate 97:13

accumulated 98:5

accuracy 108:9 110:22 201:3 231:16

accurate 29:17 31:8 33:21 38:11 39:21 77:2 78:2 95:10 109:10 132:15 152:17 161:12 210:16

accurately 26:23 32:22 49:6 93:2 94:24 105:19 107:24 112:5 146:10

acetic 99:13,17 100:1

acid 129:6,10

act 19:10 21:15,16,21 23:3 174:11 177:14 183:20 209:25 210:1 214:7 229:17

action 183:19

actions 166:21 167:18

actual 69:12 91:25 107:13

acute 63:22 64:25 92:2,7 107:16 108:12 120:9 121:1,4,5 142:8 178:6 200:2 204:2 211:21 226:10

add 123:16 214:13 224:13 227:20 228:25 229:4 230:7 235:14 236:10.13.22 238:23

added 212:10 218:16

adding 213:14 214:17 217:20 221:22 222:4 224:14 228:5 235:24 236:13 237:17

addition 124:6 177:10

additional 83:14 94:9 95:2 109:13 124:11 149:19 150:7 161:21 167:18 169:1 181:10 212:1,18

Additionally 182:12

address 21:9 34:23 196:20 205:22 213:24 214:13

addressed 180:16 189:3

addresses 205:25 211:15

addressing 43:7

adds 231:17

adequate 189:1

adequately 189:3

adjacent 188:23

adjourn 74:22

adjourned 206:20

adjusted 109:5

administers 209:24

Administration 25:2

administrative 14:7 19:12 20:23 21:3 44:13 70:23 173:21 196:2

Administrator 14:13 15:19 20:1 169:4

admission 35:11 36:9 41:22 84:25

admit 39:25 42:22 82:20 84:17 160:16 162:3 163:4 164:5 165:2 166:4,25 167:22 168:18 169:19 170:19 171:16 173:2 210:20 211:8

admitted 38:23 40:5, 24 42:1 43:2 77:13 78:9 79:6 80:1,19 81:19 82:23 83:22 84:20 160:19 162:6 163:7 164:8 165:5 166:7 167:3,25 168:21 169:22 170:22 171:19 173:5 210:23

adopt 21:13 22:13 23:23 28:11 31:15 34:8 62:11 95:7,12,15 137:10 161:24 174:6, 20 176:19 177:17 178:21 183:13

adopted 29:16 33:18 135:6 136:10 151:10 176:7

adopting 95:24 135:9, 11,15,20 136:11,20 150:14 240:13

adoption 22:16 28:7, 13 31:21 87:15 114:23 116:20 136:6 178:15 179:17 182:22 183:2

adopts 183:14

advances 30:21

advantage 103:20

advantages 102:24 112:14

Advisory 55:5

affect 30:9,14 31:4 92:18,23 93:22 96:12, 18 98:6 99:15 126:19 153:22,23

affected 22:23 179:10 188:2

affects 48:16 154:10

Affidavit 168:9 171:6 172:6,15 181:18

affiliate 76:2 86:2

affinity 97:12 100:23 129:20 130:3

affirm 36:25 75:7 158:13 209:1

afternoon 133:5 158:5

agency 25:14 62:8 175:21 179:2,7

agree 127:8,18 154:14, 23 194:2 198:23 199:15 201:23 202:7 207:6 216:8,11 218:22

agreement 108:21 109:2 165:16 223:5

agricultural 22:5

ahead 75:11 151:1,2 155:14 158:17 196:23 201:20 209:4



Index: Air..B-A-C-A

B-A-C-A 158:10

Air 159:6 analysis 29:10 33:2 assessments 130:13 **applying** 62:21 68:14 51:20.21 52:14 57:11 144:19 150:23 **Alamos** 13:15 14:10 202:23 242:7 **assisted** 181:20 16:12 17:2 26:13,16 appointed 14:2 analytes 52:18 45:11,13,19 46:4 47:6, appreciation 49:14 assorted 56:22 68:5 13,14,15 55:8 56:11, analytical 52:3,8,12, 13,22 171:7 181:16,19 approach 33:9 83:15 **assume** 64:17 120:21 21,25 154:13 173:11 176:8 178:2,7, Albuquerque 172:16, **assuming** 191:17 13 201:15 analyze 135:3 22 181:4 assumption 219:19 analyzing 130:14 approaches 112:11 algae 127:24 assumptions 136:13 **Andrews** 16:10 27:14 **approval** 83:8,10 alkalinity 100:7 125:24 183:19 214:9 Assurance 52:7 126:2,14,17,20,21 answers 38:16 77:7 159:20 127:9,11 approved 112:4 anticipate 23:20 attached 162:11 185:23 allowing 44:7 anymore 69:11 **April** 54:15 attainable 174:14 alluded 94:13 apologize 28:18 aquatic 26:25 29:13 attended 133:15 alter 96:12 177:21 152:15 186:11 191:14 30:5,17 31:5,16 33:10, 229:2 attorney 232:3 alternative 205:23 22 48:16 49:5 64:24,25 206:4.8 207:3 211:13 apparently 186:3 65:3,7 90:5,15 91:6,17 audible 65:12 143:24 92:5 95:1 97:9,11,14, 146:16 154:7 aluminum 111:25 appeal 136:6 176:19 25 98:23 111:21 audience 240:11 Amalia 15:1 112:12 116:3,7,15 appearance 17:22 117:7,17,23 118:7 Audit 52:17 Amanda 28:25 37:5.15 appearances 16:3 119:17,19,20 120:9,10, 44:8 **August** 180:19 15,18,21,24 121:3 appearing 15:4,14 128:4,9,15,18 131:20 amazing 60:22 16:25 17:7 author 125:11 162:20 163:17 164:17 **Amazon** 243:7 appears 68:20 74:18 authority 179:16 175:11 193:15,16 125:15 208:23 222:2 **Ambient** 162:21 204:2,3 211:22 212:3, authorize 174:6 10 220:18 225:20 163:17 164:17 Appendix 236:7 authorized 25:4 226:5,7,11 237:22 238:5 **amend** 13:16 14:4 authorizes 28:9 arbitrarily 201:5 27:17 44:10 176:19 **applaud** 137:23 178:21 authorship 88:12,14 arbitrary 201:10 applicable 63:18 **amended** 211:19 67:17 88:25 117:25 automated 50:23 51:3 area 22:24 46:13 47:12 234:22,25 176:5 178:6 87:12 144:1,5,10 198:6 availability 136:24 amendment 21:10 application 25:16 areas 46:18 50:16 avoid 143:20 22:11 23:24 153:19 53:23 argue 200:6 203:18 205:24 **avoids** 113:2 applications 150:3 amendments 20:22 argument 134:18 aware 24:14 30:4 applied 104:10 108:4 34:11 79:21 84:15 35:18 202:19 144:6 arm 51:2 86:13 87:9 107:15 awesome 227:3 arrive 134:11 118:5 122:5,7 143:7 applies 118:6 177:25 149:2 173:22 183:13. 193:16 axes 111:2 **arrived** 134:12 15 **apply** 35:20 36:15 **axis** 92:9,10,11 108:15, arroyos 50:5 ammonia 63:22 44:18 63:1,21 114:6 17 110:10,11 111:22 **Arts** 160:1 115:21,25 116:3,16 120:7,13,14,17,22,23 amount 129:10 133:21 assess 113:8 178:14 В 121:2,5 175:16,17 137:9,16 138:16 244:9 assessment 29:17 176:25 194:8 212:14

31:8 33:21 84:9,13

95:11 104:3,12 159:9

analyses 126:9 136:21

202:14

1000

214:1

TRAID/NMED PETITION FOR RULEMAKING TO AMEND 20.6.4.900 NMAC TRANSCRIPT 01/14/2025 Index: B-A-R-R-Y..Bureau

B-A-R-R-Y 75:23

Baca 157:11 158:8,9, 12,19 183:23 184:1,8 187:2

Baca's 199:17

Bachelor 159:25

back 13:6,10 20:2 27:22 59:9 60:20 61:13 73:2,9 85:13 89:23 93:7 106:11 107:5 145:1 149:10 152:14, 19 155:24 157:9,10,16 172:1,9 199:10,12 204:20 206:25 233:7 244:5

backdrop 45:6

backed 232:11

background 44:15 50:10 86:15 87:8 94:10 95:3 97:6 151:21 152:8 164:1

Bandelier 45:23 47:3

bar 106:11,12 147:3

Barry 29:1 75:5,13,22 85:25 87:19

base 139:3 148:7

based 26:21 30:7,18 31:17 53:2 55:14 67:21,24 68:25 71:11 89:1,25 90:12,14 91:10 92:12 93:13 95:25 96:5 97:14 111:23 113:6 114:25 115:2 116:11 121:19 122:12 123:4 143:2 146:11 148:11 150:7 175:20 176:5,16 177:11,18 180:11 182:23 191:9 199:17 202:21

basic 99:14 195:21

basically 148:20 199:5 232:11

Basin 60:6 63:12 197:7 212:7,12,13,23 218:17, 18.23 238:12

basing 201:8

basins 62:17,22

212:25

basis 22:10 29:21 31:23 80:12 82:18 90:18,19 91:20 95:16, 17 97:2,3,16 135:16 162:25 178:13 179:18 231:25

Bates 67:11 76:21

Battelle 25:10

begin 73:8 86:11

beginning 190:18 221:7 243:10

begins 178:19

behalf 16:11,25 17:8, 13 24:25 27:14

behaves 91:4

belief 38:12 39:22 77:3 161:13

Benchmark 76:1 86:2 242:13

beneficial 207:7

benefit 76:20 136:2 224:4 240:10

bias 109:2

bifurcate 229:22

big 137:25 139:9,10 202:2

bigger 216:4

bind 98:3 100:8,23,25 101:1 129:21

binding 98:22 130:3

bioaccumulation

177:23

bioavailability 29:18 30:10,15 31:4,9 49:4, 14 90:4 92:18 95:11 96:13,18 97:10,21 99:17 102:17 104:5 176:2 177:22

bioavailable 99:2 100:2,9

Biologic 49:2

biological 100:19 177:20

Biotic 27:24 90:9,17 91:11 93:17 94:23 95:8,25 96:25 97:6,23 101:2 176:1 242:6

bit 27:10,22 50:16 52:6 53:13 54:18 65:18 66:9 110:24 130:15 133:8 142:11 224:7

bits 47:8

Black 103:15

BLM 28:1 30:18 31:16 32:1,2 33:2,12 49:2,6, 11,20 53:23 60:13 62:8 91:11 95:22 97:8 101:22,25 102:1,13,18, 23,25 103:15,21 104:23 105:2,3,6,8,14 107:24 108:10,17 109:25 110:9,22 111:8, 10,12,15 128:7,10,12 129:24 131:8 132:12 134:25 135:3,4,6 143:11 148:19 150:3 164:2,25 176:1,2,8,14 178:2 193:21,22 242:6

BLM- 146:10

BLM-BASED 29:6 30:23 31:21 32:4,23 93:18 95:23 102:16 105:20 109:8 112:6 126:16

blood 66:9

blue 20:2 46:18 100:14 110:6

Board 55:6 56:11

Boards 36:18

bodies 113:25

body 90:13 93:19 94:20 96:11 123:4 124:21 138:25 175:14 183:4 224:15

bolded 220:23 221:4

Book 93:8

borne 130:4

bothered 194:17

bottom 74:7 110:25 111:3 121:12 142:12

bound 100:25 101:6 108:25

boundaries 113:17 198:24 199:2

boundary 45:19 46:10,12 49:22 114:4, 5,7,12

Box 103:15

boxes 66:1 191:25

Brancard 61:22,23
62:1 66:22 67:8,14
69:17,21 70:2,6 71:6
113:22 119:7,10,25
186:18,19 192:2,3
193:8 194:3,4,14
195:4,8 196:19,24
199:1 207:19,25 208:2
212:17 216:19,20,23
217:6 218:15 219:5,16
220:2,6,10,15,25 221:6
222:10 223:23,24
225:17,18 226:2,13
231:5 233:22,24 235:6
244:14,15

Brancard's 205:22,25 211:16

break 18:14,23 73:10 157:8,16,18,20 205:15, 18 206:6,11,12,16

Brecken 17:13 20:15

brethren 69:9

briefly 21:6 29:25 34:23

brings 23:9

broad 212:19 232:1

broader 133:8

brought 14:8,16 71:6 140:24 244:5

brown 46:13

built 131:19 191:18

bunch 68:20

Bureau 20:16 31:14 45:1 53:19 130:12 151:11 159:7 182:8,16 183:16 195:19 209:18, 21,24



business 25:5

button 235:7

BWXT-LOS 13:14 14:10 16:12 26:13

by-variant 127:3

С

C/I 225:13

Ca 98:15

Caco3 225:15 230:21

Cad 136:16

calcium 90:3 98:16 99:4 101:16

calculate 33:9 103:6 105:20 112:11 146:10 176:4 203:4 225:8

calculated 94:23 95:25 104:22 107:4,24 123:3 143:10 211:24

calculating 101:19 108:10 112:6,15 131:20 145:6

calculation 29:20 31:10 200:19 203:8 204:12

calculations 128:14 132:9

calendar 182:14 214:11,12

California 25:11

call 13:10 34:20,22 75:4 124:13 158:1 207:23

called 62:24 105:16

calling 94:7

camera 73:21

Canyon 46:20 47:2 114:14 197:20 198:17 213:6 217:13 218:2 221:13 223:15 225:1

cap 144:21

(CA)

capricious 201:11

capture 65:1 138:24 139:4,14

captured 149:22

carbon 32:24 48:18 91:1 92:22 100:17,21 101:9,13 105:12 130:1, 8 153:11,12 178:4 225:11,12 230:17

carbonates 100:8

Cardeña 15:1

care 137:7

careful 34:3

Carleton 160:1

carried 131:21 204:23

carry 60:17 61:9

case 18:20,24 19:23 23:16 73:1 75:1 98:3, 24 105:9 114:8 126:11 128:13 155:7 190:6,12 228:21

catch 172:3

cc'd 188:19

CCW 188:9 189:4

celebrate 130:25

cell 121:17 122:11

center 24:24 69:10 243:14

certified 15:1,2

cetera 62:18 67:23

chain 51:8,9,10,15,21, 25 52:9

chair 13:25 16:7,22 20:12 27:6 44:5 58:17, 25 61:5,19 85:19 125:3 127:7 131:14 138:6 152:24 156:6 157:24 158:6 184:15,24 189:6 190:14,25 192:3 194:1, 15 203:15 204:20 205:11,14 208:12,18 215:20 216:9 217:6 218:14 220:14 221:6 226:1 227:19 229:12, 21 230:9 232:9,17 233:1,21 234:8,14,16 240:21 243:24 244:15 **Chair's** 235:20 239:18

Chairman 13:5 24:7 59:1,7,17 125:7,12 126:7 128:2 132:21 153:2 154:25 155:11 156:18 185:1,6 186:1, 10 190:16 193:2 195:2 198:20,23 199:14 200:14,18 201:19 202:10 203:22,25 204:10 205:1,6,16 206:15,19,24 207:9,20, 24 208:13 216:11 224:4,10 229:14 230:1, 6,13 231:7,22 232:15 233:2,6,17 234:9,18,24 235:11,22 237:15 238:3,20 239:4,8 240:10,18 242:3,15,17 243:4,21 244:13,23

CHAIRWOMAN 58:18 138:9 140:4 184:17 207:22 208:19 215:21 234:15 239:6

challenge 232:10

challenges 135:10

challenging 130:15

chance 13:6,9

change 41:16 57:12 70:7 121:12 131:25 148:2 151:3,9 153:16, 24 172:10 183:3 192:22 194:8 198:19 199:24 201:9 231:1 232:8 237:23

changed 76:19 117:24 232:23

changing 71:8 81:14 151:13,14 185:20 201:13 204:14

channel 74:6

channels 15:4

characteristic 123:5 124:18

characteristics 67:22 71:12,14 96:11 121:21 122:13,23 123:9,12,17, 21 124:10,14,21 148:15 177:21 195:10

chart 106:12 147:3

charts 239:21

chase 206:14

chat 73:23

check 65:25 237:9

checked 52:23 191:24

checking 203:5

chemical 96:10,14 177:20.23

chemistries 143:14

chemistry 26:21 28:3 30:13,22 31:3 32:3 33:3 48:22 49:3,12 90:13,16,25 91:3,13 92:21,25 93:21 94:19 96:16 97:20 102:3,7 145:13 147:20 160:1 233:8

chemists' 53:1

Chief 209:21

choose 15:7,12,14 20:4,6 74:6,8

chosen 151:23

Chromium 68:4

chronic 64:25 92:3,7 107:17 108:13 120:10 178:6 200:3 204:3 211:22 220:18 226:10

circle 221:20

circles 110:1

circulated 169:2

circulating 23:20

circulation 171:14

circumstances 22:1

citations 241:7

cited 162:10

Citizens 55:5

City 55:7

Civil 35:19 36:15

Clara 56:1

clarification 35:17

93:23 224:12 232:4

clarifies 213:20

clarify 113:21,23 122:2 142:13 192:12 194:5 214:14,16

clarifying 213:24 225:25

clarity 172:1 198:22 223:7 242:1

class 233:8

classification 46:25

classifications 46:23

classified 197:14 198:6 212:16 217:4,17 218:1 219:2 221:11,22 222:4,7

Clean 42:18 57:3 174:10 177:14 183:20 187:13,16 188:10,21 209:25 214:6

clear 60:4,6 119:21 156:3 172:10 198:9,13 201:10 224:16

clearer 192:24

clerical 211:7

click 15:7 74:8

climate 151:4

close 23:15 190:12 207:20 216:3 229:10

closed 20:5 200:17

Closing 190:2

co-located 25:19

co-petitioner 24:15 26:15

co-petitioners 16:14 17:4 24:11

Code 14:7 19:13 20:23 21:3 44:13 70:23 196:2,13 243:17

codified 151:11 174:24

coin 232:13

Cold 65:7

collaboration 173:23

collaborative 29:3

collaboratively 183:6

colleague 133:9 152:11

colleagues 138:13 195:18

collect 49:19 135:2

collected 50:17,18 51:5 106:19 114:9 147:5,10,17 149:14,15

collecting 49:18 51:4 130:13

collection 33:2 44:23 50:19,20 51:3 52:5,10 139:22 176:12 231:16

College 160:2

color-coded 106:13

Colorado 238:11

column 99:22

Colón 217:12

combination 105:11 109:6 110:20

combinations 109:15, 23

combine 193:10

combined 53:9 124:11

combining 106:15

comment 18:13,18,20, 25 19:3,6,8,14,24 23:8 41:8,19,20 42:11,15 56:25 57:1 60:12 72:23,25 73:12,15,20, 24 74:20 127:9 156:23 182:20 186:3 188:5 190:9 203:24 216:1 235:9 238:17 239:18

comments 15:9 42:10, 14,17,20 54:4,5,7,8 57:3 95:6 156:19 180:8,14,17,18,24 185:8 187:20,23 188:14,15 189:3,12 233:3,18

Commission 13:22

14:3.13 16:23 17:19 20:1.4.13 21:12.23 23:19 24:8,14 27:16 28:10 30:3 34:6 38:25 40:7 41:1 42:3 43:4 44:6 64:18 66:12 73:5 77:15 78:11 79:8 80:3, 21 81:21 82:25 83:24 84:22 87:15 90:21 113:15 114:22 115:15, 23 117:1,19 132:18 134:5 137:6,21 157:13, 25 158:7 160:21 162:8 163:9 164:10 165:7 166:9,22 167:5 168:2, 23 169:4,24 170:24 171:21 173:8 176:18 178:19,23 181:21 183:13,14 190:22 201:2,15 206:22 207:6, 13,15,17 210:25 211:10 213:14 227:23 232:7 236:2,9,18,21 240:5,15 241:22,25 244:5

Commission's 15:19 19:11 28:7 34:2,5,25 181:25 182:21

Commissioner 13:7 43:19 58:11,14,21,22 59:21,22,25 61:4,18, 22,23 62:1 66:22 67:8, 14 69:17,21 70:2,6,11, 12,15,17,20 71:5 72:9, 10 86:18,22 87:3 113:22 119:3.4.6.10.25 121:14 122:2 123:13 124:24 125:1 132:24, 25 133:4.17 138:20 140:7,8,14,15,18 141:6 145:16,19,21,23 146:4 152:18 153:4 155:10, 18 156:25 184:11,12, 20,22 185:7,11 186:2, 4,14,15,17,19,21,23,25 187:1,5 189:6,10,11 190:25 191:12,13,22, 23 192:2,3 193:8 194:1,2,4,14,22,25 195:3,4,7 196:19,24 198:21 199:1 200:8.9. 16,22 201:19,21,23 203:23 204:1,12,19 205:2,22,25 207:11,19, 25 208:2,3,4,5,6,8,9,

10.11.14.15.16.17 211:16 212:16 215:15. 17,23,25 216:12,15,16, 18,20,23 217:6 218:14 219:4,16 220:2,6,10, 15,25 221:6,18 222:2, 10,15,16,21,23 223:2, 22,24 225:16,18 226:1, 13,18,19,25 227:2,8,19 228:7,12,13 229:19,20 230:6,8 231:4,5,10,11, 23 232:5,17 233:4,7, 22,24,25 234:1,2,3,4,5, 6,7,10,11,12,13,22 235:2,5,6,8,12 236:16, 20,25 237:4,13 238:1, 3,7,22 239:9,10,24 240:20,21 241:1,6,12, 16 242:2 243:2,5,21,23 244:8,13,15,16,24

Index: clarifies..complex

Commissioners 16:8 57:23 191:8 203:20 226:23 237:5

Commissions 36:19 231:25

committed 31:20

Committee 85:20

common 47:19 137:8, 12 180:6

commonly 16:12 81:5 89:24 93:7 94:5 98:9

communications 53:15 55:15

Communities 42:18 57:3 187:15 188:10,21

Company 25:4

comparing 110:25 126:10 132:12 147:13

comparison 89:16 108:12,13 127:3

compete 99:5

Competition 98:9,12 99:6 101:17

completed 51:22 72:25

completely 172:2

complex 112:22,23 129:13,17 135:7,9,11



TRANSCRIPT 01/14/2025 Complexation 98:10 condition 96:8 177:17 constraints 176:9 99:11 100:13 101:14 condition-dependant compliance 25:22 148:12 88:1 26:2 conditions 26:24 complicate 221:19 33:21 48:9 96:7 105:21 175:8 109:9 146:12,21 147:2 complied 183:9 149:23 151:3 177:16, composition 129:15 19 182:24 contained 104:21 conduct 14:3 comprehensive 200:25 181:5 conducted 19:9 84:14 comprehensively 105:5 context 21:7 30:1 91:12 confer 152:11 211:14 comprised 25:5 conference/ compromise 212:24 teleconference 54:12 computer 142:15 confidence 131:7 196:19 222:8 202:12 **concede** 199:19 continues 118:1 confident 150:19 concentration 191:2 109:16.22 110:19 203:9 confirmed 236:21 concentrations 111:1 contractor 17:2 conflicting 199:6 129:2,25 130:7 142:21 confluence 114:18 153:14 154:18 213:16 197:24 213:10 223:19 25:20 230:22 225:5 contracts 25:23 **concept** 62:24 64:15 confused 62:7 66:24 66:14 181:11 192:15 contrast 94:21 225:19 218:12 contribute 84:15 confusing 24:19 **concern** 118:4 134:22 199:18 200:23 201:5 confusion 193:19 220:21 242:3 212:20 concerned 61:17 consensus 35:15 192:8 193:20 217:16 conservative 111:9 concerns 13:22 36:6 143:19 83:23 84:21 142:4 192:4,6 193:13 196:20 consideration 24:1 205:23 206:1 211:16 163:8 164:9 165:6 34:3 227:10 concise 23:21 considered 50:9 conclude 87:14 232:13

considers 90:24 183:8

consistent 31:18 92:5

102:20 174:21 176:11

Consolidated 52:16

constituents 92:6

constitutes 84:25

178:7

53:5

133:22

consultant 75:25 86:1 Cooperative 165:14 coordinate 180:6 **contact** 65:5,8,10,15 coordination 79:19 173:23 Contacting 179:9 Coordinator 159:13 **copies** 43:17 173:7 content 169:15 170:16 243:12 copper 26:20 27:2,19, 24 28:15 29:6,12,15,17 118:3 173:17 205:21 30:6,8,14,18,23 31:1,4, 8,16,17,22 32:18,23 33:11,19,21 34:10 continually 150:5 44:17,20 45:3 48:11,25 continue 31:20 95:16 49:5,10 53:22 54:13 67:25 68:4,12 80:11 81:4 83:11 87:10 88:9, 25 89:4,7,22 90:5,17, 18 91:4 92:12,19,24 Continuing 101:22 93:1,3,7,10,14,17,22 contract 26:3 52:13 94:22 95:7,11,25 96:16,18,25 97:6,21 98:3,21 99:1,5,17,19, contractor-operated 21 100:2,5,9,23,24 101:6,7,8,19 102:9,18, 25 103:6 104:5,6,22 107:3 111:23 113:8.10 115:24 116:22 117:9, 13,18,25 120:3 122:18 123:7,8 124:12,20 contributor 126:15 128:10,12,25 129:1,21, 24 130:3,6 133:24 control 21:11 38:24 134:6,22,25 142:8 40:6,25 42:2 43:3 52:7 150:24 153:7 163:1,18, 73:4 77:14 78:10 79:7 24 164:3,19,24 175:20, 80:2,20 81:20 82:24 25 176:1,4,8 193:5 197:4 203:5,9 212:4,5, 157:12 160:20 162:7 11 213:3 217:9,22 219:8,22 220:23 221:8 166:8 167:4 168:1,22 223:11 224:15,17,22 169:23 170:23 171:20 225:9,21 227:15 206:21 210:24 211:9 238:16 239:3 238:12 copper's 164:1 controlling 104:4 105:8 113:10 **copy** 43:14,19 78:2 86:23 160:3,12 188:2 convenient 152:4 210:7.16 conversation 126:24 corner 15:5 45:9,12 conversely 100:4 74:7 135:5 147:13 **correct** 64:21,22 118:2 convincing 130:20 122:1 124:15 127:7

133:16,17 160:12

cooperation 63:7

concluded 90:6 94:12,

concludes 115:6

conclusion 34:7

228:20

244:9

118:11 155:7 183:21

134:19 182:21 190:19

concurrent 176:12,14

188:16 189:2 191:20, 22 206:17 207:14 219:2 235:21 236:14, 15 241:24

corrected 154:22

correction 76:14,25 211:7

corrections 38:7 76:12 161:18

correctly 133:13 241:5

correlate 127:16

correlated 126:18 127:13.19

correlation 125:21 126:5,9

Council 56:3

Counsel 16:18 28:5 157:17 182:10 207:17 235:23 236:2,9,18,21 240:5,12,15 241:22,25

count 106:10

counterpoint 231:24

County 17:22 45:13, 14,15 55:8 56:11,13

couple 43:16 115:13 126:11 145:24 155:12 161:20 203:19

Court 76:21

courts 201:6,9

cover 94:3 218:23

covered 86:8 115:14 199:4

covering 219:1

covers 219:20

COVID 60:16 61:17

CRADA 165:16

create 53:10 185:22

created 51:18,23 129:1 132:8 148:20 182:19 192:14

creates 127:15 135:10

creating 62:23 66:3

113:24

(CA)

criteria 22:9.14.17.20 26:20 27:2.18 28:11.15 29:2,6,8,13,16 30:5,8, 9,18,23 31:2,6,17,22 32:4,8,18,23 33:9,14, 20 34:9 44:21 45:4 48:11,12,13,14,23,24 49:7,10,16 54:14 62:12,13 63:15,16,20, 23 67:15,21 68:24 78:23 79:18 80:12,14 81:5,7,12,14 82:17 83:11,17 86:6,17 87:11,17 88:4,10,13, 24,25 89:5,7,11,16,17, 20,22,23,25 90:8,9,10, 19,21,22 91:16,19,21, 24 92:1,6,12,13,17 93:1,6,8,10,18 94:2,3, 5,8,12,16,22 95:10,14, 23,24 96:5,22 97:3,16 98:25 99:1,8 101:11, 19,21 102:9,16,21 103:6,21 104:5,10,22 105:4,6,8,14,20 106:25 107:1,3,6,8,12,17,19, 25 108:11,15,17 109:12,25 110:3 111:7, 15,18,22 112:11,15 113:5,10,18 114:3,6, 11,24 115:18,24 116:3, 14,21 117:6,9,13,16 120:3,6,9,11 121:1,4,5, 18,24 123:3,25 124:11, 12 126:16 128:3,8,9, 12,17 131:18,20 133:24 134:6,14 138:23 139:14 142:8 143:11 144:14,22 146:11 153:7 156:17, 21 162:19 163:2,18,24 164:3,18,24 165:23 166:1 173:20,24 174:21 175:13,15,17, 20,22,25 176:5,21,24 177:2,9,11,18 178:6,11 180:2 182:23 183:1,3, 11 193:5,15,17 197:5 204:2,4 211:23 212:4, 11 213:4,22 214:1 217:9,22 219:8,22 220:19,23 221:8 223:12 224:1,15,17,23

criterion 71:9,11 92:2, 3.7 122:12

Cross-examination 19:16

cross-reference 64:3 67:13

culture 175:2

Cumbre 15:22

curiosity 146:6 151:20

curious 140:25 148:1 156:11

current 29:12,19 30:4 31:9 33:24 37:17 48:12,14 75:24 81:13 88:7 89:2,6,16,21 90:18 91:20,23 97:2 106:25 115:1 116:12 144:22 159:8,14 163:1 175:19 209:19,22

curves 132:3

custody 51:9,11,12, 15,21 52:1,9

cut 206:14

cutting 27:21 240:7,12

D

dad 187:8

Daily 171:7 181:16,19

darker 47:17

dashed 109:25 110:15

data 29:10 31:18 32:3 33:2,3 44:22 49:17 52:8,15,23,25 53:3,8, 10 57:6,9,11 59:8,10, 11 84:7,8,14 95:15 104:11,15,16,20 106:20 110:9,13 115:5 127:12 129:22,23 132:16 134:11,15 135:2,3 136:24 138:16 139:25 141:2,12 144:17 148:20,21,22 149:2,9,11,13,15,19,22 150:3,7 154:2 176:12, 17 202:14 231:16

238:6

database 176:15

Index: corrected..degrees

dataset 50:14

date 168:16

dated 180:19

David 15:21

day 193:24 223:16

de 114:15 197:21 213:7 221:14 225:2

decades 90:15

deceases 100:6 101:8

December 54:21

decided 61:15 63:5 95:12

decimal 202:6 204:4,6,

decision 202:4

deems 21:24

deep 46:18

deeper 244:12

default 176:15

Defense 53:4

defensible 29:9 33:8 112:10 150:18,20 177:12 182:25

defer 59:14 64:5 152:12

define 196:10

defined 46:9 62:18 192:21 196:5 197:16 219:6 221:21

defines 193:12 198:24

defining 46:14 114:1, 4,5 192:18

definition 129:17 219:12 227:11

definitions 195:22,24 196:3 214:14,17,19,22 219:7 244:11

degree 87:22 148:5

degrees 87:20



225:9,20,21 226:5,7,11

227:14 237:20 239:2

Index: Delaware..documents Delaware 25:3 develops 128:8 describe 44:22 46:7 dissolved 32:24 91:1 84:5 159:23 177:3 92:22 100:16.18.21 deliberate 20:5,7 diagonal 108:18 101:9,13 105:12 129:8, describes 79:18 84:12 23:15 difference 132:11 9,11,25 130:2,7 153:10 89:14 deliberation 34:6 153:17 154:6,9 200:20 175:19 178:4 225:10 230:17 **describing** 83:10 87:7 202:2,9 203:11 219:5 delineates 46:12 97:22 120:5 145:12 differentiate 110:15 distribute 179:2 delineation 46:11 description 22:21 differs 89:19 distribution 106:5 36:12 86:14 delivered 51:14 147:9 difficult 25:8 109:17 descriptor 212:11 delivery 52:10 District 182:3 139:8 147:21 213:6 demonstrated 146:9 diverge 127:10 difficulty 185:22 designated 62:14,19 demonstrates 93:21 63:18 64:16,20 115:20, digestible 163:25 divergence 145:5,9 167:17 23 116:7,17,23 117:2, diverges 110:24 digits 131:17 132:1 8,9,12,14,23 118:5 demonstration 28:21 156:20 145:11 174:20,25 175:14,18 29:23 32:15 41:9.15.18 177:24 183:2.4 Division 20:17 direct 18:9 32:16 35:3 42:16 54:11 55:1 56:17 57:1 78:20 88:14 115:4 38:1,4 85:3 86:9 designed 104:14 **DOC** 32:25 91:1 128:17 150:1 180:3,10, 152:16 158:23 160:24 100:15.16.24.25 101:1. detail 23:13 84:12 87:9 12,15,18,25 188:9 161:6,19,25 174:19 5,7 105:12,18 107:10 94:14 109:18 200:24 231:14 181:9 209:9 109:6,22 112:1 122:25 demonstrative 85:5 detailed 28:20 29:23 directed 21:12 70:25 126:1,3,16 127:5 129:5 31:24 32:14 187:13 130:14,19 136:16 Denorah 14:25 direction 137:24 142:9,20 147:24 details 65:18.19 153:11,13 154:3,17 directly 128:14,15 Department 14:11 Detection 52:19 178:4,10 199:24 15:25 17:14 18:10 152:13 192:19 213:15 225:11 230:18, 19:20 20:18,20 25:14 detections 52:22 Director 37:20 21 31:14 32:7 52:16 53:4, determine 105:7 5 82:5 95:9 156:12 disagree 131:24 docketed 14:13 19:18 159:2,4,13 166:22 21:8 determined 107:21 disapprove 199:20 167:18 180:4,7,13,22 document 39:18 40:17 181:20 182:12 183:5 develop 29:5 32:8 disassociates 99:20 41:12 54:4,10 76:6 209:17 213:24 217:19 104:9 111:14 138:16 discuss 36:22 44:10 228:4 244:2,20 78:17,25 79:15 80:9 143:9,21 145:14 48:11 52:6 53:23 54:12 81:2 82:2 83:6 84:5,10 165:22 178:8 Department's 82:14 55:14 57:13 86:4 180:5 153:20 160:9 161:5 182:20 developed 27:23 191:2,9 194:12 198:14 162:17,24,25 163:15, 54:10 57:7 96:5 105:15 229:23 departs 30:23 22 164:16,22 165:13, 107:11 114:10 115:2 20,21 166:15,20 discussed 54:2 56:19 depending 48:21 128:7,12 134:6 143:12, 167:11,16 168:8 169:8 63:2 64:6 144:11 94:19 148:5.14 13,17 149:2,21 180:13 170:5 171:5 172:14 190:17 227:3 187:18 210:13 239:14. depends 71:1 129:14, **developing** 44:20 45:2 discussing 156:7 22 240:2 16 136:12 79:17,20 83:16 86:4,16 224:6 89:10,14 106:21 114:3 Documentation depicted 98:7 129:23 135:22,25 discussion 86:8 166:17 167:13 depicting 204:21 164:3 133:21 199:16 205:19 documenting 51:11 226:22 229:18 231:9 depicts 93:4 201:2 development 24:24 232:16 237:3 239:8 documents 19:23 231:15 32:4 40:17 57:12 87:10 244:10,12 36:20 162:19 175:23 88:9 131:22 134:14 derivation 96:21

discussions 199:9

dispute 31:11

159:16 164:24 165:15

180:5,10 183:8 192:25

166:2 173:25 178:11

177:8,10

1000

Deroma 16:17

179:24 196:12 201:1

239:16,17,19 240:3

241:23 243:12

Index: DOE..equations

DOE 17:8 63:14 122:18 environment 15:25 drought 147:6,12 151:3 17:14 18:9 19:19 20:18 **DOE's** 26:9 elicit 98:6 31:13 32:7 82:5 97:12 **due** 60:16 134:14 **DOECAP** 52:17 eliminated 121:19 159:2 209:17 244:2,20 147:15 176:9 **DOEM** 26:10 **EMLA** 26:11 environmental 14:12 duly 37:6 75:14 158:20 17:8 26:10 53:3,6 **DOEM's** 26:15 209:6 empirical 129:22,23 75:25 76:1,2 86:1,2,3 130:4 duration 106:18 87:21,22 88:1 159:6 **DOEMLA's** 42:19 175:21 employed 158:25 duties 159:14 209:23 **Dolan** 16:20,21,24 159:1 209:15.16 **EPA** 29:15 30:7,16 24:4,6,10 31:6,19 33:7 45:1 49:9 enclosure 187:23 Domestic 175:5 Ε 53:2.20 83:8 89:2.23 encourage 132:18 90:6,16 93:9,16 94:2, dominates 99:21 139:13 e-mail 19:25 35:7 12,21 95:5,7 97:16 Dominguez 13:7 104:10,13 107:6,11 **end** 18:20 35:14,15 e-mails 182:6 58:21,22 132:24,25 111:21 112:3,8 115:1 69:6 93:1 122:16 133:4,18 184:21,22 earlier 106:1 219:3 116:12 128:8,20 132:4 134:16 217:14 185:11 186:2,4 191:12, 134:13 137:4,11 151:4 early 23:22 103:14 ended 104:19 126:14 13,22,23 200:8,9,16,22 155:19,24 156:10,15, 180:11 204:19 205:2 208:3,4 23 162:18 163:16 ends 57:16 215:24,25 216:12 early-on 61:1 164:17,24 165:14,25 221:18 222:2 231:11 **Energy** 14:11 25:14 175:24 178:16 180:8, easier 39:6 233:25 234:1,22 235:2, 52:16 53:5 22 183:18 185:12,19 5 239:9,10 243:22,23 easily 33:14 112:20 186:6 188:11 196:12 engagement 32:13 244:16 163:25 214:8 227:15 232:21, 44:25 174:1 177:4 24 239:3 Dominguez' 185:8 180:11 183:7 east 46:2.5 **EPA's** 27:24 29:12 Download 179:25 engineers 131:1 Eastern 56:2 30:22 31:15 32:23 downstream 47:14 **English** 14:18,24,25 easy 243:18 33:24 49:1 53:7 80:11 71:24 152:6 15:8.10 74:9 169:10 81:4 89:6 91:9 93:5 Ecology 87:20 170:8 181:11 95:9 97:2 129:24 **DQA** 84:9 Edition 243:6 131:19 164:2 165:21 enhance 21:19 174:8 **DQO** 84:8 175:21 178:2,8,13 Editions 243:6 enhancing 25:15 **DQO/DQA** 104:13 **EPA-** 26:19 editorial 154:15 200:1 105:1 enlighten 152:6 **ephemeral** 47:18,21 educated 191:3 **draft** 41:9 54:4,6,13 ensure 84:14 88:24 48:4 50:4,22 108:2,6 55:2 180:12,15,17 104:15 128:11 educational 159:23 120:25 121:2 drafted 38:4 76:9 ensuring 25:22 26:1 epidemiological effect 90:1,24 97:20 161:9 181:3 202:22 227:25 enter 17:22 drainage 152:1 equal 92:23 effectively 136:10 entertain 229:17 draw 149:8 230:12 Equally 99:9 effects 30:12 31:2 49:11 drinking 117:11,15 entire 221:3 231:20 **equation** 32:22 33:16 202:16 239:17.19 93:15 102:20,23 103:1, effluent-fed 47:10 5,21 107:9 108:16 drive 48:1 entities 24:18 25:9 effort 29:3 135:2 111:25 112:7 120:10, 55:10 56:6 137:24 187:25 188:15 drivers 178:11 11 131:5 136:5 142:23 entitled 94:4 154:20 200:4,12 204:3 efforts 173:23 driving 147:23 230:25 233:13 entries 16:2 **element** 92:2,4,8 98:3 drop 99:18 222:11 equations 33:8,13 107:17 entry 182:19 **Dropbox** 43:14 85:5 49:6 64:23 91:8,25 **elements** 107:19 93:11 102:21 103:23,

<u></u>

25 105:17 106:22 107:14,18,22 108:10, 22 109:11,14 110:3,21 111:14,18,24 112:4,10, 14,18,25 113:2,6 114:10,12,24 120:14, 17,22 124:1,2,5 131:23 135:22 136:1,7 143:1, 9,18 146:9 148:23 149:18,21 150:14,20, 22 151:6 154:22 165:22,23 178:3,7 185:21,24 200:2 211:25 213:19,21 225:8 242:10,11

error 154:12 200:21

Española 56:23

essentially 114:8

establish 91:16 175:12

establishing 173:22

ethical 232:4

evaluate 95:17 97:10 109:17 130:5 135:3,4

evaluating 31:21 117:19 139:13

evaluation 105:10 128:11

evaluations 105:6

Evans 17:6,7

event 38:21 40:4,22 42:25 73:11 182:14 190:7

events 147:16

evidence 18:4 39:1 40:8 41:2 42:4 43:5 65:13 77:16 78:12 79:9 80:4,22 81:22 83:1,25 84:23 160:22 162:9 163:10 164:11 165:8 166:10 167:6 168:3,24 169:25 170:25 171:22 211:1,11

evidentiary 20:6 190:13 229:10

evolved 93:12

examination 37:9

57:22 59:6,24 61:25 70:19 75:17 118:13 119:9 125:6 133:3 138:8 140:9,17 146:3 153:1 155:17 158:23 185:5 187:4 209:9 216:22 227:7

Examine 179:24

examined 37:7 75:15 158:21 209:7

examples 119:18 146:24

exceedance 144:4

exceeds 143:22

excellent 72:19 128:1

Exchange 55:24

excluding 197:4 212:3

exercise 36:17

exhibit 28:23 30:19 37:23 38:19,23,25 39:16 40:1,5,7,11,20, 24 41:1,5,23 42:1,3,7, 23 43:2,4 56:19 67:12 76:4,17,18,19 77:10, 13,15,22 78:6,9,11,13, 15 79:3,6,8,12,16,23 80:1,3,7,11,16,19,21, 25 81:4,16,19,21,25 82:4,13,20,23,25 83:4, 8,19,22,24 84:3,7,17, 20,22 88:6,21 122:7 160:4,7,16,19,21,24 161:3 162:3,6,8,15 163:4,7,9,13 164:5,8, 10,13 165:2,5,7,11 166:4,7,9,13,25 167:3, 5,9,22,25 168:2,6,18, 21,23 169:6,19,22,24 170:2,19,24 171:16,19, 21 172:1,8,12 173:2,5 181:10,13,17 210:8,11, 20,23,25 211:3,5,8,10 241:13,17

exhibits 29:24 34:24 35:1,3,25 36:2,6,13 39:13 43:8 77:19 85:1 161:22 162:11 169:1 173:8 181:10 191:10 238:25 239:1 241:2,10, exist 120:19 149:17

existing 69:19 141:23 192:10 198:8,10 199:7 218:10,24

exists 150:4 226:8

expect 149:24

expectations 180:5

expected 138:25 139:16

expects 137:21

expensive 130:15

experience 87:24 185:15,18,19 196:21 240:2

experimental 202:14

expert 232:18

expertise 232:1 233:11

experts 196:8 200:15

explain 66:17 116:25 177:1

explanatory 23:21

explicit 193:18 225:23

explicitly 30:11

explore 244:3

exposures 92:3,4

expressed 225:14 230:20

expressing 103:20 113:4

expressly 18:17

extend 221:2 222:13 223:15 225:1

extended 44:25

extending 221:12

extends 220:3.11.12

extensive 31:25 231:14

extensively 32:6

extent 29:15 148:9

extraordinarily 200:25

extrapolated 194:13 extrapolating 143:20

Index: error..field

F

F-U-L-T-O-N 75:23

faced 136:22

facility 51:15,16

fact 60:25 130:25 163:23 196:7 236:22

factors 148:1

facts 21:25

fails 234:17

fair 133:20

fairly 137:25 201:10

falling 111:4

familiar 33:16 47:15 50:5 103:2 112:19 121:13 125:17 130:11 187:6.14

Fane 16:10 27:13

fashion 191:3

favor 200:6 232:25

Fe 13:1 45:14 46:1 53:22 55:8 56:23

feasibility 178:14

February 159:5

federal 25:22 56:5 62:8 174:3,10,19

Federally 14:25 24:23

feedback 103:14 180:8.24

feel 150:19 188:25

Felicia 13:20 14:1

fewer 136:3

FFRD 24:24

field 25:19,21,25 26:11 50:20 51:6 61:13,16 182:3



figure 92:11,14 102:5 106:9,15,17 108:11,12, 14 113:19 140:24 141:8 142:7 143:2 145:2 151:24 156:16 202:17

figures 131:4,5,13 132:7,10,19 142:12 155:23 156:5 185:9,13, 16,21 199:19,23 201:6 202:5,12,18,20,25 203:13 204:7,8,9,18

filed 19:23 172:4 243:13

files 178:19

filtration 51:18

final 23:10 54:9,12 100:12 114:21 153:20 178:16 180:25 183:19 233:9

finally 42:5,22 84:1 112:8 113:4

find 62:13 66:25 67:4 70:1 72:5 130:23 152:20 179:19 187:11

finding 64:18

fine 132:7 191:6 199:3 203:22 206:8 219:18 221:1 222:6 223:24 227:12

finger 235:6

finish 19:8

finished 18:22 19:1

finite 201:3 231:16

fish 22:4 97:25 98:22 128:16 174:16 175:2

fit 108:20

fits 192:10

flagged 52:22 153:5

fleshy 190:10

floor 190:14 229:12

flow 50:4,6 139:3 148:7,11

focus 88:2

focused 104:3 128:15 194:6

focusing 103:25 113:9

folks 103:5 112:19 224:5 240:11

follow 23:2 52:13 153:3 185:7

follow-up 155:12 203:24 228:17,18

font 114:13

food 231:24

Footnote 120:3

force 147:24

Forest 46:1

forewarned 70:3

Forget 150:12

forgot 153:5

form 33:16 51:8,23 55:2

formal 13:18 180:14 183:18 187:22

format 93:15 102:20, 23 103:22 107:9 112:7

forming 231:25

forms 51:22,24 52:9 81:10 100:7

Forum 238:13

forward 131:22 150:22 216:8 243:25

found 19:18 87:4 212:25

foundation 35:9,13,18 41:16 78:21 88:16 135:17

foundations 26:19

fraction 129:10

framework 28:6 173:19 174:5

free 99:19,21

frequency 106:18

frequently 237:23

fresh 30:17 163:17 164:18

freshmen 233:8

Frey 70:16,17,20
140:14,15,18 145:16,
19 153:4 155:10,18
156:25 186:25 187:1,5
189:6 194:23,25 195:3
201:20,21 203:23
204:1,12 208:5,6
222:15,16,23 223:2
227:1,2,8 228:7 233:4,
7 234:2,3 235:8,12
236:16,21,25 237:14
238:1,4,7,22 239:24
240:20,21 241:1,6,12,
16 242:2 243:2,5
244:8,24

Frijoles 47:2 114:16 197:21 213:8 221:14 223:17 225:3

front 85:23 90:21 122:3 134:4

frozen 50:6

fruit 201:7

full 37:13 86:19 94:19 158:4 221:20 223:9

fully 29:13,22 62:13 115:19 116:6,15 135:6, 10 177:23 183:1

Fulton 29:1 33:6 59:15 75:5,6,13,20,22 77:20 81:23 85:2,25 86:18 87:4,19 115:10 118:9, 15,17,21,23 133:5 140:20 155:19 157:7 242:14.16

Fulton's 65:17 118:11

function 107:5

functional 53:8

fundamentally 203:12

funded 24:23

funding 176:10

future 148:24 150:23 165:24 213:23 214:3

G

Index: figure..Grande

gathered 57:10

gauging 49:23,25

gave 103:11 187:13

general 22:23 54:1,25 56:14,20 111:16 139:4, 12 146:23,24 175:15 180:23 240:12

generally 110:18 138:23

generate 95:22 105:3 109:11 111:10,15,18 178:5

generated 242:12

generic 69:4

geographic 45:6 48:9 57:5 62:24 87:12 120:6

Geology 195:19

Georgia 83:9

gill 97:25 98:22,23

give 15:13 21:24 38:15 43:23 131:4 146:15,18, 23 152:16 200:14 204:10 220:9

glad 229:15

globe 15:6,7 74:7

goal 21:5 174:10,22 232:20,23

good 16:6 17:12,18 20:11 27:12 44:5 60:8, 9 104:16 128:23 133:5 134:17 138:19 158:5 188:25 198:22 212:24 216:7 237:6,13

goodness 187:10

Gorgeous 221:17

Governing 179:21

government 60:8

graduated 159:25

grams 204:22

Grande 63:11 114:19 197:7,24 212:7,12,13,



23 213:11 218:17,18, 22 223:20 225:6

grants 178:23

graph 109:17 110:11

great 67:4 140:3 143:5 148:21 150:8 238:8

greater 33:10 92:23 94:14 142:21 144:13, 16 153:14 154:18 213:16 230:22 243:15

greatest 220:7

green 47:11,17 49:24 98:13 110:6

ground 61:7

growing 93:19

Guaje 114:14 197:20 198:17 213:6 217:13 218:2 221:13 223:15 225:1

guess 66:8 69:25 139:20 150:10 191:7 216:24 220:6

guidance 33:25 53:2 132:4 134:13 135:12, 13 137:10 177:15 228:2

guidelines 53:1,8 131:19

gummit 187:8

Gutierrez 14:25

guys 85:23 137:13 222:23

Н

habitat 175:10

hand 73:22

handheld 39:6.7

handle 35:5

hands 73:16 190:10

hanging 201:7

happen 214:7

(CA)

happened 223:3

happy 35:21 36:21 227:17 230:12

hard 103:17 110:15

hardness 30:10,24 33:1 48:16 68:8,10 69:1 90:2,23 91:2,14 92:10,13,15,17,21 96:17 98:18,19,25 99:3 105:13,19 107:5,10 109:6,23 111:1 112:1 121:24 122:22,24 123:6 124:6,10,17 142:8,25 144:4,7,12, 13,16 145:4 147:25 163:1 178:5,10 204:22 225:13 230:19

Hardness- 89:24

Hardness-based 27:1 29:20 30:7 31:10 33:13 48:15 71:10 81:6 90:7, 10 91:19,24 92:1,17 93:10 94:12,16 98:24 99:7 101:21 123:24 124:1 144:22 175:22

Hardness-dependent 211:21

hardnesses 121:18

Harms 72:9,10 145:22, 23 146:4 152:18 189:10,11 208:8,9 228:12,13 234:4,5

hat 137:15

hate 69:14

head 39:8 121:10 130:17

heading 166:1

headquarter 25:18

heads 190:24

headwaters 46:21 114:17 197:23 213:9 223:18 225:4

health 21:19 159:6 174:7

hear 15:8 30:2 32:25 33:5 66:20,23 156:11 157:10 222:24 227:17 236:16 **heard** 91:18 133:12 149:3

hearing 13:13,19,24 14:2,3,21 15:17,20 16:7,16,19,22 17:5,6, 10,15,24 18:23 19:9,18 20:12,25 23:9,18 24:2, 7 26:5 27:5,7 34:7,13, 17,19 35:6 36:4,11,23 37:3 38:18,20,25 39:4, 24,25 40:2,7,19,21 41:1,21,24 42:3,21,24 43:4,18 57:19,24 58:4, 9,16,20,23,24 59:19 61:20 66:19 67:6 70:9, 14 72:7,12,18 73:5,7 74:11,16 75:4,6,9,19 77:9,11,15 78:5,6,7,11 79:2,4,8,22,24 80:3,15, 17,21 81:15,17,21 82:6,19,21,25 83:20,24 84:16,18,22 85:8,18 86:24 118:10,14,19,24 119:6 124:24 125:3 132:23 133:1 138:5 140:6,12 145:21 152:23 155:2,6,8,10,13 157:2,4,13,15,23 158:6,11,16 160:15,17, 21 162:2,4,8 163:3,5,9 164:4,6,10 165:1,3,7 166:3,5,9,24 167:1,5, 21,23 168:2,17,19,23 169:3,10,18,20,24 170:7,18,20,24 171:8, 15,17,21 173:1,3,9,10, 12 174:2 178:23 179:23 181:3 183:25 184:5,9,15,20,23,24 186:5,8,13,17,21,24 189:9,15,20,25 190:4, 18,23 191:4,5,16,21 192:1 196:22 203:15 205:7,11,13 206:2,10, 13,18,22 207:4,12,23 208:21 209:3 210:19, 21,25 211:4,10 214:12 215:4,9,14,19,23 216:9,14,18 219:4,17, 25 220:4,8 221:25 222:20,25 223:4,22 225:16 226:16,21 228:10,15,19,22 229:3, 8 230:5 236:20 237:8, 25 240:24 241:9,14,18, 24

held 56:16,23 60:23,25 61:3

Index: grants..idea

helpful 119:23 185:3 206:3

helping 188:17

helps 72:2

Hey 151:4

hiatus 61:12

high 53:12 57:9 100:22 110:21 139:3 147:6,12 176:16

highlights 97:18

highly 109:10 126:18 127:13

historical 176:16

history 93:5

hit 171:24

holdover 69:13

home 48:2

Honor 17:19 229:7

honored 17:19

hope 13:6 66:17 222:18 235:9

hoped 190:18

horizontal 92:9 108:15 110:10

huge 202:9

humic 129:6.9

hybrid 61:3

hydrologic 48:8 107:25

hydrologically 53:11

hydrologies 48:5

Т

I(4) 142:19 198:18,19

I.(4) 200:1

ice 47:14

idea 196:6 198:22

Index: identified..issue

influential 91:3 140:22 intermittent 46:23 237:6 47:18.22.25 48:2.4 identified 37:23 39:15 information 31:1 improvement 101:20 50:22 108:2,7 40:11 41:4 42:7 43:23 44:15 151:23 152:20 **in-house** 16:17 64:11 76:4 78:15 79:11 161:22 164:1 179:3,7, interpret 14:17 80:6,24 81:24 83:3 inclined 194:2 20,22,25 181:23 interpretation 15:9 84:2 160:7 161:3 182:14 240:17 243:16 include 22:8.20 63:8 74:4 162:15 163:12 164:13 **initial** 180:12 88:8 99:10 123:5,9 165:10 166:12 167:8 interpreter 14:16,20 175:1 179:12 196:3 168:5 169:6 170:2 initially 225:24 15:1,2 74:3,13,14 212:15.18 214:21 171:2 172:12 210:11 221:11 238:5 239:19 initiates 23:1 51:8 interpreters 14:17,23 identifies 165:21 included 28:21 57:11 initiating 214:10 interpreting 14:23 198:25 88:11 126:2 196:13,14, interrupt 195:4 205:19 **input** 22:22,25 23:7 **identify** 35:22,24 17 218:6,10 219:2 32:11 93:14 102:12 78:17 79:14 80:9 81:2 236:24 241:4.20 interrupted 61:9 105:1 176:3 177:6 82:2 83:6 176:23 includes 82:14 87:25 178:5,10 180:21,24 interruption 60:15 188:18 212:24 124:10 128:4 217:25 188:3,11,22 interruptions 60:18 **Ildefonso** 46:3 55:25 219:13 221:22 **inside** 51:2 103:17 **Interstate** 14:6 44:11 illustrated 107:1 including 15:24 22:1 199:5 42:13 66:20 86:12 intra-annual 146:19 illustrating 108:9 inspection 51:7 88:19 90:25 92:22 147:19 immediately 23:15 99:17 107:9 128:9 instances 121:5 **intrastate** 14:5 44:11 162:23 163:21 164:21 **impact** 98:20 102:15, Institute 25:10 165:19 166:19 167:16 introduce 14:15 35:1 17 105:14 116:22 168:13 169:13 170:12 instructions 15:13 169:1 117:1 154:1 171:11 172:20 173:19 insured 23:7 introduced 62:4 impacts 26:25 176:20 198:1,6 217:3 intend 214:12 introduction 86:12 inclusion 244:21 **imparts** 49:13 87:18 intended 104:17 impermeable 100:19 incorporate 27:17 127:22 228:2 invertebrate 98:1,23 89:4 112:24 127:15 implement 112:23 127:23 intent 60:17 120:8 incorporated 33:15 214:23 122:8,21 123:1 129:6 invertebrates 127:22 54:7 98:5 103:2 112:20 implementation 149:20 165:22 198:11 128:16 139:22 240:8 135:12,13 178:15 intention 178:8 194:13 invite 19:7 72:22 206:4 incorporates 30:25 implements 209:25 237:25 32:10 49:11 **inter** 147:19 implicate 192:19 invited 55:4,23 56:4,10 incorporating 46:16 interact 98:21 54:5 64:7 90:23 92:24 implications 194:18 involved 40:16 53:20 interaction 54:17.19 101:12,13 64:10 78:24 152:13 **implies** 131:7 202:12 interactions 53:15,18 188:13 192:25 increase 144:11.12 importance 204:14 57:13 Involvement 32:14 increases 92:15 98:25 233:9 interacts 91:5 99:1 100:4,6,7 101:6,9 ion 99:21 136:17 important 96:18 99:9 interannual 146:19 independent 52:23 102:11,14,15,16 ions 99:4 105:18 126:22 125:25 127:6 157:16 interest 52:18 **IP** 55:18 56:9 196:10 indicating 110:18 interested 179:9 irrigation 175:6 196:4, 220:9 **Importantly** 92:20 188:1.4 6 95:18 individual 54:23 55:13 interesting 69:16 70:4 issue 127:15 195:7 71:17 131:9 239:14 impression 194:8 140:2 145:20 199:22,25 212:21

interface 101:24

237:16 244:17

industrial 22:6 175:4

impressive 59:8

(CA)

Index: issued..listed

issued 25:23 30:16 kicking 53:20 Liability 25:4 **LANL** 24:18,23 26:8,12 45:21 kickoff 41:19 licensed 131:1 issues 85:10 113:2 178:16 214:13 216:5 large 47:16,19 **kind** 87:14 88:15 89:13 lies 233:12 italic 114:13 93:4 97:22 99:13 larger 64:14 66:3 **Life** 26:25 29:14 30:5, 103:12,15 105:23 lastly 171:1 17 31:5,16 33:10,22 106:14,17,23 107:1 48:17 49:5 64:25 65:3, 109:19 111:11,16 latest 30:25 49:13 7 90:5 91:6,17 92:5 112:13 114:12 120:5 164:23 95:1 97:14 111:21 **J(2)** 67:1 121:13 194:24 126:10 129:16 131:21 law 174:9 112:12 116:4,7,15 145:11 146:17 147:9, **J(2)(a)** 71:8 194:7 117:7,17,23 118:8 25 149:22 165:24 laws 179:21 195:9 119:18,19,20 120:9,10, 196:15 232:10 15,18,21,25 121:3 **J1** 69:6 **lawyers** 193:23 kinds 139:25 128:4,9 131:21 162:20 **lay** 35:12 January 13:2 53:21 163:17 164:17 175:11 knowing 48:7 66:9 94:6 204:2,3 211:22 212:3, laying 135:17 139:8 204:5,7 240:2 10 220:18 225:21 **Jemez** 55:25 56:3 lays 41:15 knowledge 38:12 226:5,7,11 140:25 141:4,13 39:22 49:13 68:7 77:2 Lea 17:21 **Ligand** 27:24 49:2 **iob** 159:14 189:1 151:7 161:13 232:7 90:9,17 91:11 93:18 lead 88:8 159:15 192:18 209:22 94:23 95:8 96:1.25 leading 165:25 John 17:7 L 97:7,23 101:2 176:1 242:6 leap 124:8 **Jones** 20:1 43:22 44:1 L-E-M-O-N 209:14 85:13,15 207:24,25 light 47:11 115:11 learned 30:14 208:3,5,7,10,12,14,16, 155:11 **L.L.C.** 17:1 24:11 leave 156:22 18,20 233:20,21,25 likes 100:25 **L.I.c.'s** 13:14,15 234:2,4,6,8,10,12,14, Lee 15:22 limit 36:1 142:25 laboratories 25:20 **left** 74:7 106:9.17 144:5,9,17 145:8 Journal 172:16,22 52:11,12,13 53:7 108:11 236:4 199:24 203:5 181:4 laboratory 17:3 45:18, left-hand 15:5 45:17 limited 25:3 65:3 20,21 46:22 47:7,20 jump 194:25 89:17 117:17 119:20 121:3 49:21 50:11 52:3,21,22 June 55:12 176:10 leg 133:12 Laboratory's 26:2 iurisdiction 83:9 **limiting** 185:15 legacy 26:7 Labs 25:24 jurisdictions 112:4 limits 52:19 143:6 legal 28:6 117:21 lack 233:15 179:16 justification 29:22 linear 32:20 105:16 lacked 95:13 111:17,23 125:25 justified 131:8 202:13 Legislative 182:10 127:5 178:3 203:14 laid 28:6 35:9,23 Lemon 208:24,25 lines 109:25 110:4 landholders 45:22 209:5.13 215:2.11 justify 177:8 111:4,5,6 138:13 221:18 223:8 224:19 lands 63:14 justifying 132:16 244:11 227:18 235:12 236:8 language 15:3 69:18, link 43:14 lengthy 103:12 149:5 Κ 19.25 71:9 74:6 119:13 linked 225:22 letter 67:20 68:17 83:9 123:15 192:9,12,24 121:16 122:10,17 193:9,10,14 194:17,21 Lisa 14:22 74:1 Kari 16:9 27:12 197:18 198:17 205:24 188:20 235:20 list 62:17 193:7 240:8, **keeping** 232:25 206:5,9 207:3 211:13, level 33:22 94:24 132:1 13 241:8,17 19 212:2 214:22 216:3 key 30:1 104:1,4 144:7 223:8 224:6.20 234:25 listed 96:7 114:13 109:16 110:14 235:25 236:11,13,22 levels 225:19 120:16 239:12 kicked 56:24

Index: listen..Mexico listen 15:11 74:23 management 14:12 mechanically 98:20 M 17:9 26:3.10 48:10 listening 15:10 mechanism 151:6.8 51:25 52:2 **listing** 193:3 mechanisms 97:19 M-I-C-H-A-E-L 158:9 managing 17:1 98:7,8 101:12 lists 96:24 macrophytes 127:24 **manmade** 219:14 meeting 13:10,23 20:7 listserve 182:8 Madam 14:21 16:6.21 Manual 53:6 41:18 53:21 54:24 17:6 20:11 24:6 34:17 55:3,6,13,19,24 56:3,9, liter 153:12 204:22 **map** 45:16 106:6 38:18 39:24 40:19 225:12 230:19,23 13,17 60:24 85:12,14 141:5,19 142:2 41:21 42:21 57:19 meetings 41:8 60:25 Livestock 175:9 58:23 75:3,19 77:9 March 56:10.16 61:13 78:5 79:2,22 80:15 local 26:24 56:5 171:13 180:15 81:15 82:19 84:16 melt 50:7 marked 77:21 Located 46:19 85:18 118:10 133:1 members 20:13 29:5 155:6,10 157:2,23 location 139:5 141:17, **markup** 153:6 32:12 44:6 54:20 85:19 158:5 160:15 162:2 20 152:7 **MASS** 159:10 157:24 158:7 232:3 163:3 164:4 165:1 locations 50:2,3,9,10, 166:3,24 167:21 membranes 100:19 Masters 87:22 12 106:2,7,16 138:18 168:17 169:18 170:18 Memorial 25:10 141:19 152:14 169:17 material 100:17,22 171:15 173:1 184:23 129:9 130:2 195:13 186:5 205:13 210:19 memory 35:6 241:1 log 51:17 196:12 219:16 mention 119:17,20 **long** 62:17 69:13 materials 148:18 made 15:21 55:14,20 139:19 148:21 159:3 210:2 112:9 202:4 219:11 237:22 matter 14:12 15:24 mentioned 97:1 17:23 23:19 24:12 magnesium 90:3 101:23 103:11 108:25 longer 157:19 26:14 129:8,11,12,15, 98:17 99:4 101:16 135:8 136:3 241:2 longer-term 92:4 21 160:4,25 161:16 magnitude 92:16 167:20 169:10 170:7 merit 244:3 looked 109:15,21 148:10 189:24 210:8 met 23:8 54:2 132:3 141:4,15 main 178:10 matters 19:17,19 **los** 17:2 26:15 45:10, metal 33:9 99:16 maintain 94:25 13,19 46:4 47:6,12,13, Maureen 16:24 24:9 112:11 129:17 176:2 maintaining 51:12 15 55:8 56:11,13,22 maximum 143:8,16 metals 33:14 68:5,15, 114:15 171:6 181:16, 21 88:4 97:10,12 maintenance 159:17 19 197:21 213:8 Maxine 24:12 121:23 122:19,20 221:14 225:2 **make** 18:3,11 36:18 Maxwell 16:1 17:16, 123:2,3,24 124:19 63:8 64:18 69:4 76:15 18,21 18:10 35:8,24 lost 145:2 187:7 195:25 165:14,23 166:2 178:9 125:23 134:18 141:9 222:17.18 244:6 211:23 220:19 36:5,8 58:3,5,7 118:20, 171:23 172:5 189:22 22 184:6,7 189:21,23 **lot** 54:17 62:3 65:25 **method** 29:9 91:16 191:24 192:23 198:12 215:10.12 222:21 68:3 132:5 135:25 96:23 101:19 109:19 202:9 203:23 205:20 229:4,6 154:13 138:11 143:25 144:3 207:9 214:20 219:5 220:13 221:3 224:9 Mcreynolds 24:13 Lots 55:10 methodology 65:20 230:3 235:3,8 238:1,4, means 64:17 99:22 methods 22:21 96:24 love 66:23 19 242:19 195:14 197:14 198:15 111:13 145:6 177:13 low 27:6 129:4,24 makes 125:24 150:8 182:25 240:3 243:3 meant 193:1 195:16,20 201:7 making 21:1,22 63:3 measurable 153:17. **Mexico** 13:1 14:7 lower 15:5 45:12 66:4 136:13 196:15 23 154:5 17:14 19:12 20:18,22



measure 154:6,9

measuring 61:7

measurement 154:12

21:2,15 23:3 25:5

29:20 34:1 44:12 45:10

55:5 82:5 89:12 95:5,7

159:1 168:10,15 170:9,

131:2 139:24 144:1,3

201:9 207:5 220:20

managed 24:25 26:12

manage 25:23

63:14

lucky 50:7

<u></u>

lunch 18:14 72:20 73:9

TRAID/NMED PETITION FOR RULEMAKING TO AMEND 20.6.4.900 NMAC TRANSCRIPT 01/14/2025 Index: Mexico's..Non-technical

15 172:17,23 176:7 178:15 179:6 181:5,7, 14 182:1 183:18 209:16 210:1 243:14

Mexico's 27:1 30:4 31:9 163:1 174:23 175:19

mg 98:15 225:13

mg/cl 153:13 230:19

mg/l 142:22 143:1 144:4,16 153:15 154:3, 19 213:17 225:14 230:20,24 231:2

mic 39:2,6,7 236:19

Michael 158:8,19

microphone 25:7

microphones 27:11

middle 54:22

military 25:16

milligrams 153:12 225:12 230:18,23

minimum 21:18 138:21

minute 77:18

minutes 157:21 235:1 237:12

misreading 194:7

misrepresented

186:3

missing 136:14

mission 26:12

misunderstanding

186:11

MLR 32:21 33:7,12 105:17 111:17 112:9 126:14 132:13 143:12 148:23 149:18,20 150:14 165:22 178:3,9, 13 242:7

MLR-BASED 108:15 165:23

Moander 58:11,14 86:18 87:3 140:7,8 184:11,12 190:25

194:1 198:21 208:10, 11 215:16,17 229:19, 20 230:8 231:4,23 234:6,7

model 27:25 49:2,20 90:9,17 91:10,11 93:18 94:23 95:8 96:1,25 97:7 101:2 102:13 105:3 126:2 129:2 132:13,14 143:20 144:19,24 145:14 148:19 176:1,2 185:10 242:6.8

modeled 220:16

modeling 26:20 185:16

models 110:25 143:12 178:9

modified 68:6 177:15 201:18

modify 69:1,18,23 199:10,12

modifying 198:9

moment 38:21 40:3,22 224:9

monitor 50:1 113:7

monitored 95:21

monitoring 31:25 104:2 141:22 159:9,21 176:15,17

monsoon 148:8

Montgomery 16:10 27:13

months 61:12,14

Monument 45:24 47:4

morning 14:18 16:6 17:12,18 20:11 27:12, 15 37:12 44:5 115:12

motion 205:9,20 207:5,10 229:17 230:3, 13 231:3,6 233:22 234:17,19,23 235:3,4, 19 236:1,23 237:7,24 238:1,4,19

move 39:25 41:22 42:22 53:13 82:20 84:17 137:18 203:16,

21 205:7 211:7 238:23

moved 90:8

moves 160:16 162:3 163:4 164:5 165:2 166:4,25 167:22 168:18 169:19 170:19 171:16 173:2 210:20

moving 39:12 72:21 78:13 137:24 150:21 243:25

multilinear 127:4

multiple 31:3 32:20 49:3,12 90:24 93:21 105:16 111:17,23 127:4,16 139:5 178:2

multivariant 126:14

multiyear 29:3 32:13 149:6

Ν

N3b 16:13 26:15 27:14 37:21 38:19,25 40:7,20 41:1 42:3,19 43:4 53:1 77:10,15 78:6,11 79:3, 8,23 80:3,16 81:16 83:18

N3d 16:18

naming 218:8

narrative 175:15

national 13:13 14:9 16:25 17:3 24:10 25:1, 15,20,24 45:19,24 46:1 47:3,7 53:7 89:7

nationally 30:16 93:5

Natural 151:21 152:8

necessarily 141:21 194:11 199:12

needed 49:20 94:25 214:14,15 241:25

negative 200:12

nerd 127:11

newer 61:2

Newport 13:14 14:9 16:11 26:13

News 13:14 14:9 16:11 26:13

newspaper 171:13 179:5

newspapers 56:22 172:24

NGOS 55:9

nib 69:5

nice 125:14 132:21

Nicholas 15:25 17:20

NMAC 13:17 21:4 22:15,18 27:17 28:9 30:6 63:17 89:10 91:25 96:2,20 113:25 174:24 178:22 180:3 183:10 197:14 198:4

NMCAB 55:6

NMED 17:13 20:19 23:6,14,17 28:5 29:4 31:19 53:19 63:7 64:5 66:21 80:21 81:21 82:25 83:24 84:22 88:19 155:20 159:3 160:4,7,16,21,24 161:3 162:3,8,15 163:4,9,12 164:5,8,10,13 165:2,7, 10 166:4.9.12.16.25 167:5,8,22 168:2,5,18, 23 169:6,19,24 170:19, 24 171:3,16,21 172:12 173:2.7 178:12 180:14 181:10,13 182:17 183:8,12 187:19 188:11,12 210:3,4,8, 11,20,25 211:8,10,14 235:1,20 241:16

NMED's 23:12 45:1 158:1 182:3

NNALA 25:25 26:4,5

NNSA 25:2,13,17,21, 25 26:4,9

Non- 52:21

non-detect 134:21

non-substantive 236:5,10

Non-technical 73:15 190:9



nonprofit 25:9

noon 18:15

north 46:4,19 114:15 197:20 213:7 218:3 221:13 223:16 225:2

north-northeast 46:2

north-northwest 45:25

Northern 55:5

northwest 47:12

not-modified 69:25

Notably 33:12

note 49:8

notes 67:17 120:7

notice 23:7 41:7,12 161:23 166:23 167:12, 19 168:14 169:9,16 170:6,14,16 171:8,12 172:21 174:2 178:23 179:4,11 181:2,6,11, 16,24 182:5,7,13,17

noticed 33:1 56:21 196:13

notification 41:17 56:18 181:22

notify 22:21

November 55:22 56:2,

NPDES 54:23 71:16

nuclear 13:14 14:10 16:11 25:1,15,17 26:13

number 67:12 69:12 71:7 76:21,23,24 106:2,10 120:20 121:23 131:17 132:1 134:20 139:7 147:14 185:8,12,15 199:18 203:3,7 233:10,14 239:13,23,25 242:22

numbers 233:13 235:15 241:17

numeric 22:14 67:15 92:16 123:2 128:11 131:20 154:2 175:17

numerical 107:18

numerous 53:18

0

O'GRADY 14:19,20,22 15:18 74:3.13

oars 81:16

oath 19:15 38:16 77:6

object 133:11 185:12 186:6

objection 36:9 84:19 217:2,20 228:5 237:11

objections 38:22 40:4, 23 41:25 43:1 77:12 78:8 79:5,25 80:18 81:18 82:22 83:21 160:18 162:5 163:6 164:7 165:4 166:6 167:2,24 168:20 169:21 170:21 171:18 173:4 210:22

objective 84:8 89:3 138:24

Objective/data 104:12

observed 105:21 146:13

obvious 136:2

occur 149:24

October 172:25

of.900 67:2

offer 19:6 39:3 73:14, 19,23 74:19 83:18 102:23 190:9 243:24

offered 217:17

offers 38:19 40:20 77:10 78:6 79:3,23 80:16

office 14:11 17:8 25:25 26:9,11,16 51:25 52:2

Officer 13:19,24 14:2, 21 15:17 16:7,19,22 17:5,6,10,15,24 20:12 23:18 24:2,7 27:5,7 34:13,18,19 35:6 36:4, 11,23 37:3 38:18,20

39:4,24,25 40:2,19,21 41:21.24 42:21.24 43:18 57:19,24 58:4,9, 16,20,23,24 59:19 61:20 66:19 67:6 70:9. 14 72:7,12,18 73:7 74:11,16 75:4,6,9,19 77:9,11 78:5,7 79:2,4, 22,24 80:15,17 81:15, 17 82:19,21 83:20 84:16,18 85:8,19 86:24 118:10,14,19,24 119:6 124:24 125:3 132:23 133:1 138:5 140:6.12 145:21 152:23 155:2,6, 8,11,13 157:3,4,15,23 158:6,11,16 159:20 160:15,17 162:2,4 163:3,5 164:4,6 165:1, 3 166:3,5,24 167:1,21, 23 168:17,19 169:3,18, 20 170:18,20 171:15, 17 173:1,3,9,10,12 183:25 184:5,9,15,20, 23,24 186:5,8,13,17, 21,24 189:9,15,20,25 190:4,23 191:4,6,16,21 192:1 196:22 203:15 205:7,11,14 206:2,10, 13,18 207:4,12,23 208:21 209:3 210:19, 21 211:4 215:4,9,14, 19,23 216:9,14,18 219:4,17,25 220:4,8 221:25 222:20,25 223:4,22 225:16 226:16,21 228:10,15, 19,22 229:3,8 230:5 236:20 237:8,25 240:24 241:9,14,18,24

Offices 25:19,21 182:4

older 90:10 107:6

Olson 16:5,6,9 27:4,6, 9,12 34:14,17,22 35:16 36:21 37:10 38:18 39:2,10,24 40:9,19 41:3,21 42:5,21 43:6, 22 57:18,25 67:11 69:16,22 70:4 72:14,16 75:2,3,11,18 76:20 77:9,17 78:5,13 79:2, 10,22 80:5,15,23 81:15,23 82:7,19 83:2, 18 84:1,16,24 85:9

86:23 87:1 115:9 118:9,15 133:11 155:3, 5 157:6 184:2,4 190:3 215:8 229:2

Index: nonprofit..Orth

on-the- 61:6

on-the-ground 61:8

ongoing 55:16

online 60:24 61:1

open 56:14,20 110:1 215:3

open-circle 111:5

open-ended 146:17

opening 18:1,3 20:8 21:5 34:16 216:25

operate 25:23

operated 24:25

operating 17:2 26:3

opinion 134:1,4 156:13 194:21 204:11

opinions 185:14 232:12

opportunity 24:20 60:7 74:24 85:22 216:4

opposed 203:13

option 39:5

order 15:3 191:15 214:21 229:21 243:15

organic 32:24 91:1 92:22 100:16,17,21,22 101:9,13 105:12 129:8, 11,12,15,20,25 130:2,7 153:10 178:4 225:11 230:17

organism 98:2,4 99:24 101:4

organisms 100:3

original 131:19 132:16

Orth 13:20,23,24 14:1 15:17 16:19 17:5,10, 15,24 24:2 27:5,7 34:13,19 35:6 36:4,11, 23 37:3 38:20 39:4 40:2,21 41:24 42:24 43:18 57:24 58:4,9,16,



TRAID/NMED PETITION FOR RULEMAKING TO AMEND 20.6.4.900 NMAC TRANSCRIPT 01/14/2025 Index: outcome..Petitioner's

20.24 59:19 61:20 66:19 67:6 70:9.14 72:7,12,18 73:7 74:11, 16 75:6,9 77:11 78:7 79:4.24 80:17 81:17 82:21 83:20 84:18 85:8 86:24 118:14,19,24 119:6 124:24 125:3 132:23 138:5 140:6,12 145:21 152:23 155:2,8, 13 157:4,15 158:11,16 160:17 162:4 163:5 164:6 165:3 166:5 167:1.23 168:19 169:20 170:20 171:17 173:3,10,12 183:25 184:5,9,15,20,24 186:8,13,17,21,24 189:9,15,20,25 190:4 191:4,21 192:1 196:22 203:15 205:11 206:2, 10,13,18 207:4,12,23 208:21 209:3 210:21 211:4 215:4,9,14,19,23 216:9,14,18 219:4,25 220:4,8 221:25 222:20, 25 223:4,22 225:16 226:16,21 228:10,15, 19,22 229:3,8 230:5 236:20 237:8,25 240:24 241:9,14,18,24

outcome 109:20 200:12

outdated 30:7 89:22

outer 46:10.13

outfalls 71:23

outline 45:10 174:4

outlined 49:22 115:3

outlining 173:20

output 105:24

outreach 44:25 60:3 103:13 149:5 159:11, 21

outset 24:22

oval 98:13 100:14

overarching 63:9

overprediction 109:3

overprotective 48:20 90:11 94:18

overseen 26:8

overview 53:22 57:5 103:12

overviews 104:8

owner 76:1

ownership 45:22

Ρ

p.m. 18:23 19:2,7 73:6 74:23 157:14 206:23

package 187:7

pages 240:1,4

Pajarito 22:12 26:22 27:19 28:4,15 29:6,14, 18 32:1,5,8,19 33:3,23 34:10 44:16 45:6 46:8, 9,14,16 47:21 48:6 49:1,22 50:13 53:24 62:25 64:15 66:15 87:13 88:11,25 95:20 105:9,22 107:8 108:3,5 109:9 113:20 116:8,18 117:3 120:4,19 123:7 124:4.12.17.19 129:3 146:13 150:25 192:15 193:5 197:5,12,17 198:14 212:6,18,22 213:4 217:10,23 218:11 219:9,23 220:23 221:2,8,10 222:13 223:12,14 224:23,25

Pam 20:1

pandemic 54:22 60:16,20

panel 110:24

panels 109:24

paper 43:16,19

papers 28:1 31:25 32:22

paragraph 119:16 197:8 211:20 212:8 213:2,3 217:8,20 220:15,16 221:7 224:22 226:4 243:10

Paragraphs 224:3

parameter 110:8,12 125:25 242:8

parameters 30:13 31:3 32:1 48:18 49:4, 12,20 68:9,25 90:25 91:3,13 92:21,25 93:22 95:22 96:17 102:3,7, 13,15 104:1,2,4,21 105:7 107:10 109:16 110:20 113:6,9 122:24 123:10 124:5,22 125:21 136:4,14 176:3

parentheses 193:6

part 30:6 31:13 34:11 40:14 63:9 114:2 120:5 137:2 141:21 149:12 181:8 188:17 217:18 218:17 220:23 221:4,5 231:24

partially 106:16 134:14

participants 26:4

participate 179:23

participating 157:17

participation 23:5 88:17 214:20

parties 15:24 23:20 64:9 169:3 179:10 188:2,4 191:19 199:2 211:15,18 224:6

parties' 239:1

party 52:21 187:19 231:13

pass 43:11 85:6

passed 195:17 232:14

past 53:16

pasting 240:7,13

path 205:4

pathway 98:12 99:7,8, 25 100:11,12,13 101:14,15,17

pathways 99:10

pause 38:21 40:3,21 41:24 42:25 77:11 78:7 79:4,24 80:17 81:17 82:21 83:20 84:19 160:17 162:4 163:5 164:6 167:23 168:19 170:20 201:17 210:21

Pausing 165:3 166:5 167:1 169:20 171:17 173:3

people 17:21 60:19 94:4 193:21 196:5,8 202:3 233:12 240:16, 18 241:23 243:18

percentile 110:8,12

perennial 47:1,3,6 48:3 108:2,7 148:7

perfect 108:20 109:1 130:18

performance 144:24

performed 26:12 51:19 107:22,23 108:1

period 19:3 41:8,19,20 42:11,16 56:25 57:2 60:19 106:3 139:21 150:7

permeables 192:17

permission 43:24

Permit 54:23 55:13 71:17,18,21

permits 149:17

person 22:15 23:1 28:10 61:3 176:18 178:19

Personally 237:17

perspective 150:11, 16 232:18

Petition 13:15 14:4,8 22:16 28:10,22 41:13 44:10 54:13 67:9,10 81:9 82:13,15 83:13 84:11 116:6 122:4 133:25 176:18,22 177:7 178:20 181:1 227:24 229:17 234:21

Petitioned 137:14

Petitioner 20:19 22:19 27:14 67:12 187:17 192:14 231:21

Petitioner's 43:24



Petitioners 15:23 18:4,6 21:9 23:6 32:6 34:16 76:22 78:6 79:12 80:16 81:16,25 82:15 83:3,19 84:3,13 97:4 137:16 173:24 178:1 180:4,16,21 181:4,21 183:5,9 188:1 201:3 215:6 228:24

Petitioners' 20:21 22:10 24:21 26:18 27:16 28:23,25 29:24 30:19 37:23 38:19 39:15 40:1,11,14,20 41:5,23 42:7,23 44:24 76:4 77:10,22 79:3,23 80:6,24 82:20 84:17 181:15 187:7 241:15

Petitioning 231:13

Petitions 24:16

ph 32:25 48:18 91:1 92:22 99:13,15 100:4, 6,10 101:14 105:12,18 107:10 109:6,22 112:1 122:24 126:17,19,21 127:9 142:8 147:24 178:4,9

PH.D. 37:5

ph/doc 122:23

Phase 165:16

phrase 71:13 123:16 124:9 194:24 197:3 198:16 217:3,12,17 218:11 222:11 230:10

phs 99:18

physical 96:10 177:20

pick 193:23

piece 125:14 132:22 135:9 204:18

pieces 47:8

(CA)

place 60:17 150:23 187:8 195:25 231:12

places 125:15 202:6 204:4,6

plan 32:15 54:10 60:4, 14,16,17 79:16 88:12 180:1 183:6

planned 48:11 61:10

planning 79:19 180:9

Plans 174:1

plant 127:23 128:24

plants 128:5,18,22

Plateau 22:12 26:23 27:19 28:4,16 29:7,14, 19 32:1,5,9,19 33:4,23 34:11 44:17 45:7 46:8, 9,14,16 47:21 48:6 49:1 50:13 53:24 62:25 64:15 66:15 87:13 88:11 89:1,5 95:20 105:9,22 107:9 108:3,5 109:9 113:20 116:9,18 117:3,8 120:4,19 123:7 124:4,17,20 129:3 136:23,25 146:14 149:17,25 150:21,25 192:15 193:5 197:6,12, 17 198:15 212:6,19,22 213:4 217:10,23 218:11 219:9,23 220:24 221:2,9,10 222:13 223:12,14 224:23,25

platform 15:20 17:17 19:4 24:12 70:15 73:18 74:21 140:13 186:25 190:8 222:24 226:25

played 86:3

pleasure 34:25

plots 110:6,7

plotting 110:17

plug 102:3,6

point 48:2 53:14 55:2 69:17 70:5 93:23 112:9 122:17 125:23,24 133:20 134:16 137:13 140:1,3 151:21 152:3 194:6 195:1 197:10 205:8 216:8 222:1 229:20 231:12 238:9 243:9

pointed 28:9

pointing 241:23

points 30:1 108:24 115:14 141:13 152:6

191:8 196:18 204:24

Pojoaque 60:6

polish 206:8

pollutant 226:6

pool 203:17

portal 182:1,20

pose 232:9

position 139:12 159:15 203:1 231:20

possibility 244:25

post 149:14 171:7 181:16,19

post-fire 139:23

post-hearing 191:18

posted 169:16 182:5,

posting 179:7 181:24

potential 18:8 22:22 26:25 96:24 113:2

potentially 94:16 152:1 206:7 244:1

Powerpoint 85:5 140:24

precedence 83:15 111:19

precipitation 50:6 147:16

precise 109:10

predict 176:4

predicted 129:2

predicting 111:9

prefer 226:14 237:23

preference 36:3 64:9

Preferences 227:13

Prefiled 35:3 38:1 43:10 76:7

premarked 173:7

preparation 78:25

prepare 65:22 73:8

prepared 38:10 43:10

77:1 85:2

present 22:24 44:8 55:4,23 56:4,11 57:4 74:15 85:6,23 122:17 130:17 177:5,7 179:22 191:1 201:4

presentation 43:15 57:17 62:2 65:14,17 118:11 146:1 189:14

presentations 30:2 88:18

presented 28:24 32:9 54:25 55:12,18 56:9,15 106:6 116:6 147:3 197:19 200:11 234:25

presenting 181:17 208:24

preservation 51:19

preset 174:20

pretty 112:22,23 129:24 130:19 135:12 191:2

previous 121:9

previously 44:9 56:24 77:21 79:11 88:20 95:19 106:6 108:25 113:23 169:2

primarily 31:17 95:13

primary 65:8,10,14 97:18 118:3 175:8

principal 125:11

principle 201:14

prior 72:21 82:6 133:14 176:8

priority 60:4

private 55:10 56:6

problem 130:10 218:8 232:9 235:14 242:23

problematic 214:18 216:6

procedure 35:20 36:15 179:21 187:21

procedures 19:11 34:5 52:14 84:13 89:9 173:21

proceed 34:6

proceeding 16:13,15 21:8 35:20 82:10

proceedings 36:22

process 23:11 32:14 50:20 51:9 52:5 103:13,14 104:8,11,12, 13,14,19 105:1,24 111:13 114:2 135:7 143:10 149:5,7,10 177:4 180:10,20 188:23 200:23 214:20

processes 173:21

processing 51:14,16,

profession 37:18 75:24

professional 87:24 134:1,3

Program 37:20 52:17 195:18

programmatic 176:9

programs 141:23 149:16 176:13

progression 32:20

prohibits 176:11

propagation 22:3 174:16

proper 138:2 242:19

properly 183:9

property 46:22 50:11

proposal 27:16,23 29:22 32:10 34:3 41:12 65:20 88:7,17 91:7 116:5 117:5,16,20 134:4 144:10 173:25 190:20 192:23 193:11 214:15 229:25 244:19

propose 69:24 178:2,9 195:21 205:23 224:14

proposed 20:22 21:10 22:11 23:23 26:6,17,22 28:14 29:1,8 32:20 33:19 34:8 40:14 41:16 44:17,20 45:3 48:12,23 49:5 57:12 62:4 64:24

66:25 78:22 79:17,20 80:13 84:15 86:5,13,16 87:8,12,16 88:9,23 89:15,19 90:20,22 97:4 101:10 104:9 106:21 107:7,13 108:16,22 114:7,23 116:13 118:4 119:14 127:21 131:12 133:25 142:18 143:7 149:1 177:8 178:13 179:15,19 183:13,14 185:10 186:7 198:12 199:3 205:24 211:13 220:5 223:8 224:20 232:8 242:9

proposing 64:19 65:2 69:18 81:11 82:16 106:24 107:14 112:2 117:15 118:7 119:23 123:16 177:2 211:18

protect 21:18 62:13 91:16 94:25 115:19 117:7,9,14 118:5,7 127:22 128:3,13 174:7, 21 175:13 177:24 183:1

protected 65:11,15

protection 20:17 33:23 94:25 128:22 137:22 162:20 174:15 175:21

protective 29:13 116:7,15 118:1 128:18

protectiveness 65:19 150:24

protects 64:19

protocols 130:11

proved 130:4

provide 21:6 23:13 24:20 29:16 33:10,20 43:12 44:15 45:5 53:22 97:5 147:21 166:23 167:19 173:14,18 174:1,12 179:3 211:14 243:15

provided 28:22 30:19 32:2,15 52:20 54:3,5,7, 9 88:5,21 95:6 120:12 133:13 166:16 178:24 180:8,14 181:1,22

187:22,24 194:20 196:12 243:19

providing 123:24,25 124:4 139:6 173:16 205:21

provision 62:10 219:21

provisions 183:10 199:7

public 13:13,18 18:13, 17,19,24 19:6,24 21:18 22:23,24 23:4,7,8,9 29:5 32:13,14 33:17 41:8,17 42:15 54:19, 20,24,25 55:3,13,18,19 56:9,12,14,15,17,20 57:1,14 60:9 72:22,25 73:12,15,20 74:19 88:19 103:13 137:20 149:5 161:22 166:17, 23 167:12,19 168:14 169:9,10,16 170:6,7,14 171:7,8,12 174:2,7 175:3 177:6 178:24 179:3,11 180:23 181:2, 23 182:7,13,17,20 188:13,22 190:9 214:19 228:3 243:10, 20

publication 168:9 171:6 172:6,15 181:14, 18 227:13 228:1 235:17 238:24 243:1

publications 236:23

publicly 242:24

published 89:8,23 90:7,16 94:6 168:15 169:17 170:8,15,17 171:13 172:22,24 181:3,7,15 183:17

publishing 179:4

Pueblo 46:3,20 55:23, 24,25

Pueblos 55:8

pulling 141:8

pump 50:24

purchase 243:7

purple 47:24

purpose 44:14 104:17 174:9 179:14 205:21 231:6

Index: proceed..quality

purposes 21:21 22:5,7 131:18 153:9 171:25 223:6 225:9 230:16 232:5

pursuant 34:4 149:16 180:3

put 18:5 69:11 140:21 188:14 193:6 197:10 204:16

putting 63:6 195:21

Q

QA/G-8 53:2

QA/QC 52:14

qualifications 159:24

quality 13:16 14:5 19:10 20:16 21:11,13, 15,16,20 22:8,9 27:2, 18 28:2,3,8,14 29:2,10 30:5,12 31:14 33:20 34:1.9 38:24 40:6.25 42:2 43:3 44:18,21 45:1,4 48:8,10,24 52:7 53:5,12,19 54:14 57:9 59:10 73:4 77:14 78:10,23 79:7,18 80:2, 13,20 81:12,20 82:17, 24 83:11,17,23 84:7,8, 12,14,21 86:5,17 87:11,16 88:2,3,10,13, 24 89:5,11,15,20,22 90:20 93:6 95:14,15 96:4.22 97:19 101:11 102:21 103:3 104:10, 11,12,16,20 107:3,8 110:2 111:7 112:21,24 113:5,18 114:11,24 115:5 116:2,14,21 117:6,25 130:12 134:6 138:23 151:11,14 157:12 159:6,7,12,17, 19,20 160:20 162:7,19 163:2,8,18 164:9,18 165:6 166:8 167:4 168:1.22 169:23 170:23 171:20 173:19 174:5,8,14,23 175:13, 18,22 176:3,13,16,19



177:18 182:8,15,24 183:3,15,17 206:21 209:18,20 210:1,24 211:9 214:4,24 227:14 228:1 239:2

question 59:2,15
60:11,13 67:3 71:1,3
72:4 119:24 123:14
126:1,6 128:2 131:15
134:17 135:18 136:11
138:19,20 141:7,10,12
143:4,5 144:2,9 146:7,
18,22 148:25 149:13
150:17 151:17,19
152:9 154:4 156:2,17
187:2 190:21 191:7,16
194:15 216:1 227:4
240:6,11,23 241:21

questioning 57:22 115:12 118:13 130:22 133:7 137:3 215:3

questions 13:21 19:21 38:15 57:20 58:2,3,6,8, 12,23 62:6 70:13,21,24 72:5,11 77:6 113:23 115:16 118:17,18,21, 23 119:5 125:2 133:9 138:3,12 145:17,22,24 152:21 153:4 155:1 157:3 183:24 184:3,6, 7,18,23 186:16,20,23 187:15 194:23 200:10 215:7,11,12,18,22 216:13,17 225:17 226:20,24 228:14

quick 77:17 187:2

quickly 112:17 172:5 239:15

quorum 191:1

R

R2 109:5

R2s 132:6

(CA)

raise 27:10 73:16,22

raised 115:16 194:23

ran 105:2 128:21 132:9 200:19

range 105:21 109:8 110:19 143:13,15,21 144:25 145:12,13 146:11 149:23

ranges 109:16,22

rationale 81:10 86:14 87:7 88:22 89:14 177:1

Ray 17:20

re- 156:9

re-read 223:8

re-review 156:14

reach 188:1 190:19

reaches 47:6

read 187:18 204:8 211:12 224:19

readily 103:2 112:20

reading 192:24 217:25 223:10 224:21

reads 230:15

ready 31:15 229:16 230:11 233:19 238:18, 21

real 187:2 231:17 244:17

realistic 135:21

realize 195:14

realizing 137:24

realm 244:25

reason 102:18 131:16 149:1 190:1 204:17

reasonable 148:5

reasoning 141:16

reasons 23:21 36:16 44:20 65:24 90:14 94:13 135:8 136:3 157:17 178:20

Rebecca 207:13

Rebuttal 18:8 161:15

recall 133:19 155:19 242:21

receive 43:17 232:22

received 22:25 32:11 39:1 40:8 41:2 42:4,10, 17 43:5,14 57:2 71:20,

23 77:16 78:12 79:9 80:4,22 81:22 83:1,25 84:23 85:4 115:12 160:22 162:9 163:10 164:11 165:8 166:10 167:6 168:3,24 169:25 170:25 171:22 177:6 180:25 188:3,11 189:4 211:1,11

receiving 67:21 71:11, 14,18 121:20 122:12, 22 123:4,8,11,16,20 124:9,13,18,20 195:10, 11,15

recently 24:17

recessed 73:5 157:13 206:22

recognize 37:25 39:18 40:13 41:7 42:9 45:9 76:6 77:24 95:9 160:9 161:5 162:17 163:15 164:16 165:13 166:15 167:11 168:8 169:8 170:5 171:5 172:14 210:13

recognizes 33:7

recommend 113:16 114:22 150:5

recommendation

114:21 156:21 164:2, 23,25 178:17

recommendations

29:12 31:19 33:25 49:9 87:14 89:2 113:14 115:1 116:13 175:25

recommended 26:20 30:8,17 49:10 89:7 90:18 93:6,9 95:6 97:2 111:21 163:24 166:1 213:14

recommending

144:19,20

recommends 183:12

record 20:6 37:14 42:14 51:11 75:21 82:7 158:4 162:24 163:22 164:22 165:20 166:20 167:16 168:13 169:14 170:13 171:11 172:20 186:5 189:24 190:13 200:17 201:8 205:20 207:5,8,16,20,21 223:7 228:25 229:5,11 231:13 241:3

Index: question..referring

recording 15:20

Records 69:9,23 243:14

recovery 60:19

recreation 174:17

recreational 22:4

red 47:7 50:8 93:8 110:6

Redirect 72:15,17 155:4,6 189:17,18

redline 122:5,6 153:6

reduces 144:12

reducing 185:12

redundant 221:23 222:5 226:14

refer 45:20 69:6 94:5 141:18 200:2 242:7 244:20

refereed 242:25

reference 50:8 76:17 91:22 136:18 212:12 228:6 237:21 238:11 239:20 240:9 241:8 242:4,9,10,20,24

referenced 39:13 122:14 123:18

references 193:4,11 196:15 227:21 228:2 235:14,17 236:8,9,24 237:18 238:5,10,24 239:12,16,22,25 240:14,19 241:4,8,20 243:11

referencing 212:22 217:7

referred 16:12 32:25 78:19 81:5 87:13 89:24 90:8 91:10 93:8,17 98:9,12 100:13 104:11 143:16

referring 94:1 145:10 156:4 198:8 240:16,18



Index: refers..revisions

refers 200:3 242:5 Reporter 76:21 resources 134:24 82:12 83:12 162:23 163:21 164:21 165:19 137:9.12 180:7 reflect 26:24 177:16 reporting 15:22 52:15, 166:19 167:15 168:12 respective 24:21 206:5 169:13 170:12 171:10 reflected 27:25 32:21 172:19 reports 125:11 191:19 respond 22:24 95:8 177:5 202:10 reflecting 30:21 99:8 relevant 19:17 36:7,13 represent 20:16 110:7 84:10 96:6 177:19 responded 180:23 reflects 29:11 31:6 representation 91:23 182:23 197:3 134:7 response 42:10,14 represented 48:5 reliable 36:19 176:11 65:12 93:19 139:23 regard 87:15 91:4 99:12 109:24 143:24 146:16 154:7 94:11 135:14 reliance 30:24 representing 24:10, 180:18 187:9,12 relies 29:8 regime 107:25 13 98:17 108:20 109:1 199:17 region 120:6 relinguished 51:16 request 34:4 51:22 responses 42:19 52:1 190:23 191:5 207:18 187:14.16.20 register 168:10,15 227:23 170:9,15 172:17,23 rely 96:22 responsible 25:15,21 179:6 181:5,8,14 requested 23:18 35:8 26:1 relying 36:19 183:18 237:10 responsive 141:10 requests 23:14,17 remainder 161:24 regression 105:16 229:24 rest 43:7 77:18 require 103:24 112:25 108:19 111:18,24 151:15 126:1 127:4,5 131:10 remaining 138:12 result 29:3 101:5 132:3 178:3 required 21:13 51:19 remediation 26:8 results 144:13 202:13 60:24 103:9 122:24 regular 55:15 remember 137:7 134:25 138:16 141:22 Resumé 39:19.21 regulation 69:20 241:5,10 180:2 214:3,23 77:25 78:3 88:5 160:4, 178:21 179:1 10,13 210:8,14,17 reminder 39:11 43:13 requirement 35:19 115:16 117:21 214:6 regulations 23:4 retrieval 51:8 remove 68:7,23 151:7 174:4,19 182:22 requirements 22:18 retrieve 51:6 reopen 205:20 207:5, regulators 53:16 54:3, 23:8 28:12,17 174:4 return 18:16 72:20 7,16,21 6,18 57:14 181:22 73:1 74:25 **reopened** 229:1,5 regulatory 21:7 62:5 **reauires** 130:16 review 28:7 31:13 82:6 135:11 136:21 176:3, 78:21 86:15 87:8 88:16 **Repeal** 178:21 95:5 104:15 133:14,15 94:9 95:2 141:23 repeat 123:14 155:25 156:10 159:16 149:16 150:10,16 Rescheduled 169:9 173:24 180:14 183:18 173:16 174:5 replaced 121:19 170:6 171:8 185:20,24,25 214:4,6, reiterate 112:16 11,16 215:1 216:5 replacing 76:23 research 24:24 87:25 115:22 231:12 228:3 243:20 244:4,22 replicate 49:6 91:9 90:15 93:20 165:15 reject 69:14 107:11 128:7 reviewed 227:11 resemble 33:13 rejoin 85:11 reviewing 122:3 replicates 32:23 reserve 36:9 43:7 relate 70:22 142:14 **Reviews** 66:11 137:7 replicating 110:21 reserved 18:17,25 176:9 related 139:2 212:20 report 23:18 28:21 73:11 revise 151:6 205:5 29:23 32:16 41:9,15,18 **relates** 226:5 Reservoir 47:13,14 42:16 54:11 55:1 56:18 revised 183:16 relating 19:22 resident 60:5 57:1 78:20 84:9 88:14 revision 159:16 115:4 125:19 128:20 relationships 24:17 resolve 204:5 163:19 227:15 231:19 141:9 150:1 155:22 relative 89:18 resolved 223:3 229:15 239:3 242:5 165:17 178:16 181:1 183:8 190:23 191:5 relevance 35:22 36:1, Resource 56:3 revisions 186:7 200:24 231:14 22 41:11 42:13 81:8

1000

Index: rhythm..set **rhvthm** 54:1 133:22.23 134:2.7 66:18 192:20.21 137:19.23 165:25 **right-hand** 45:9,12 run 25:17 102:1,8,13 192:6 103:5,9,19,24 104:25 rigorous 91:15 101:18 **scientific** 31:1 49:13 rigorously 95:21 93:20 178:12 232:7 S rink 47:15 scientifically 29:9 218:10 33:8 91:15 101:18 S-H-E-L-Y 209:14 **Rio** 63:11 114:18 112:10 150:18 177:12 197:7,24 212:7,12,13, **safe** 61:16 182:25 23 213:10 218:16,18, 135:16 **Salinity** 238:12,15 scientifically-22 223:19 225:5 defensible 96:23 **sample** 50:3,19 51:5,7, **Rito** 114:15 197:21 17,18,23,25 52:2 scientist 87:25 213:7 221:14 223:16 108:23 130:16 132:9 225:2 Scientists 159:19 139:21 River 141:1,13 238:12 218:5,7,9,25 scope 117:17 133:8,10 sampled 50:12 road 227:12 192:4,23 sampler 50:25 Scott 17:12,13 18:2 **robust** 33:1 49:17 samplers 50:23 50:14 53:10 57:6 20:10,11,15 35:8 58:1 25:13 106:20 115:2,4 134:11 118:16,18 157:22,23 samples 50:18 51:4,13 135:12 149:21 150:3 158:24 160:15.23 52:2,5,11,20 104:20,25 162:2,10 163:3,11 106:2,5,8,10,19 108:24 robustness 136:23 164:4,12 165:1,9 114:9 130:13 139:7 rock 46:5 151:22 152:5 166:3,11,24 167:7,21 147:5,10,12,15,17 168:4,17,25 169:18 role 86:3,13 88:7 159:8 sampling 31:25 51:1 170:1,18 171:1,15,23 207:23 209:19 60:14 61:7 106:1 173:1,6,11,14 183:23 141:19 roles 24:21 184:1 189:17,18 205:12,13,17 206:7,12 San 46:3 55:25 room 16:16 19:5 73:14 207:2 208:23 209:10 230:15 74:20 190:8 Sandoval 45:14 210:19 211:2,6,12 roughly 18:15 215:2,5 223:6 224:8,11 **Santa** 13:1 45:14,25 228:17,18,20 53:22 55:7 56:1,22 round 204:25 scratching 121:10 sat 137:6 rounding 200:10,21 screen 15:6 43:25 74:8 201:6,12 202:24 satisfied 28:13 85:16 86:19 87:2 231:17 232:23 233:9, satisfies 28:16 117:21 142:16 15 **save** 36:1 237:12 screenshot 101:24 routine 141:21 **scanned** 128:20 season 148:6,8,11 174:9 **row** 107:2 scarcity 31:18 seasonal 139:1,14 rule 21:10 22:11 23:24 69:14 131:3 139:4 **scatter** 132:5,7 seasons 139:5 179:15,17,19 192:9 193:1 235:25

Rulemaking 13:15 19:11 20:20 23:2.10 26:6,17 34:5 151:9,15 174:2 178:18,24 179:3, 11 181:23,24 182:6,7, 13 192:5 201:18

rules 23:3 35:19 36:14

schedule 61:7

Scheduling 191:15

schematic 97:17 98:8 107:2

scheme 138:1

science 25:17 29:11 31:7 62:3 87:21 89:2 97:15 115:1 116:12

secondary 65:5 175:8

section 69:8,11,12,24 71:7 123:19,22 153:10 159:10 174:11 175:1 177:14 183:19 197:2 198:16 212:13 218:18 219:3 224:16 225:10 226:4,10 227:21 228:6 230:14,17 239:11,20

sections 47:24 199:13

security 13:13 14:9 17:1 24:11 25:1,16

segment 66:3,16 113:24 175:18 199:7

segment-specific 31:22 63:20 95:17

segments 47:9,17 63:2,4 64:2,12,21 66:2, 5,13 116:18 192:20 193:4,7,11 198:2,9,10, 25 212:16,17 213:25

selection 152:7,13

semi-autonomous

sending 182:6

sense 63:8 138:14 146:15,18,23 150:9

sensitive 128:25

sentence 69:7 154:16 197:11 217:1,15 220:13,22 221:1,4,5 222:9,12 224:14

separate 26:11 187:23,25 203:18 229:23 237:6,16,24

separately 205:10

September 56:23

series 110:5

serve 21:20 159:10

Service 182:11

services 74:4,14

session 13:11 56:12 206:25

set 26:25 30:6 49:17 53:10 57:6,10 59:8 63:23 66:12 89:9 106:20 109:10 110:9. 13 115:5 123:12 127:13 136:21 142:12 144:5,17 148:21



Index: sets..spreadsheet

149:22 150:12 174:25 **Silas** 16:17 104:7 105:23 108:8 **space** 130:17 113:13 131:3 146:5 similar 93:11.15 112:4 sets 28:11 134:11 **Spanish** 14:17,24 147:8 148:17 151:20 136:6 220:20 139:25 165:24 224:1 15:9,11,12,15,16 74:3, **slides** 86:10 105:11 9,10,14 169:11 170:8 **setting** 31:1 48:9 57:6 **simple** 196:4 107:21 109:18 115:7, 181:12 95:24 145:8 simplified 102:19 14 145:25 147:4 **spatial** 106:5 113:17 **shaking** 190:24 simplifies 242:8 slight 224:11 spatially 50:13 53:11 share 43:25 85:16 57:7 106:20 148:13 simplifying 102:22 **slippery** 237:19 **sheer** 134:15 112:5 slope 237:19 speak 203:20 206:4 **sheet** 163:23 **simply** 193:3 **small** 137:25 speaking 15:16 39:8 74:10 138:23 147:18 shellfish 174:16 single 194:10 **SMO** 52:1 156:20 232:3 238:15 Shelly 209:5,13 236:8 sit 27:22 snow 50:7 **Spearman** 126:4,8 shipped 52:3 **site** 46:4 98:1,2 134:23 soft 126:25 127:2 136:15 139:9,17 shipping 51:23 **special** 103:8,9,18,24 software 33:12 49:2,7 177:21 113:1 130:16 **shoot** 145:2 195:25 97:8 101:23,25 102:2, site- 22:13 29:1 89:10 4,6,8,9,12,19,25 103:8, Specialist 159:22 96:21 113:4 139:13 **short** 157:8,16 10,21,25 104:23 105:2, site-scientific 110:13 3,4,6,14 107:24 Speciation 98:10 **short-** 92:2 108:10,17,21 109:8,11 99:10,12,25 100:11 site-specific 22:9,17, **show** 26:19 86:25 110:22 111:8,10,12,15 101:15 20 26:21 27:18 28:2,3, 105:10 107:20 129:24 112:6,14,22 113:1,3 11,14 33:19 34:9 species 127:23,24 128:7,10 135:9,10,11, **showed** 93:12 105:10 128:24 44:18,21 45:3 48:21,24 21 136:9,11,20 143:11 127:5 141:24 54:14 62:11 78:22 **specific** 22:14 29:2 software- 91:9 79:17 80:13 81:12 **showing** 92:1 105:24 35:24 62:22 89:11 106:4,10 110:11 172:7 82:16,17 83:10,16 sole 30:24 96:21 113:5 135:23 86:5,16 87:11,16 139:14 175:17 176:23 **shown** 89:17 94:22 **solely** 107:4 88:10,13,23 89:4,15,19 193:3,7 200:5 213:25 97:17 98:13 105:19 90:20 96:4,6 101:10 109:25 110:3 113:18 **solicit** 22:22 188:22 226:6 238:14,16 104:9 107:7 110:2.9 239:13,23 240:19 126:22 136:9 solicited 180:21 111:7 113:17 114:3,6, specifically 20:24 11,23 115:3,5,18,24 **shows** 87:1 106:7,16, **solid** 108:18 109:1 21:4 36:8 88:3 147:18 116:2,14,21 117:6,24 17 125:20 129:22 110:3,16 111:4,5,6 198:8 134:5,13 137:14,17 141:1 166:21 168:14 138:17,22 145:13 solubility 99:16 100:5 170:14 171:12 172:21 specificity 68:8,24 173:20 176:20,24 **soluble** 99:23 shuffle 244:7 177:2,9,11,16,18,19 specifics 147:22 180:2 182:23,24 183:1, side 45:17 89:18 **solution** 99:4 244:17 **specifies** 96:2 121:4 2,11 100:24 119:1 Solutions 37:19 **spell** 37:14 75:21 158:3 sites 25:18 29:10 98:22 sides 232:13 sort 62:20 81:10 104:7 209:11 114:4 134:21 135:23 significance 100:20 138:15 150:12 spelled 158:9 sitting 20:2 **sound** 35:14 significant 99:15 **Spencer** 16:10 27:13 situate 21:7 105:13 126:15 131:4,5, **sounds** 188:24 244:10 spend 134:24 13,17 132:1,10,19 situated 45:13 **source** 238:6 154:1,5 155:23 156:5, spent 111:11 situation 150:12 14,16,20 185:9,13,16, south 45:23 47:2 **spit** 102:9 17,21 195:7 199:18,23 size 109:18 114:17 152:2 197:22 202:5,12,17,18,20,24 213:9 221:15 223:18 spreadsheet 129:1 **Slide** 86:24 89:13,18 203:13 204:7,9,17 225:4 132:8 203:7 93:4,25 96:8 97:18

(CA)

Index: spring-fed..support spring-fed 47:10 subsequent 20:7 23 **streams** 47:18.19.22 50:22 108:3 114:20 105:11 107:20 180:17 stacks 106:12 **Statements** 18:2 20:9 197:25 213:12 219:1 190:2 substance 21:9 223:21 225:7 **staff** 17:11 159:18 176:10 235:1 states 21:16 96:20 substantial 32:11 strike 222:7 122:9 135:5 136:9 147:14 stakeholder 60:3 142:19 153:8 174:6,20 striking 76:22 substantive 70:7 173:25 177:3 183:7 **statewide** 30:4 31:16 156:13 227:25 236:12 **stringent** 48:19,20 stakeholders 22:22 81:13 89:17,21 91:20, 94:17,18 sufficient 32:2 104:20 29:4 32:12 45:2 54:19 24 94:2 95:12,15 55:7.11 88:18 180:22 strong 130:2 176:12 222:3 106:25 107:1 135:13, 188:18 20 136:6,10,12,20 struggling 66:8 **suggest** 153:19 **stand** 151:8 138:1 203:17 **stuck** 131:13 **stations** 49:23,25 standard 52:14 55:20 suggested 155:21 studies 130:5 202:22 117:25 127:21 131:12 205:7 212:17 statistical 105:5 203:14 153:22,24 154:2 125:20 132:12,14 suggesting 195:8 159:19 176:20 203:2 **study** 115:3 202:23 227:4 237:18 240:3 243:3 sub- 148:14 **status** 19:22 61:8 suggestion 200:1 **standards** 13:16 14:5 subcategories 227:10 21:13,17,23 22:8 26:22 **statute** 178:25 120:15,18 28:8 34:1 44:11 48:8 suggestions 200:6 statutes 174:3 62:16.23 64:8 88:3 subcategory 120:24 suitable 95:23 103:3 112:21,24 stay 202:2 subcontractor 37:21 151:12,14 159:10,11, suite 226:7 **Staying** 148:17 13,18 173:19 174:6,7, **subject** 19:15 22:17 suited 134:13 24 175:12 176:17 **step** 23:10 36:16 179:13 183:17 192:10 202:16 109:13,14 126:14 **sum** 90:2 Subjection 69:7 214:4,24 228:1 137:25 138:2 143:19 summarize 29:25 216:7 subjective 201:11 **stands** 98:16 44:19,24 86:11 231:19 stick 202:8 start 18:1 51:1.3 58:10 summarized 32:16 **submit** 19:25 160:3,23 86:7 97:22 98:11 119:1 **sticking** 131:16 88:20 161:15 183:16 210:7 215:15 219:21 221:1 stockholders 57:15 **summary** 24:20 43:10, 222:12 submittal 69:15 12.16 57:4 85:3.7 stop 72:20 **started** 49:17,19 137:5 86:14 173:15,16 submitted 161:6 149:7,9 storage 175:7 179:14 180:13 191:11 211:2 231:15 **starting** 173:15 211:20 Sunshine 182:1 **storm** 50:21 51:14,17 220:22 54:23 submitting 185:19 supervise 159:18 **starts** 51:2 217:8,11 **stream** 32:2 47:1,9,13 Subparagraph 226:9 supervision 38:5 62:16 63:1 64:12 66:2, 230:14 **state** 15:2 21:14 23:3 76:10 161:10 4.13.16 71:24 116:18 37:13 45:10 56:5 69:9, Subparagraphs 139:10 148:7 192:20 Supervisor 159:12 23 75:21 89:12 95:13 224:2 193:3,7 198:25 199:7 131:2 135:19 137:11 supplement 122:4 subscribers 182:9 213:25 138:18 158:3 174:3 supplies 22:3 178:25 197:16 209:11 streamflow 50:1,25 Subsection 63:24 210:1 217:5,21 243:14 51:1 120:2 121:11 122:14 **supply** 117:12,16 123:18.21.23.25 124:3 175:3,4,5 **stated** 44:9 56:24 streamline 113:7 197:9 212:9 216:25 174:11 235:13 **support** 20:21 26:5 streamlined 136:13 217:7 32:3 44:23 199:21

Subsections 224:2

231:20 244:19

statement 18:3.10

1000

21:6 23:20.22 34:16

65:24 178:20 189:22,

178:1

streamlines 104:2

supporting 201:17 **supports** 26:16 178:12

suppose 195:11

surface 14:4,6 20:16 21:14 27:19 28:4,8,16 29:7,19 31:14 32:5,9, 19 33:4,23 34:10 44:12,16,22 45:1 46:7, 15 48:25 53:19,24 91:5 95:20 97:11 99:14,20 104:6 108:4 113:19 114:8 116:8 120:4 121:1 124:16 130:12 146:12 147:17 150:25 151:11 152:14 159:7, 17 182:7,15 183:15 192:16 193:6 197:6,12 209:17,20 212:6,23 213:5 217:23 219:6,9, 11,20,23 220:24 221:2, 9,10,21,24 222:4,6,13 223:13,14 224:24,25

surrogate 129:5,7 130:1,18

suspect 71:4 72:4

swear 36:24,25 75:7 158:13 208:25

sweat 66:10

sweater 20:3

swinging 51:2

switch 27:8

switching 68:9

sworn 37:6 75:14 158:20 209:6

system 25:12 53:6

systematic 104:15 109:2

Т

table 39:5 67:18 68:2, 21 121:12,22 125:18, 20,23 194:10 204:20, 21 205:12 236:4

tags 146:6

tailored 26:23

takeaway 110:14

takes 135:1 137:10

taking 91:12 124:8 153:8 157:19 224:8

talk 35:10 49:16 50:17 87:9 91:8 138:22

talked 134:9 142:11 237:5

talking 68:12 111:12 129:18 139:9 226:11 237:4

targeted 54:24

team 14:16 140:21 159:11

tears 66:10

Tech2 37:19

technical 18:12.20.24 19:8 23:12,16 28:24 38:1,3,25 40:7 41:1 42:3 43:4,11 55:24 72:22 73:1,5 74:25 76:7 77:15 78:11,21 79:8 80:3,21 81:21 82:4,25 83:24 84:22 85:9 88:8,15 157:13 158:2 160:21 161:6 162:8.12 163:9 164:10 165:7 166:9 167:5 168:2,23 169:24 170:24 171:21 179:18, 19 180:9 183:7 206:22 210:25 211:10 232:11

technology 60:23

temporally 50:14 53:11 57:8 106:20

tend 225:18

tender 57:21 118:12

term 91:19 92:3 221:20,23

terms 106:1 109:3 131:3 132:19 138:15 147:19 155:23 192:9 197:16 236:2

testified 37:7 75:15 95:19 158:21 209:7

testimonies 81:6

23:12 28:24 29:24 32:17 35:4,10,23 38:1, 3,8,10 39:14 43:11 44:14 76:7,9,13 77:1 82:4 85:3,23 86:9,10, 11 88:21 91:9 94:15 118:12 125:16 133:6, 10,13 135:8 138:10 140:19 149:4 160:24 161:7 9 16 19 25

testimony 18:12 19:14

140:19 149:4 160:24 161:7,9,16,19,25 162:12 173:15,18 181:9 183:21 185:3 188:25 189:7 191:10

tests 131:9

228:21 232:19

Texas 25:11

theme 55:16 137:13

thereto 114:20 198:1 213:12 223:21 225:7

thing 139:19 142:24 193:15 196:11

things 17:25 39:3 53:9 62:12 130:17 132:2 138:1 185:19 192:19 214:16 221:19

thinking 62:8 151:1

thinks 156:12 185:11

third- 52:20

third-party 24:16 52:12

Thomson 13:5 16:7.22 20:12 24:7 44:5 58:25 59:1,7,17 85:19 125:4, 7,12 127:7 128:2 131:14 132:21 152:24 153:2 154:25 156:6 157:24 158:6 184:25 185:1,6 186:1,10 189:7 190:14,16 193:2 195:2 198:20,23 199:14 200:14,18 201:19 202:10 203:22,25 204:10 205:1,6,14,16 206:15,19,24 207:9,24 208:12,13 216:10,11 224:4,10 229:12,14 230:1,6,13 231:7,22 232:15 233:2,5,6,17 234:8,9,16,18,24

235:11,22 237:15 238:3,20 239:4,8 240:10,18,22 242:3,15, 17 243:4,21 244:13,23

Index: supporting..today

Thomson's 156:18 233:21

thought 68:11 156:1 212:24 216:2 231:24 237:1

thoughts 185:14 195:5,9 198:20 232:12

thread 137:8

threshold 138:15

thresholds 138:17

throw 139:20 196:25

thumb 139:4

tide 203:16

tightly 108:25

time 18:17,21,25 23:25 31:20 35:4,13 36:1 43:9 49:23 57:21 69:13 72:19 73:11,19 79:19 85:21 93:13 95:13 106:2 111:11 115:8 119:2 128:21 133:20 137:5 138:22 140:10 148:2,5 150:6 162:13 184:19 190:7 214:18 224:18 237:11

timelines 180:7

times 150:1

tiny 203:11

tips 28:19

title 220:17,20

titled 172:2

titles 241:3,19

today 16:17 17:23 20:14,21 22:11 30:2 32:9 38:15 44:15 77:6 85:21,24 86:4,8 90:21 101:11 133:6 134:5 135:1,24 140:11 157:18 161:25 169:1 181:17 183:22 184:8 190:20 191:1 194:12 205:1



197:25 213:11 219:14

underprotective

today's 23:9

1000

Index: today's..versus

Utilities 56:12

223:20 225:6 94:17 tool 97:9 utilize 135:21 137:22 Triennial 31:12 66:11 **understand** 18:2 62:3 **top** 107:2 110:17 utilized 149:11 205:3 82:6 95:4 133:14,15 124:7 141:11 156:18 topic 220:24 137:7 176:8 214:5,10, 192:7 193:1.21 220:21 utilizes 91:7 112:1 229:24 242:12 16 215:1 216:5,7 topics 86:8 203:21 utilizing 93:14 102:24 244:4,22 understanding 30:22 104:22 149:2 total 63:22 104:19 36:14 150:11,13 180:6 trigger 156:9,14 129:10 240:1 201:24 226:3 triggered 50:24 ٧ touch 111:16 Understood 35:16 triggers 51:4 touched 112:13 36:21 validate 109:14 **true** 38:11 39:21 59:12 undertook 104:8 touching 53:14 validated 53:1 104:25 77:1 78:2 96:15 129:13 107:21 143:14,17 town 46:4 160:12 161:12 210:16 unending 51:10 144:23 toxic 98:6 99:2 100:2 truth 37:1 75:7 158:14 units 153:11 225:11,14 validaters 52:24 209:1 230:18,20 toxicity 29:18 30:11,15 validation 53:4.8 tune 206:8 univariant 126:10 31:4 48:16 49:4 90:4 91:6 92:19,24 93:3,22 valuable 189:8 turn 13:22 27:3 39:8 universities 55:9 56:7 96:13,19 97:13,21 73:21 values 92:12 113:11 98:21 101:8 102:17 **University** 25:11,12 143:8.15.16 176:16 tweak 216:4 104:6 130:5,6 131:9 unjustified 131:25 178:5,10 144:12 176:4,6 177:22 types 139:2 untrue 59:13 200:3 variabilities 105:18 toxicological 202:22 **up-to-date** 91:15 variability 139:15 U 146:20 147:1.20 toxicology 59:11 **upcoming** 214:25 87:23 90:15 97:9 **U.S.** 14:10 175:20 variable 127:5 update 81:11 239:2 track 52:10 **Uh-huh** 63:13 64:13 variables 126:11 updated 31:15 148:23 65:6,9 68:13,22 218:20 127:16 training 102:5 103:9, 149:19 175:24 18,24 113:1 **ultimate** 232:20 variation 109:7 138:24 **updates** 94:4 162:18 139:1 146:25 148:10 transcript 15:21 181:8 ultimately 91:5 varies 148:13 transferred 51:24 updating 150:5 uncertainties 136:22 variety 232:2 transitioned 93:16 **uphill** 152:1 unclassified 46:24 197:15 198:7 217:4,18 vary 148:4 transmission 61:17 upper 45:8 142:25 218:1 221:12,23 222:5, 144:17 varying 130:6 transparency 33:11 **Upstream** 151:25 **Velasquez** 59:21,22, transparent 103:4,19 unclear 35:25 25 61:4,18 124:25 112:18 136:4 uptake 98:1 99:5,23 uncontested 28:13 125:1 186:14,15 101:3,8 **Triad** 13:13 14:9 16:25 34:8 208:14,15 216:15,16 **upwind** 50:10 24:10,13,15,25 25:3 232:17 234:10,11 under-protective 26:14.16 usability 33:11 48:19 Verification 53:3 **Triad's** 26:1 use-specific 63:16 undergraduate 87:20 version 136:20 181:7 triangles 49:24 50:8 67:15 220:7 underprediction 110:4 111:6 user 101:24 109:4 versions 113:3 **tribes** 29:4 32:12 45:2 users 33:17 underproductive versus 106:24 112:14 54:20 55:9 88:19 90:12 135:21 146:19 147:19 USGS-STYLE 49:25 tributaries 114:19 154:11

vertical 92:11 108:16

vials 130:16

vibe 237:9

Vice 58:17,18 138:6,9 140:4 184:15,17 207:22 208:18,19 215:19,21 234:14,15 239:6

video 222:17,18 224:5

Vigil 70:11,12 119:3,4 186:22,23 208:16,17 226:18,19 234:12,13

virtually 202:15

visit 13:7

visual 91:23

volume 134:15

Volunteer 159:21

vote 203:18 207:15,21 208:1 229:23 231:6 232:24 233:19.23

voted 207:20

W

W-H-I-T-E 37:16

walk 35:2 77:18 109:19

walked 143:10

wanted 24:19 45:5 46:6 50:15 52:4 57:4, 13 115:13 139:25 140:23 151:22 191:24 242:19

warrant 156:9

warranted 185:25

water 13:16 14:4 19:10 20:16,17 21:11,13,15, 20 22:2,3,8,9 26:21 27:1,18 28:2,3,8,14 29:2,10 30:5,10,12,13, 17,22 31:3,14 32:3 33:3,19 34:1,9 37:19 38:24 40:6,25 42:2,18 43:3 44:12,18,21 45:1, 3 46:20 48:8,10,17,18, 21,24 49:3,12 50:21 51:14,17 53:19 54:14,

23 57:3 59:10 65:7 67:22 71:11.14.20.22 73:4 77:14 78:10,22 79:7,18 80:2,13,20 81:12,20 82:17,24 83:11,16,23 84:21 86:5,17 87:11,16 88:2, 3,10,13,23 89:4,11,15, 20,21 90:1,3,13,20,23, 25 91:3,5,13 92:20,25 93:3,6,21 94:19,20 95:14 96:4,11,16,21 97:11,19 98:17,19,20 99:14,20,22 100:1,18, 22,24 101:6,11 102:2, 7,21 103:3 104:9 107:3,8 110:2 111:7 112:21,24 113:5,18,25 114:11,24 115:5 116:2, 14,21 117:6,11,16,24 121:20 122:13,22 123:4,8,12,17,20 124:9,13,18,20 129:3, 9,11 130:12 134:5 138:22,25 143:14,22 144:1,15 146:12 147:17,20 151:11,14 152:14 157:12 159:7, 12,17,19 160:20 162:7, 18,21 163:1,8,18 164:9,18 165:6 166:8 167:4 168:1,22 169:23 170:23 171:20 174:8, 11,14,18,23 175:3,4,5, 12,14,18,22 176:3,19 177:14,18 182:8,15,24 183:3,4,15,16,20 187:13,16 188:10,21 195:10,11,15,18 202:16 206:21 209:17, 20,25 210:24 211:9 214:4,7,23 219:11 227:14,25 239:2

watering 175:9

waters 14:6 21:14 22:12 27:20 28:4,16 29:7,19 32:5,9,19 33:4, 24 34:10 44:16,22 46:7,15,24 48:2,3,4,25 53:24 71:18 95:20 104:6 108:5 113:19 114:9 116:8 117:2 120:4 121:1,2,6 123:6 124:16 126:25 137:22 142:20 144:3,6,20 150:25 154:17 175:16 176:24 192:16 193:6 197:6,13,15 198:6,7 212:6,14,18,19,23,25 213:5,15 217:5,24 218:2,24 219:6,10,20, 23 220:24 221:2,9,11, 12,21,24 222:4,7,13 223:13,15 224:24 225:1 230:21

watershed 46:11,12 106:13 113:20 114:16 127:18 139:11 148:14 197:22 213:8 223:17 225:3

watershed's 148:15

watersheds 127:1 147:10

waterways 219:15

watt 94:20

ways 64:7 205:4

weakened 131:12

web 19:19

Webex 15:4

website 19:20 181:25 182:16,17

websites 179:8

week 23:22,23

weight 21:24

welfare 21:19 174:8

west 46:21

wetlands 219:14

wheels 243:25

whirlpool 203:16

White 28:25 32:17 33:5 36:24 37:5,11,15,17 40:9 41:3 42:5 43:9 44:8 46:5 57:18,25 58:2,6,8,13 60:1 95:19 103:11 105:25 106:7 134:9 151:21 152:4,11

White's 88:20 149:4

wholesale 194:9

widely 242:24 243:1

wilderness 224:5

wildlife 22:4 174:17 175:10

Index: vertical..written

Windward 76:2 86:3 125:11,18 242:14,16, 17,21

wise 236:22

witnesses 18:5,6,8 26:18 28:25 35:2,21 66:20 70:25 194:16 232:19

wondering 142:13 205:14

worded 172:10

words 118:6 220:11,12

work 54:10 60:9 61:16 79:16 88:12 125:9,14 130:19 132:17,22 135:25 137:16 140:20 162:12 180:1 183:6 185:2 193:9 196:8 202:4 204:15 218:21

workable 216:3

workaround 87:5

worked 32:6 108:1 159:3,4 180:4 183:6 210:2.4

Working 56:12

works 66:18

world 130:18

worry 87:3

WQC 107:4

WQCC 14:14 21:8,12 22:13,16 23:14,23 24:1,16 33:18 73:10 82:8 166:16 167:12 169:9 170:6 171:7

wrapping 113:12

write 125:10

writing 19:25 57:2

written 42:17 86:9,11 125:16 160:24 161:6,9, 15,19,25 162:11 178:20 181:9 200:13 233:12



Index: wrong..Zemlick wrong 207:14 wrote 54:4 Υ year 106:11 141:4,14, 25 147:4,6,12 214:11, years 32:7 49:18 53:17 57:10 87:25 134:10 141:3 147:11 148:3,10 151:2,13 210:5 214:5,8 yellow 49:23 yellow-shaded 45:18 yield 26:20 94:24 Ζ **Zemlick** 58:17,18 138:6,9 140:4 184:16, 17 207:22 208:18,19 215:20,21 234:14,15 239:6

