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MR. DOMINGUEZ: Good morning, everybody.

I think we'll go ahead and get started. So we will turn things over to our Hearing Officer.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the board.

We're back in the matter of WQCC 14-05(R).
To start, if we can have all counsel stand up and enter their name for the record once again, please.

MS. MCCALEB: Jolene McCaleb for San Juan

Water Commission.
MR. VERHEUL: John Verheul and Kathryn Becker for New Mexico Environment Department.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Erik

Schlenker-Goodrich for Amigos Bravos.

MR. ROSE: And Louis Rose for Chevron Mining.

MR. CHAVEZ: And once again, counsel for
Freeport is not here as of yet. When they are, I'll have them enter their name for the record.

To start off with, if we can go to public comment.

Is there anybody in the crowd that would like to give public comment at this time?

Seeing none, I'm going to move to San Juan for continuation of their direct.

MS. MCCALEB: Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: You may proceed.

CHARLES L. NYLANDER
having been previously duly sworn or affirmed, was examined and testified further in direct and rebuttal as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MS. MCCALEB:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Nylander.
A. Good morning.
Q. When this hearing recessed yesterday
afternoon, you were testifying on the topic of the Bureau's temporary standards proposal; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In order to put your testimony this morning
into context and have an easy flow from yesterday afternoon, could you please quickly recap the points you made concerning the modifications that the San Juan Water Commission had proposed?
A. Yes. Through my written rebuttal testimony, San Juan Water Commission proposed some modifications to the Bureau's proposal.

We proposed a definition for temporary
standard, for the definitions section.

We proposed language making the temporary
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standard applicable to a designated use, not just water quality criteria.

And we also proposed language making the temporary standard applicable to permittees.

Since that rebuttal was filed, EPA has issued its final water quality standards variance rule, which does become effective on October $20 t h$ of -- this month.

And I've compared the final rule with the Bureau's proposal and with San Juan Water Commission's proposal, and compared to the new EPA rule, the San Juan Water Commission's proposal most closely mimics EPA's rule.

And in essence, basically, San Juan Water Commission proposes adoption of the EPA rule.
Q. Mr. Nylander, in addition to the proposed modifications you just mentioned, were there any additional modifications to the Bureau's proposal for temporary standards that were recommended in your written testimony?
A. Yes, there were. San Juan Water Commission proposed using the term "variance" instead of the term "temporary standard."

We also proposed using the term
"documentation" instead of the term "work plan."
And we also objected to the requirement of
providing UAA-like information, having to show one of the factors in 40 CFR Section $131.10(g)$, demonstrated that an attainable use was not attainable.
Q. And has the San Juan Water Commission withdrawn those objections?
A. Yes, we have.
Q. Can you explain how the Bureau's proposal for temporary standards compares with EPA's new water qualities standards variance rule?
A. Yes. EPA's -- I mean -- excuse me. The Department's proposed language is -- is more narrowly focused. It applies only to criteria and not to designated uses.

And it applies to water bodies only and not to permittees.
Q. And what is your opinion concerning this more narrow approach to a variance or temporary standard?
A. Well, I believe it's most useful to adopt the whole tool, if this is a new water quality tool, that's authorized by EPA's final rule on water quality standards variances, as has been recommended by San Juan Water Commission, which would allow a temporary designated use and also allow a temporary standard for criteria for -- for a permittee.

However, if the Commission wants to adopt the

Bureau's more narrowly focused temporary standard, just focused on the water quality criteria, then the San Juan Water Commission supports the Bureau's proposal without modification.

In other words, the Department, the Bureau, has proposed a much narrower concept. It's more like a -- a site-specific criteria over a very deliberate length of time, instead of being perpetual.

And we think if that's what the Commission wants to do, that we would support the Department's language.

In any case, whether you adopt the whole enchilada or you just adopt a nacho with a little cheese on it, to be humorous, there is -- there is a great need for a method in New Mexico to obtain a temporary variance from water quality standards statewide. This is a need both experienced by permittees and watershed restoration groups.

The San Juan Water Commission historically has supported the concept of a temporary standard, a short duration variance from standards, and I see great value in having this concept in New Mexico's water quality standards.
Q. Could you please comment on who might benefit from the proposed temporary standard with the broadened
applicability recommended by the Water Commission based on the new EPA rule?
A. Well, in my mind, there would be two distinct groups of potential petitioners that might avail themselves of a temporary standard.

The first group would include agencies like the Environment Department, Game and Fish, soil and water conservation districts, et cetera, other natural resource agencies that might want to petition to conduct watershed restoration projects.

This group would also include watershed groups that have been established around New Mexico and environmental advocacy groups that have a desire to improve water quality in a particular basin or sub-basin or water body segment.

So that would be the first group.
The second group would be largely comprised of NPDES permittees who need additional time to implement adaptive management processes and/or treatment technology upgrades in order to meet water quality standards.

This group would include dischargers that are facing increasingly stringent criteria, especially criteria like nutrient criteria on receiving waters in New Mexico. And this would include the large category
of New Mexico municipalities that presently do not have the treatment technology to meet the more stringent nutrient criteria.
Q. Are there similar benefits to be obtained from the more narrow temporary standard provision proposed by the Bureau?
A. Yes, there are. But there are not quite as many.

For example, I think a temporary standard that applies only to criteria would be useful if a petitioner needs relief from a numeric criteria for, say, a heavy metal or some other constituent that actually has a numerical criteria published in the water quality standards.

However, I'm not sure how it will aid municipalities that may need help meeting nutrient criteria, where there is only a nonnumeric narrative general criteria for nutrients. In this case, numeric standards are only a product of calculation during the performance of a TMDL on a water body and -- and enforced as a waste load allocation numerical limit in an NPDES permit.

And I'm not sure that as proposed by the Department the temporary standard would allow relief from that kind of criteria.
Q. Mr. Nylander, you testified yesterday that you've come to realize that EPA's new rule requires performance of a UAA.

Can you please clarify and expound on that testimony?
A. Yes. 40 CFR Section 131.14(b)(2) states -I'm going to quote just a short sentence here -- "For a water quality standard variance to a use specified in section $101(a)(2)$ of the act, or a sub-category of such a use, the State must demonstrate that attaining the designated use and criterion is not feasible throughout the term of the water quality standards variance because: (1) One of the factors listed in section $131.10(g)$ is met, or (2) actions necessary to facilitate lake, wetland, or stream restoration through dam removal or other significant reconfiguration activities preclude attainment of the designated use and criterion while the actions are being implemented."

That's a statement right out of the new federal rule.

And interestingly, in the preamble to the rule, published in the Federal Register on page 51041, EPA stated "The level of rigor required for a water quality standards variance is no different than for a designated use change. That said, the appropriate
technical and scientific data required to support a designated use change and water quality standards variance can vary depending on the complexity of the specific circumstances."

So this -- this language that was EPA's language in this recent rulemaking final -- final rulemaking, very similar to, I think, some information provided earlier this week by one of the Department's witnesses in answering this same type of question that seemed to indicate there might be some -- some sort of flexibility depending on the complexity of the circumstance.

I truly don't know for certain how flexible they would be. So in my mind, it's still a little confusing as to whether you really need to meet the rigor of the UAA or not.
Q. Well, to follow up on that confusion, because the Bureau's proposal for temporary standards applies only to criteria and does not allow for a temporary downgrade of a designated use, would you agree that it would be less likely that a full-blown UAA would be required for a temporary standard applying only to a criteria?
A. Yes. It sort of sounds that way to me. It sounds like you might not have to do as much rigorous
scientific demonstration. But $I$ really feel it's unclear, and it would depend on -- on the site-specific circumstances, I guess.

But I still have concerns as to how much of that kind of UAA work the petitioner would have to do, and whether the final product, once passed on to EPA for approval as a water quality standard change -- whether they would review it in that kind of spirit of saying we're just temporarily changing this and we're going to maintain the underlying use criteria.
Q. Thank you.

And finally, Mr. Nylander, what is your opinion concerning the Bureau's proposed language for 20.6.4.12H regarding compliance with a temporary standard?
A. Well, the San Juan Water Commission and I - I representing them agree that a temporary standard should be included in the development of NPDES permits.

And based on EPA guidance in the Water Quality Standards Handbook, San Juan Water Commission, you know, has proposed adding language addressing the use of temporary standards in developing water quality-based effluent limitations in NPDES permits.
Q. Mr. Nylander, do you have anything else you would like to add concerning the temporary standards
proposal?
A. No, not at this time.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So let's move on to Section 20.6.4.97 NMAC concerning ephemeral waters and your testimony on behalf of the San Juan Water Commission that was previously filed.

Can you please summarize your testimony about the Department's proposed amendments for that section?
A. Yes. As stated in my direct testimony and rebuttal testimony, $I$ have no objection to the listing of the 30 new surface waters segments in this section of the water quality standards that has been reserved for ephemeral waters.

However, my testimony thus far in the proposed amendments has focused also on the Commission's adoption of the EPA rebuttal presumption and the issues and concerns $I$ have on behalf of the San Juan Water Commission regarding the Commission's adoption of this concept and -- and the resulting water quality sections at 20.6.4.97 and 20.6.4.98 as -- as resulted from changes that were promulgated as a result of the 2009 triennial review.

My testimony file discuss the common sense interpretation of the Clean Water Act's purpose and
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interim goal statements and EPA's most recent evolving interpretation of those goals and purpose that are some 43 years old now, and now referring to them as regulatory requirements.

And instead of repeating this kind of testimony, $I$ prefer to briefly describe for clarity with the Commission the impact of the Commission's adoption of the rebuttable presumption and offer some constructive suggestions on what can be done to reverse those impacts.
Q. Okay, Mr. Nylander. Would you then proceed to provide that elaboration on the impacts and your suggestions?
A. Yes. The designated uses for Section 20.6.4.97 -- those are the ephemeral waters that are now the section where these 30 segments are being added to -- the designated uses are livestock watering, wildife habitat, limited aquatic life and secondary contact recreation.

And in order for a water to be listed in this section, you must first take a nonperennial unclassified water in the state and perform a UAA in order to document that its uses can't support the Clean Water Act 101(a)(2) fishable/swimmable interim goals.

Once that's demonstrated and approved by the

Department and the Commission and EPA, the surface water can be listed in the new Section 20.6.4.97.

And in fact, during this triennial review, the Commission is presented with the first 30 surface waters to be listed in this section since the -- since the section was adopted in 2009 , some -- some six years ago.

And in my testimony, I already define some financial costs, transactional costs associated confirming these 30 surface waters and indeed finding them to be ephemeral so they can be listed.

However, the language in Section 20.6.4.98 represents the most significant and burdensome impact on New Mexico as a result of the Commission's adoption of the rebuttable presumption.
Q. And could you please briefly describe your concerns with regard to Section 20.6.4.98?
A. Section 20.6.4.98 is titled Intermediate Waters, and this standard applies to all nonperennial unclassified waters of the state, except those waters included under Section 20.6.4.97. Those are the ephemeral waters that have undergone this UAA process. The . 98 section, Intermediate Waters, resulted from the adoption by the Commission of the rebuttable presumption in 2009. It is fraught with significant issues and impacts.

The primary issue is that the designated uses for this section are livestock watering, wildlife habitat, but also include marginal warm water aquatic life and primary contact recreation. Indeed, these are the Clean Water Act $101(\mathrm{a})(2)$ fishable/swimmable interim goals that have been adopted by this Commission for over 120,000 miles of nonperennial waters in New Mexico.

And because this section applies to all
nonperennial waters in the state by definition, it includes -- and I'll cite just a few sentences from the Commission's definition of waters -- "All surface water situated wholly or partially within or bordering upon the state, including lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, reservoirs, and natural ponds."

And also means all tributaries of such water, including adjacent wetlands, et cetera. It also includes any water of the $U S$ as defined by the Clean Water Act and not included in the preceding description. So according to this definition, the Commission has set as an enforceable goal the 101(a)(2) fishable/swimmable goals in every arroyo, wash, playa lake, mudflat, sandflat, wetland, wet meadow, et cetera. And given the present EPA regulations, this enforceable
goal cannot be downgraded now without the successful performance and approval of a UAA.

Thus, New Mexico has placed itself in the untenable position of stating that primary contact and recreation -- primary contact recreation and fishing are attainable goals in all these types of waters unless you perform a UAA and it's approved in order to downgrade the use.

I find this personally to be incredibly irrational.

Historically this Commission has focused on our perennial waters. We have approximately 6,000 miles of perennial waters in the state. And during my tenure with the Environment Departments prior to NMED, I basically saw that the Commission was focused on protecting those perennial waters and focused on high quality cold waters as a priority, the little headwaters, like the Rio Hondo and the Chama and so forth.

And now, some 40 years later, we are now focused, evidently, on ephemeral or intermittent waters, which, as $I$ mentioned, extend around the state, more than 100,000 miles of these kind of features. So --
Q. Mr. Nylander, on that point, are you suggesting that the $W Q C C$ should not be protecting
ephemeral waters or only that more appropriate standards should be applied to them?
A. Well, the way -- . 97 standard now, it is the appropriated -- appropriate designated use and criteria for those waters, once they've undergone the UAA process and can be listed there.

I'm suggesting that we now, after six years, have 30 segments that will be listed, and we have tens of thousands of sections to go out of the .98 section that are still unclassified nonperennial, but they have to be looked at with a UAA study in order to list them as ephemeral streams.
Q. Mr. Nylander, what are the cost implications to the State of New Mexico because of the adoption of Section 20.6.4.98 and the rebuttable presumption concept?
A. Well, you know, they are significant. In my file testimony, $I$ basically gave a couple of data points on what $I$ could glean from the cost of doing the studies for the 30 segments that are being added. But I see that over time these costs could incrementally mount up.

The cost is both to the actual petitioner who wants to undertake working on one of these nonperennial unclassified segments or by the Department in its obligation to work with and review these kind of
applications.
I'm not clear whether the Department has a plan to undertake annually some kind of work plan to chip away at these unclassified waters that are listed in. 98.

But quite frankly, New Mexico's -- New Mexico's a poor state. We have a population that's just barely over 2 million. Our workforce is a little bit less than 1 million people. Average median income for the employment in New Mexico is in the mid-40,000 a year range. And we have 25 percent of our population at or below the poverty level.

When I look at the UNM Bureau of Business and Economic Research statistics, it's obvious to me that New Mexico is -- is just holding on. A third of our workforce is in the government and education and health care industry sector.

And BBER says that the health care sector is the one that's going to grow in the upcoming years because of the demographics of the population, aging population, and the fact that we have -- the Affordable Care Act has propelled many more people into the Medicaid category. So we have presently about 40 percent of the state's population qualifies for Medicaid.

So looking at the income revenue for state government and looking at the income for the average New Mexico citizen, we are not a flush state. We are not in a good situation.

And $I$ think any kind of regulation or standard or rulemaking that unnecessarily costs money and transactional costs, if it's really not needed, we should take a very careful look at those situations. And I think the . 98 rule is one of those rules that, unfortunately, was adopted in 2009 without thinking about the consequences.
Q. Mr. Nylander, do you have any information about how much it costs to perform a UAA to designate a stream segment as ephemeral?
A. Well, the very -- the very least costs that $I$ was able to glean from talking with consulting firms and looking at work that's been done here in New Mexico, just to go through the sort of phase 1 screening that might be sufficient to -- to reclassify an ephemeral stream into the .97 segment of the standards would be somewhere on the order of $\$ 10,000$ for consulting and then -- not counting then the government's time and processing and working with the paperwork to actually get that change made.

So they're not trivial. And I think when $I$
looked at the mining segments that the Chino Mines and others that brought into the . 97 category now, I mean, those costs were certainly upwards of 150,000 . And that was primarily -- it was over a four-year time span that that work was going on and lots of trips back and forth to Dallas and working with the Department and so forth. So, I mean, nobody, quite frankly, wants to disclose a lot of the cost information, but $I$ think it's significant, and it's the costs that you're spending to show that an arroyo is really an ephemeral stream. So it used to be a lot more straightforward and common sense before 2009 .
Q. Mr. Nylander, the San Juan Water Commission has not proposed during this triennial review that there be any changes to Sections 20.6.4.98 or .97.

So what is the purpose of your testimony with respect to the problems caused by the rebuttable presumption?
A. Well, I really -- I really believe that an error has been made. I think that the -- that the Department, taking EPA's guidance after the 2005 triennial, was influenced to believe that the rebuttable presumption was, in fact, a requirement and basically just went forward with their belief that they had to do it.

I think it's interesting that $I$ find nothing in the record that shows there was any real pushback with Region 6 or with EPA in general about the proposed impact -- or the proposed rulemaking in 2005 , which was to basically assign the secondary contact use and the limited aquatic life use to ephemeral streams.

And EPA didn't like that, and they wrote at length in their Record of Decision about that not being acceptable because of these other requirements.

And I think that's in one of the exhibits, both for James Hogan and for me, that particular 2005 Record of Decision.

So basically, I think it's unfortunate, but there really wasn't a strong objection or pushback with EPA, and $I$ think there's a lot of room to do that.
Q. And what would your recommendation be about how the state could go about accomplishing that?
A. Well, $I$ think that at the very least the Commission could impanel a working group to study this issue and come up with a -- with a position paper that then could be used to support meetings with EPA, to see if there's a way to kind of undo what -- what this rebuttable presumption has done to the state standards.

I think that the congressional delegation may be some help in that area, that they would certainly
take an interest in the transactional cost burden for the state.

And I know that, you know, other organizations like the Western Coalition of Arid States, WESTCAS -that basically those kind of organizations have fought very hard for their 22 or 23 years of existence to get a special EPA treatment for arid west states.

And I was a former president of WESTCAS, and I'm still an emeritus member, but they were able to help secure a $\$ 5$ million EPA grant years ago, which was administered by Pima County, in Tucson, to look at site-specific criteria and uses for arid west ephemeral streams and intermittent streams, something that was really applicable to our type of climate, which is only getting hotter and dryer.

And the results of all those studies have been sitting in headquarters in Washington for five or six years now, and nothing's been done with them.

But it's those kinds of activities that I think -- I think would help, and I do think there are some other ways that you might be able to undo some of the harm in Section. 98.

For instance, if you wanted to change primary contact use for these nonperennial waters to secondary contact, but yet keep the more stringent criteria that
supports primary contact, you're allowed to do that, and EPA's water quality handbook does allow you to designate secondary contact, even though it doesn't meet their rebuttable presumption notion, as long as you have criteria that protect the more stringent use.

So you could undo some things on the recreational side.

On the aquatic life side, I think -- I think it's unfortunate that a more strong argument wasn't made in 2005 and 2009 for the limited aquatic life use. But I -- again, I think that with the right pushback, I think this could be accomplished.
Q. Mr. Nylander, in your written testimony, you provided some testimony about the ongoing waters of the United States EPA rulemaking. And since you filed that testimony, there has been a final WOTUS rule adopted.

How does your testimony on that topic mesh with the concerns you have just raised?
A. Well, the proposed water of the US rule has received a tremendous amount of pushback by 31 states in the $U S$ that have filed suit to basically stay or block that rulemaking. And 11 of -- 11 states received actually a stay in the federal court in South Dakota for a temporary stay of the rulemaking.

New Mexico was among those 11. So New Mexico
is among the 31 states who have filed protests of this WOTUS rule, and it was the New Mexico Environment Department and the Office of the State Engineer that spearheaded the New Mexico participation in the litigation.
Q. Let me stop you there a moment, Mr. Nylander. Would -- I believe you said South Dakota.

Would you be referring to a district court case in North Dakota?
A. Yes, I would. Thank you.
Q. Thank you.
A. I -- I get south and north confused sometime.

I think that the fact that the Environment Department is now protesting, in a sense, the expansion of jurisdiction by EPA for waters of the US -- a little bit schizophrenic with their adoption in 2009 of the rebuttable presumption.

It's as if 2009 time frame they were wanting to expand to cover everything that possibly could be covered, and now in 2015 the Department's posture is the opposite, that they don't want to see water quality jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act expanded to unknown areas.

I will also mention on that that I've become aware that there's a congressional letter that's been
written, signed by 106 congressmen, dated August 4 th of 2015, and it's basically to the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency, requesting that the Office of Inspector General perform a -- an
investigation on EPA's unprecedented grassroots lobbying effort to promote their water of the US rulemaking.
Q. So, Mr. Nylander, in a sentence or two, could you just summarize what the purpose of this testimony has been for this Commission and why you think it was important?
A. Well, most of the Department's rationale to adopt this rebuttable presumption was part of the 2009 triennial review process. And in my mind, now that the state is stuck with -- with the standards as they're written in the -- in the current version of standards, that basically $I$ would suggest that the Department and the Commission work together to try to see if they could undo some of the harm and damage that's been done.

And $I$ think it would lift a tremendous cost burden off of the shoulders of the state, and it would also not maintain the sort of appearance that the Commission is trying to make wet meadows and wetlands and playa lakes fishable and swimmable.

Common sense would tell you that these things are -- are not capable of supporting primary contact and
fishing and -- and it's just nonsensical to spend time and resources doing unnecessary paperwork to demonstrate that.
Q. Thank you.

So, Mr. Nylander, let's move to the final topic that you're going to address today.

Would you please summarize your written testimony regarding the Department's proposal to amend Sections 20.6.4.101 through 503 NMAC by upgrading nine surface water segments from secondary contact recreation to primary contact recreation?
A. Yes. Most of the Department's rationale in their proposal for upgrading the designated use from secondary to primary contact for these nine segments was not supported by sound scientific evidence.

The statements of reason that were in the proposal contained or relied on anecdotal evidence, web site publications, the fact that an area was open to the public, and -- and there was even some double negative language that basically said we have no information to say that it might not be attainable, and so on and so forth.

So I think in looking through it and looking for actual good, sound, scientific data, I didn't see much, and it seems like they really are relying more on
the rebuttable presumption that I've already talked about, that they have to basically assign the highest attainable use to those waters according to EPA's concept.

Looking at all nine of these segments, the secondary contact, $I$ think, is the more appropriate use for most of the segments. And as I mentioned previously, you can preserve the existing secondary contact use as is but accomplish what the Department is wanting to accomplish by just increasing and reassigning the bacterial criteria that comports with the primary contact use.

EPA's water quality handbook, as I said, basically allows this and presents it as option number two when you're differentiating between primary contact and secondary contact use.

So it is a way that -- and when you look at the bacterial limitations, the criteria for primary use versus secondary use, they're very, very close as far as the number of organisms per hundred mLs.

So I would suggest an easy way would be to just leave secondary contact and, if you really want, assign the higher bacterial criteria to those nine segments.
Q. Mr. Nylander, day before yesterday, did you
hear the Bureau's testimony that the designated use upgrade is necessary because there are no UAAs on record that show the primary contact use is not existing or not attainable?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do you agree with that position?
A. Well, prior to 2005 , secondary contact use was assigned to these water quality segments, and triennial review after triennial review, EPA approved those uses.

But now, since 2005, when EPA's kind of de novo reinterpretation of the goals of the Clean Water Act and their fabrication of this rebuttable presumption, basically they're basically mandating, if you will, that all -- all designated use be capable of supporting primary contact recreation and aquatic life use that would include fishery.

So I think there's really no legal basis for EPA's reinterpretation. I think that it is just a reinterpretation, and $I$ do, as $I$ said earlier, propose that -- or I would suggest that the Commission seriously mount an effort to challenge that type of interpretation.
Q. And, Mr. Nylander, in the Department's testimony and in the exhibits that they provided in this triennial review, did you see any documentation that EPA
was requiring the upgrading of preexisting designated uses because the UAA was not done in the past, or just requiring that newly designated uses meet the fishable/swimmable requirement?
A. Well, $I$ didn't find any information or -- that would suggest EPA was directing that on these nine segments that these uses be upgraded.

There is regulatory language that says when you -- when you have a triennial review and you have waters that are not assigned the fishable/swimmable uses, you should re-examine those to see if that fishable/swimmable use is an existing or attainable use, and if so, you should upgrade the segment.

And -- but, however, as I stated earlier, the information that was provided as to why these nine segments should be upgraded was pretty scant and not compelling, in my mind, and explained an alternative where they could just leave the secondary use and just increase the bacterial criteria for those segments.
Q. Mr. Nylander, the regulation you were just referring to concerning the availability of any new information, was that 40 CFR Section 131.20(a)?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And is there anything in that regulation that indicates that a UAA must be performed? That a UAA must
be performed in order to keep a previously designated secondary contact use?
A. No.
Q. And, Mr. Nylander, do you have any personal experience with any of these nine stream segments that are proposed to be upgraded to primary contact designated use?
A. I have some experience with visiting McAllister Lake over in San Miguel County. It's on the fish and wildiffe property there. I have fished in that lake. I have -- I have waterfowl hunted around that lake. And it's a very small -- small lake that's grown up around the banks and edges with riparian growth, cattails, and it's not the type of place where you would normally go to swim.

And I've never observed anybody swimming in the water. And those people that might boat on the water to fish, that's a secondary contact use, boating is, and so I don't really think that -- I think that secondary contact is an appropriate designated use for that body.

Likewise, the Charette Lake segment that was proposed, I've -- I've fished on that lake before. And again, it's kind of a -- a weedy lake, and $I$ think it's primarily a fishing lake but not -- not necessarily used
for swimming.
Q. Mr. Nylander, do you have anything else to add to your testimony?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Thank you.

Mr. Hearing Officer, that concludes
Mr. Nylander's direct testimony, and at this time I would like to move admission of Mr. Nylander's written direct and rebuttal testimony and exhibits, those are designated as San Juan Water Commission Exhibit C, which has attachments as Exhibit $C-1$ to $C-4$, and then also his rebuttal written testimony is Exhibit D, and it contains three attachments that are designated Exhibits D-1 to D-3.

MR. CHAVEZ: Any objection?
MS. BECKER: Yes, Hearing Officer. The Department does have an objection to the admission of the direct and rebuttal testimony of Mr. Nylander. There's been departure from that today. We would like to review that with him and determine whether that should be reliable for submission.

MS. MCCALEB: Mr. Hearing Officer, prior to this hearing, there was no objection to any of the written or rebuttal testimony of Mr. Nylander. At the beginning of his testimony, he mentioned that he would
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be modifying some of that testimony today, which I believe some of the other witnesses have also done, given changes of circumstances, adoption of new rules and what have you, in the interim since the written testimony was filed.

MR. CHAVEZ: Final word?
MS. BECKER: Modifications are such that it's not clear that the direct and rebuttal is still reliable. There's been significant departure. I would like the opportunity to review with this witness what he would like the Commission to rely upon.

MS. MCCALEB: I believe Mr. Nylander testified that he was adopting his written direct and rebuttal testimony with the modifications that were made orally here.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. Just because there's been a, I guess, accusation that it has been a significant departure, I do want to allow the Environment Department some questioning on that before $I$ allow it.

MS. MCCALEB: Okay. Thank you very much.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I would -- no. I don't have any specific objection.

I would note that it seems that the proper test would be whether or not Mr. Nylander's testimony is a logical outgrowth of his written or direct testimony.

In prior Commission proceedings that we've been involved in, what the counsel for the Department may be implicitly recommending is that this issue could be addressed in concluding arguments, the written concluding arguments, to determine whether or not those are, in fact, a logical outgrowth of the -- of the direct and rebuttal testimony.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Hearing Officer, just one point.

We're in a rulemaking proceeding, and it seems to me that all of this information the commission can sift through, and if the Department has questions about what the San Juan Water Commission's current position is, they can certainly delve into that on cross-examination.

I think the Commission's savvy enough to gauge what's being said or not and whether to rely on it or not. So I don't see that that should be an objection to its admissibility. It may go to weight, but $I$ don't think it should go to admissibility.

MS. CHAPPELLE: Freeport, you know, understands the comments raised and understands the NMED's desire to cross-examine and figure -- figure that out, nail that down, and so we would support their
ability to do that.
MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. So what I'll do is we'll go to NMED first in cross, if you can address those issues up front. Once -- once it appears that you're done, kind of let me and counsel know so that $I$ can just make the final decision on that.

MS. BECKER: Yes, Hearing Officer.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Hearing Officer, did you want to have Freeport make their appearance for the record so the --

MR. CHAVEZ: Oh, I'm going to go there in just one second. Thank you for reminding me.

So let's go ahead and go cross, NMED first.
MS. BECKER: Mr. Hearing Officer, if I may ask for a ten-minute break or five-minute break, whatever you'll allow.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
First of all, can we have Freeport enter in their appearance for the record.

MS. CHAPPELLE: Oh, my apologies.
Germaine Chappelle for Freeport.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
Anybody -- any other parties?
MR. DOLAN: Tim Dolan for Los Alamos National
Laboratory.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Dolan.
Let's go ahead and take a five-minute break, and we'll come back on the record.
(Proceedings in recess from 9:55 a.m. to

10:05 a.m.)
MR. CHAVEZ: We are back on the record.
So before we officially proceed with cross-examination by the Environment Department, $I$ want to hear a little more on the objection to the exhibits, and once that issue has been decided, we'll move officially to your cross-examination.

MS. BECKER: Hearing Officer, you would like me to speak to my objection again to the --

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes. What I would like to do is before we start your cross-examination, let's -- I want to provide some -- is it questioning that you want to do of the witness?

MS. BECKER: Yes, Hearing Officer. What I would like to do is -- due to his withdrawal of certain positions that were stated on direct, I would like to ascertain, on almost a page-by-page format, what portions of his testimony he's withdrawing and what part remains in place, such that if it's more confusing and -- to the Commission, let alone myself, on what the position of the Commission is, ask that the

Commission -- ask that the witness stand by his testimony provided that's on the record, as opposed to that which was prefiled, to the extent that it's that different.

MR. CHAVEZ: So it's going to be part of your cross, essentially.

MS. BECKER: Yes.
MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
Point on that?
MS. MCCALEB: Yes, Mr. Hearing Officer. In my experience before this Commission in previous triennial reviews --

MS. GREENWALD: I'm sorry. We can't hear. We can't -- we could hear her, and we can't hear you.

MS. MCCALEB: Mr. Hearing Officer --
MS. BONIME: Could you use a microphone, please?

MR. CHAVEZ: If you could hold on one second, we'll address that.

MS. GREENWALD: Okay. Thank you very much.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
MS. MCCALEB: Mr. Hearing Officer, given my experience in appearing before this Commission before in other triennial reviews and other rulemakings, it has also been the practice that the parties file written
direct and rebuttal testimony based on the information before them at that point in time.

As the hearing -- prehearing procedure progresses, the parties often attain more information, they have meetings, they may end up withdrawing proposals, as has already been done by some of the other parties before.

And even at the hearing, parties can clarify what their most current proposal is, or they agree to withdraw information, and that that is not a basis for withdrawing -- excuse me -- the previous -- I'm sorry. I need some water. That's not a basis for withdrawing the previous written testimony.

What is testified to on the record at the hearing is a clarification to any changes they want to make to the previous testimony, and if it needs to be clarified, it can be clarified on the record through cross-examination, but does not merit withdrawal of the original testimony.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Yeah. I would -- for Amigos Bravos, we certainly substantively do not agree with the San Juan Water Commission, but we object to this line of questioning. I agree wholeheartedly with what Ms. McCaleb has said.

We are not necessarily limited directly to the direct and prefiled written testimony. There is a -there is a reason why we have a hearing and why we have a dialogue here today. If it was simply premised solely on what we had written in our prefiled testimony, there would be no reason for us to be here.

The Water Quality Act in terms of defining what kind of evidence is admissible says very broadly that the Commission should consider all evidence. Now, the Commission is certainly entitled to give whatever probative value or weight to that evidence it wants to, but that doesn't mean that they can exclude this kind of organic dialogue.

I think that what the San Juan Water Commission does today -- and again, I don't agree with it substantively, but $I$ think it is their right to be able to raise these kind of issues that are very responsive to either new information or the testimony that arises in the course of these proceedings.

This is precisely why you have these proceedings, to tease out what is the focal point of the distinct -- of the differences between the various parties and to try to encourage the parties to resolve these differences of opinion.

In all the Commission proceedings that $I$ have
been in in the last 10,15 years, there has been dialogue between the parties in the course of those proceedings, and very frequently -- and Amigos Bravos has been able to do this, we've been able to resolve differences of opinion in the course of those proceedings, provide a consensus agreement to the Commission, and therefore resolve the issue. And that leads to better rulemaking.

So we object to the Department's line of questioning. To the degree that they do have concerns that the proposals are not a logical outgrowth of the testimony or any of the proposals, my sense is that that can be addressed in any sort of closing arguments that are provided for in the procedural order, and $I$ think that is the proper place to do that.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
Please.
MS. BECKER: Mr. Hearing Officer, I would concur with much of what Ms. McCaleb and Mr. Goodrich-Schlenker --

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Schlenker-Goodrich.
MS. BECKER: Excuse me.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: It's difficult. No worries.

MS. BECKER: -- said in the context of the
dialogue and discussion.

However, what's different is it's my
understanding that this follows more the element of surprise. Certainly, we've been in discussion, my client with the San Juan Water Commission, and these discussions have occurred. But what $I$ heard yesterday was that it was a result of the final rule and NMED's petition on September 4th that allowed for this new interpretation or better understanding.

We welcome a better understanding. What we don't welcome is surprise. This occurred yesterday. It's enough that we need to warrant a review. And I'm asking simply for the ability to clarify, if, in fact, it's a clarifying comment, what is the position of san Juan, and we believe that it's based on ultimately a lack of understanding of the Department's proposal.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
What concerns me is if $I$ do not rule on this issue, the admissibility of these exhibits, and wait on this questioning, there could be objections within the objection that's standing.

Given the arguments of all parties, what $I$ am -- oh.

MS. CHAPPELLE: Hearing Examiner, you -MR. CHAVEZ: Please.

MS. CHAPPELLE: $\quad-\quad$ skipped over a few parties.
So I just was wondering if you were going to circle back.

MR. CHAVEZ: I apologize. I didn't know you wanted to speak.

If you may, go ahead, please.
MS. CHAPPELLE: Sorry. My apologies.
It seems to me that what the Department is
trying to do is just flush out some things to make sure they understand what is being withdrawn and what's not being withdrawn and how the party got there, how san Juan got there.

And this is done in lots of different administrative contexts to determine what stays in and what goes out. And so to that extent, for that housekeeping purpose and to clarify later, when we're trying to figure out what was in and what wasn't in, it certainly makes sense to me to go down that road.

So from an overall housekeeping, good organization standpoint, we support the request.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Hearing Officer, not to reiterate what other folks have said, but just to remind you again that this is a rulemaking, the criteria for admissibility ought to be relevance. The questions that I think the Department has is over what the -- what the

San Juan Water Commission's proposal actually is. That they can probe on cross-examination. But I think that goes to the admissibility of the written or oral testimony.

So we would suggest that you should admit all of the testimony subject to probing it on cross-examination and then let the Commission sift through it and decide what the appropriate weight should be.

Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, parties.
What I am going to do -- and once again, the -- what concerns me is that we proceed without me ruling on these -- on this evidence. We could have objections with the objection, which could confuse the matter more.

So what I'm going to do is I am going to -- I am going to allow the evidence, $I$ 'm going to admit the evidence, and I'm going to have NMED continue with their cross-examination.

And obviously, a good part of that questioning could be on the issues that they're dealing with, and what it's going to do is allow me, as the Hearing Officer, and the Commission to determine what weight is going to be ascribed to that based on your questioning.

So if -- if we can just proceed, I'm going to allow the evidence.
(Exhibits SJWC A through D admitted into evidence.)

MR. CHAVEZ: And, ladies and gentlemen in the audience, if, by chance, you have an issue as to whether you can hear, come and let Pam, our administrator, know. We're going to put microphones at each table to make sure you guys can hear how the proceedings are going.

MS. GREENWALD: Great. Thank you.

MS. BONIME: Thank you.

MR. CHAVEZ: Absolutely.

And also, if you would like to move to the
front row just to ensure you're hearing everything to be said, we would offer you all these seats.

Having said that --

MR. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Hearing Officer.

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And I think these
microphones -- they may have -- you may have to push the button to speak.

You want to test them?

MS. MCCALEB: Test.

MR. HUTCHINSON: You have to push and hold the button.

MS. MCCALEB: Test.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAVEZ: So, NMED, you may proceed with cross.

MS. BECKER: Thank you.
CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. BECKER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Nylander.
A. Good morning.
Q. Kathryn Becker from New Mexico Environment Department.

And I do have quite a few questions for you, and $I$ will try to be as clear as I can, because my goal is to understand what it is that the san Juan Water Commission seeks to have the Commission rely upon for purposes of this hearing.

And certainly, $I$ do recognize that a --

MS. GREENWALD: I'm sorry. I still can't hear you.
Q. (BY MS. BECKER) -- changed mind is a -- is something that the Department certainly welcomes and it's discussions we've had to date.

But first $I$ want to ask, as a result of you having made some legal conclusions, are you, in fact, a lawyer?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Okay.

So with that, $I$ would like to follow the outline that you did this morning. I appreciate you organizing it, $I$ believe, topically and to temporary standards, ephemeral waters and the nine segments.

Is that -- is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's start with the temporary standards, then.

I again appreciate that -- I understood that you withdrew your recommendations to the Commission that they find that the definition be as broad as is contained in the final rule; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

And that it furthermore is -- the language of the standard is appropriate and -- as opposed to your former position of having it be called a variance; is that right?
A. Yes, that is right.
Q. Okay.

And then, similarly, your use of language in
terms of the Department's narrow -- narrowly tailoring of the rule is, in fact, what occurred, and therefore,
it's applicable to site-specific water bodies as opposed to permittees; isn't that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay.

So I'm going to turn to what has been admitted as the San Juan Water Commission's Exhibit C, which is your direct testimony. It would be helpful if you had that in front of you.

So as it relates to the temporary standards proposal, beginning on page 1, in summary, would it be fair to say that your testimony is that it now supports the Department's narrowly tailored criteria-based temporary standard?

All the way through -- I'm just reading and see if I can't just understand that to be the case through page 10.

Would that be a fair statement?
A. Subsequent to my oral testimony this morning, I think that is correct. I did say this morning that when given a choice between the more all-inclusive temporary standard approach, which San Juan Water Commission proposed, versus the narrowly focused temporary standard, that the Department in its most recent petition that was filed in September time frame, I think, suggests, that San Juan Commission could accept
the more narrowly focused temporary standard proposal.
Q. Thank you.

So with the additional caveat that you just articulated, would the first 10 pages be replaced by your oral testimony?
A. Oh, gosh.

MS. MCCALEB: Objection. I don't believe that that's a decision for Mr. Nylander to make.

The position of the San Juan Water Commission would be that this was his original testimony based on the original petition filed by the New Mexico Environment Department and that his testimony and the position of the San Juan Water Commission was modified over time based on the most recent filing by the New Mexico Environment Department that was made in either August or September of this year.

Therefore, his original testimony is still applicable as of the time it was written.

MR. CHAVEZ: I would overrule that and allow the witness to answer.

Please proceed.
MR. NYLANDER: The first 10 pages contains a variety of points that were made specific to the original Department petition and proposed language, and I -- I believe that earlier this morning I'm giving the

Commission a choice of either adopting a larger concept temporary standard or a more narrow concept temporary standard.

So if they want to think about the impact of the larger concept, which is what San Juan Water Commission's position has been, I think these 10 pages would still be relevant to their understanding of what the larger concept entails.

However, if their feeling is, after the record is clear to them that maybe the more narrowly focused Department petition that's just come in in the last few months -- if that's really the way they want to go, then I've already said San Juan Water Commission has no objection to that, and we support -- we support the narrower version if that is the type of tool that the Commission wants to adopt.
Q. (BY MS. BECKER) Mr. Nylander, am I correct in understanding that any change in your direct and prefiled testimony came about either as a result of the petitions filing on September 4 th or the new rule which was finalized in August of this year?
A. Those two -- those two things did influence our change in thinking.

Also, the Department had requested a meeting with us back on April 21st of this year and -- to
discuss our approach and their concept on temporary standards. So that influenced our thinking, because it really changed the way we understood the Department's proposal, up until this hearing started.

And then we got more insights from the direct testimony of $N M E D$ the first day of the hearing.
Q. Fair enough. And I understand that you have adjusted over time due to those three -- three factors, if not others.

But the point being that the first 10 pages of your direct reference the petition in place at the Department but also the draft rule, and I'm not aware of any differences in the draft rule to the final rule as it relates to temporary standards that would influence your change in position at this point.

Can you identify that for me?
A. I -- I found that the draft rule and the final EPA rule were virtually identical. I think the final rule did allow for a greater time length of their water quality variance. I think -- I think originally in the proposed rule there was discussion of limitations to maybe five years or ten years, and the final rule did not put a time limitation that would be applicable to all variances.

EPA -- EPA allows a case-by-case basis and --
and -- but requires a review every five years if the variance is awarded for longer than five years.
Q. And wouldn't it be appropriate to state that the final rule simply requires that a state adopting a variance or temporary standard have a time limited or temporal nature to it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

Let's look, then, at benefits. I'm looking at page 10.

You identified that there would be little benefit to a regulated community to obtain a temporary standard as opposed to a UAA.

Has your position also changed in this regard?
A. Yes, it has. I believe that based on the original petition and the -- and the language the Department proposed, when -- when we thought that a UAA was going to be required, then it seemed to us that if -- if a petitioner perform a UAA and showed a use was not attainable, at that point they had -- would have a choice.

They could either request a downgrade -- a permanent downgrade of the use and the criteria that go along with that, or they could request a temporary standard which would still keep in place the underlying
use and criteria but allow them some variability in the -- in the criteria and standard for a certain length of time.

We questioned what the motivation would be for the petitioner if it would be simpler just to ask for a downgrade of the standard based on their UAA work.

Now I understand your concept a little bit further, and $I$ understand you've narrowed it just to criteria instead of a designated use.
Q. And furthermore, you did identify you're familiar with the final rule, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did then also see the section in the final rule that explicitly identifies when a UAA is required and when it is not required.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay.

And I'm speaking to Section 40 CFR 131.10
designation of uses, specifically paragraph (j).
And so you -- it is your understanding, then, that no UAA is required to -- when the state designates for the first time or has previously designated for a water body uses that include the $101(\mathrm{a})(2)$ uses of the Clean Water Act?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

So if we turn, then, to page 13 of your direct, it's my understanding that you still affirm the use of temporary standards for the Commission as a tool to allow the state greater flexibility and to meet the highest attainable designated use.
A. Yes.
Q. Furthermore, I understand that you affirm that there's no objection -- oh, I'm sorry. I jumped ahead.

Before I get to page 14, I just want to make certain that $I$ introduce the topic. That is now returning to ephemeral waters, which is Section 97 of the state's water quality standards.

My understanding is that you still have no -and I'm reading from page 14 -- you still have no objection to the designation of these stream segments as ephemeral waters; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And $I$ would like to turn to your statement that it's the rebuttable presumption that, in essence -rebuttable presumption -- your statement was that the state has adopted.

Is that -- were those your words?
A. Yes. In essence, the state has adopted the rebuttable presumption.
Q. Okay.

I'm going to identify what's been admitted into evidence as your Exhibit C-3, which is the draft rule that was published in the Federal Register in September of 2013. And I'm going to ask if you would turn with me to page 54522 .

And in the -- oh.
A. 54542 ?
Q. Excuse me. 54522 .
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

And this is background as to why EPA is -- is making this proposal specific to designated uses.

And it's important that you understand that it's EPA, not the WQCC or the Environment Department, that's interpreted that the uses specified in Section $101(a)(2)$ of the Clean Water Act are presumed attainable.

Do you understand that's EPA's presumption?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you understand that that presumption has been passed on to the states who have received designated -- who have the ability through primacy to implement that?
A. Yes, I do. I -- and I mentioned in my oral
testimony this morning that when that passing on occurred in the 2005 triennial review time frame and the Record of Decision that EPA filed, basically they made it clear that they were requiring that kind of language. And my testimony this morning was that it was unfortunate that the Department or the Commission did not push back on -- on that requirement.
Q. I understood your testimony, but I'm not sure if your reading of the draft rule and the final rule reflects EPA's interpretation of the Clean Water Act Section $101(a)(2)$ to be the rebuttable presumption and to be in place even prior to the Department's 2005 triennial review.
A. To my knowledge, EPA has never brought that issue up to the state until the 2005 time frame.
Q. And while that may be the case, I'm going to ask you to look -- it's both in the draft rule and the final rule -- the footnote that EPA -- and I'm going to read EPA -- I'm reading -- I'll read from the draft rule, which is in -- is that the one in front of you?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Just - -
A. What -- what page is that?
Q. Same page, footnote 9. It's in the lower right-hand corner.
A. Um-hum.
Q. "EPA's 'rebuttable presumption' that the uses specified in Clean Water Act $101(a)(2)$ are presumed attainable, unless demonstrated to be unattainable through a UAA, has been upheld in Idaho Mining Association versus Browner," a 2000 court case in Idaho. Are you -- do you see that?
A. I do see that.
Q. Do you see that states have, in fact,
challenged, but EPA has been upheld since at least 2000 in its interpretation of the rebuttable presumption?
A. I was aware of that.
Q. Okay.

Certainly, I heard your testimony, and it
is -- today, and that was also reflected in your direct testimony, that, in essence, the rebuttable presumption just cost too much for New Mexico to implement; isn't that correct?

I'm looking for a yes or no answer.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

And are you also aware of the fiscal analysis that's required of any federal agency and the financial information that's contained in the final rule?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And it was found to be not burdensome to the state; isn't that right?
A. I didn't interpret it that way. I -- I seem to recall that they were kind of gross estimates based on national implementation of the variance rule. And $I$ don't remember if it was state by state or not, but --

MS. MCCALEB: Excuse me, Ms. Becker.
Could you please refer me to the language you're asking about?

MS. BECKER: Sure. It begins on page 51044, the Summary of Potential Incremental Burden and Cost to States and Authorized Tribes.

MS. MCCALEB: And are you looking at the draft rule or the final rule?

MS. BECKER: Final.
MS. MCCALEB: Okay. One moment.
MR. NYLANDER: So I noticed on that page when I looked at it that water quality standards variances were estimated to cost anywhere from $\$ 2.5$ to $\$ 11.4$ million per year, and New Mexico's portion of that be some amount. I have no idea what amount.

MS. BECKER: Okay.
Q. I'm going to just ask you to look on page 51045 of that same section.

And I'm going to ask you, do you see the
language in the first column that says "Although
associated with potential administrative burden and cost in some areas, this rule has the potential to partially offset these burdens by reducing regulatory uncertainty and increasing overall program efficiency"?
A. I see that language.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see the sentence following that, that "Use of these tools to improve establishment and implementation of state and authorized tribal water quality standards, as discussed throughout the preamble to this rule, provides incremental improvements in water quality and a variety of economic benefits associated with these improvements, including the availability of clean, safe, and affordable drinking water sources; and a -- water of adequate quality for agricultural and industrial use; and water quality that supports the commercial fishing industry and higher property values"?

MS. MCCALEB: Excuse me, Ms. Becker.
Are you asking that question with regard to the benefits and costs of this rule or Mr. Nylander's testimony about the costs of the rebuttable presumption and the ephemeral waters rule?

MS. BECKER: Thank you for your question. And
the answer is as it relates to the implementation of variances as burdensome.

MS. MCCALEB: Thank you.
MR. NYLANDER: The language you cited on page 51045 basically, $I$ think, applies to all of the associated rules that are being amended by this final rule, which include more than just the water quality standard variance. It includes changes in the antidegradation, changes in triennial review language, and adopts a new highest attainable use language and so on, so forth.

So I would -- I would have to agree that when you take all of these rules that have been amended by this federal action published August 21st, 2015, that indeed there should be some other kinds of benefits from all those things. Don't know specifically, though, what the benefit precisely is for a water quality standard variance.

MS. BECKER: Thank you.
Q. Moving on through your direct, I'm now turning to, $I$ believe, the third topic area, which has to do with the redesignation of the nine segments.

Specifically, if you'll look with me on page 24.

It's your understanding that in the draft
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final rule -- excuse me -- in the draft final rule and the final rule EPA's proposing to use the highest attainable use as the Clean Water Act 101 standards; is that right?
A. I -- that's my interpretation. Yes.
Q. Okay.

And it's your understanding of the final rule
that if -- that a UAA is required to show nonattainability with the Clean Water Act Section $101(\mathrm{a})(2)$ uses, correct?
A. Yes. If you're -- if you're trying to - trying to alter a $101(\mathrm{a})(2)$ use, then you must -- in the way of a downgrade, you must perform a UAA.
Q. And do you -- and you do understand that the nine segments are, in essence, an upgrade, not a downgrade; isn't that right?
A. It's a -- it's an upgrade, but I've suggested that there's another way to accomplish what you're trying to do, and that is to leave the secondary contact use as (b) and just upgrade the bacterial criteria for those nine segments. That is an approvable standards change, and you wouldn't be required to designate primary contact.
Q. Well, with that, let's look at the final rule. If you would turn with me to page 51024 .
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So again, the bases for the Department's action is that there -- that the rule requires if new information is available at the time of triennial review, that -- that they designate the highest attainable use.

Are we -- are we in agreement on that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

So when I look at the final rule, specifically

I'm in the middle column --
A. This is -- this is preamble language. It's -it's preparatory language before the rule is stated. But yes.
Q. I understand.

And I'm reading from the middle of the page about the subcategories of uses under the $101(a)(2)$.

Is what you were referring to in your testimony today about affording the Commission another option of how to look at -- at a change in criteria -are you referring to the subcategory of the $101(a)(2) ?$
A. Not at -- not the way this paragraph is structured. I'm -- I referred to the EPA Water Quality Standards Handbook and their guidance on recreational uses.

And on page 2 of their guidance, they give a
state two options for designating recreational uses, and either designate primary contact recreation for all waters of the state and set bacterial criteria sufficient to support primary contact, or, option two, designate either primary contact recreation or secondary contact for all waters of the state and where secondary contact is designated set bacterial criteria sufficient to support primary contact recreation.

EPA believes a secondary contact recreational use with criteria sufficient to support primary contact use is consistent with the Clean Water Act $101(a)(2)$ goal.
Q. Is that contained in your testimony, Mr. Nylander, that guidance document?
A. This is -- this was an exhibit in my --
Q. Your rebuttal?
A. -- my testimony. It's a document of record. Furthermore, EPA, in their 2005 triennial review Record of Decision letter, which was incorporated as an exhibit by several of your witnesses -- it also has a citation in the $R O D$ on page 4 --
Q. I'm familiar with that. And I'm going to --
A. Okay.
Q. I apologize for interrupting. But let's - -
let's date for -- I'm not finding that exhibit, although I believe it's in here.

So would you just tell me the date of the -the guidance that you provided?

And, Ms. McCaleb, if you could help me identify where that is in his exhibits. I'm not seeing it.

MS. MCCALEB: Can you provide the title of that guidance, please, Charlie?

MR. NYLANDER: Water Quality Standards Handbook, EPA.

If it wasn't -- I don't recall at this point if it was added as an exhibit to the direct or rebuttal or if it was just merely referenced.

MS. MCCALEB: Could you please look at Exhibit D-1 and confirm whether that's the correct exhibit?

It would be attached to your rebuttal
testimony.
MR. NYLANDER: Oh. Sorry.
Yes. That is -- that is the exhibit that I'm referring to.

MS. BECKER: Thank you.
Q. And what is the date of this exhibit?
A. This was -- this was copied off the Internet, off the EPA official web site. I don't -- I don't see a
date on it. But it is their current Water Quality Standards Handbook language.
Q. Okay.

But you did identify, though, that the Federal Register for 131.14 of the Clean Water Act does become effective October 20 th of this year, does it not?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And wouldn't that, in fact, be the most current information available from EPA's perspective on the temporary standards and triennial reviews?
A. It might be the most current, but the Water Quality Standards Handbook has existed for decades, and --
Q. Fair enough.
A. -- their criteria for primary and secondary contact is -- and their options have always remained the same.
Q. Okay.

So you identify the handbook as your bases of knowledge, and furthermore, what $I$ believe you were referring to was the Department's Rebuttal Exhibit Number 4 to Mr. Hogan's -- Dr. Hogan's --
A. Yes.
Q. -- testimony.

And what I'm going to ask -- what I'm asking
you to look at, in light of the bases of your decisions, is what's the middle column of the preliminary material as to, you know, why does EPA, in essence, do what it does.

Do you see the language in the middle column regarding the subcategory distinction that $I$ was just asking you about?

Mr. Nylander, I'm referring to the final rule.
A. Oh. I thought you were on -- sorry.

This is still on page 51024?
Q. Correct.
A. Okay.

And this preamble language in the middle column, and what paragraph again?
Q. The middle column, it would be the second paragraph.

If you'll just reread that second paragraph where the Clean Water Act distinguishes between two broad categories of use.
A. Yes. It reads "The Clean Water Act" --
Q. No. I'm not asking you to read it out loud, just for yourself.
A. Oh, okay.
Q. Thank you.

Specifically, it has -- it has a footnote,
footnote 14.
Do you see footnote 14?
A. I do.
Q. Okay.

And I'm going to read from footnote 14.
"A sub-category of a use specified in
section $101(a)(2)$ of the Act is not necessarily less protective than a use specified in section 101(a)(2) of the Act. For example, a cold water aquatic life use is considered a use sub-category, but provides 'for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish and wildlife,' consistent with Clean Water Act section $101(a)(2)$. On the other hand, a secondary contact recreation use (i.e., a use, such as wading or boating, where there is a low likelihood of full body immersion in water or incidental ingestion of water) is considered a use sub-category, but does not provide 'for recreation in and on the water,' consistent with Clean Water Act section 101(a) (2)."

Did I read that correctly?
A. You -- you did read it correctly, and it's language that $I$ had looked at during my research. I was puzzled by the paragraph "On the other hand," because the -- they gave examples of wading and boating, but then they say that's not recreation in and on the water.

And as far as $I^{\prime} m$ concerned, wading is recreation in the water, and boating is recreation on the water. So that distinction I -- I was confused by them --
Q. I recognize the --
A. -- drawing that as an example.
Q. I recognize the confusion, Mr. Nylander. But should the Commission rely on your interpretation of this language or EPA's interpretation as proposed in the final rule in the Clean Water Act?
A. Again, with the -- the uses that they -- have as examples of wading and boating, if you compare that to the state's and the EPA's definition of primary contact recreation, there's supposed to be prolonged exposure to the water, and -- so again, I -- obviously, EPA's rulemaking is more authoritative than my opinion, but in my opinion, this is one of those gray areas that could be questioned.

And again, on the subcategory of aquatic life use or fisheries use, I'm not sure why -- if they accept these subcategories as protective of $101(a)(2)$, why they would single out limited aquatic life in the New Mexico standards as not meeting the $101(a)(2)$ goal. It is -it is just a subcategory that still protects aquatic life.
Q. With that, we concluded walking through your direct, and $I$ believe in my closing arguments I'll be able to identify on what to rely and is relevant.

And let's just in a cursory manner, then,
address your rebuttal, please.
If you would look with me -- I'm going to take
just a minute so that I'm not redundant to the extent that we've already articulated your positions.

Mr. Nylander, if you would turn with me to page 24 of your rebuttal testimony.
A. Excuse me.

What page?
Q. 24.
A. Thank you.
Q. At the --
A. I'm sorry. I don't have that particular page for some reason.

May I look over the shoulder of --

MS. MCCALEB: I can give you a copy.

MR. NYLANDER: Okay.
(Discussion off the record.)
Q. (BY MS. BECKER) Are you on page 24?
A. I am.
Q. Okay.

So this is talking about the Department's
petition wherein Ms. Pintado's testimony was changing the recreation use for the water segment from secondary to primary contact?
A. Yes.
Q. So this is that third component of your testimony wherein there's been some change; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And so your statement on this page is that you disagree -- and I'm reading from the third to the last sentence on the bottom of the page.
"I disagree with the assertion that a UAA must support the existing designated use of secondary contact."
A. I see the sentence. Yes.
Q. Is this still your position?

MR. HUTCHINSON: Excuse me.
What -- what page of his testimony are you on? MS. BECKER: 24.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And you're at the bottom of the page?

MS. BECKER: Yes. Third line from the bottom.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Oh, okay.
MR. WATERS: Of rebuttal testimony?
MS. BECKER: Of rebuttal, yes.
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MR. NYLANDER: With the EPA's interpretation with the rebuttable presumption and their final rulemaking and so forth, I -- I see now that a UAA would have to be done if somebody wanted to assign a new use that was a less than primary contact recreation on a water body.

On the other hand, existing secondary contact uses that have been published in the standards for decades, those uses EPA has not specifically written and required or requested that those sections be upgraded from secondary to primary.

And it seems to me that it's kind of late in the game for EPA to all of a sudden have approved the secondary contact for years and years and years without a UAA and, now that they've taken a reinterpretation of the act, now they seem to be saying, well, but you have to have a UAA if you're going to use the secondary contact use.

$$
\text { But } I--I \text { will }--I \text { will say at this point }
$$ that from EPA's standpoint a UAA would be required for secondary contact use, unless the criteria for that use were equivalent to the primary contact.

Q. (BY MS. BECKER) But a UAA is not required in the case of these nine water segments, is it?
A. Well, presently they all have a secondary
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contact use, and the Department's proposing to upgrade that to primary contact. And EPA would not require a UAA to upgrade it to primary contact. They would require it if you were going to downgrade it from primary to secondary.
Q. So while I understand -- so am I correct to understand that your position is still to support the upgrade for those nine segments?

MS. MCCALEB: Objection. I don't believe that that was Mr. Nylander's position, that he supported the upgrade of the nine segments.

MR. NYLANDER: No. In fact, in my testimony, I basically found that there was scant evidence to require the upgrade and -- and question -- question why -- why not just leave it as secondary contact.

And $I$ demonstrated in my testimony that you could leave it as secondary contact and just increase the bacterial criteria to the more stringent primary contact criteria and accomplish what the Department wants to accomplish or -- or the EPA might require.

The problem is once you upgrade --
Q. (BY MS. BECKER) Mr. Nylander --
A. -- to a use, then you are stuck with having to do a UAA in the future if you ever wanted to downgrade it.
Q. I think we need to be clear about the distinction here. And $I$ didn't mean to misunderstand your testimony. So let's break it down into twofold.

I recognize you have issues with the
rebuttable presumption and that, in fact, your
recommendation as contained in your direct is to
encourage the Department and the WQCC to approach EPA and -- and better determine a routing for that -- for the -- for unclassified waters to be considered ephemeral unless proven to be intermittent or perennial; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that's still your position.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

But the other issue is that you've identified that a UAA is not required to go from secondary to primary contact; isn't that right?
A. A UAA is not required to upgrade to primary contact.
Q. And therefore, the Department did not conduct a UAA for those nine water body segments, did they?
A. That's correct.
Q. And it's not required, and therefore, is your position that you do not support the find -- the

Department's position that, in fact, they be primary contact?
A. I didn't find enough evidence that was compelling to say that primary contact was indeed an attainable use.
Q. And yet we've established that the final rule did not require a UAA to do so.

So this is based on your idea of what is enough evidence?
A. No. The water quality standards regulations require that you have sufficient scientific evidence to support a change in standards, and you're changing the standard here by upgrading it, but $I$ find that the supporting rationale is fairly scant, and that's why I said it didn't look like there was enough evidence to support the upgrade.
Q. And I do think I understand your position that there's not enough.

But furthermore, you did identify, you've read the final rule, a UAA is not required, and specifically a state may -- has an obligation to review and consider an upgrade --
A. Right.
Q. -- with the evidence it does have. Okay.
A. That is correct.
Q. I think we'll just not get to necessarily an agreement on that point.

I'm just seeing if there's anything left of the rebuttal that needs to be -- I think the last question, then, Mr. Nylander, is do you -- you mentioned a working group for purposes of this Commission.

Are you willing to serve on that working group?
A. Yes, I am.

MS. BECKER: Okay. Thank you.
I have no further questions.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
Amigos, cross-examination.
I would politely just remind the audience that
if you have a cell phone please remember to silence it at this time. Thank you.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Nylander.
A. Good morning.
Q. My name is Erik Schlenker-Goodrich. I'm with Amigos Bravos.

And $I$ just have a few questions for you.
Hopefully, it won't take too long.
On page 12 of your rebuttal testimony -- why
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don't you turn to that.
And this question is with regards to the temporary standards proposal.

You state that there would not be any
increased concentrations of pollutants causing water quality impairment because any permitted point source discharge will still have to meet all applicable technology-based effluent limits; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Are technology-based effluent limits stronger or always stronger than water quality-based effluent limits?
A. They're not always stronger. No.
Q. So where a water quality-based effluent limit is stronger than a technology-based effluent limit, and the water quality-based effluent limit is weakened to incorporate a temporary standard, would that not result in increased concentrations of pollutants?
A. The way you frame that question, yes. I think the answer is yes.
Q. On page 12 of your testimony, as well, you state that EPA and NMED most likely would utilize temporary standards with respect to, quote, unquote, existing discharges, end quote, to provide time to make progress toward attaining designated uses and/or
criteria.

Is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Should temporary standards only apply to existing discharges?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the Department's temporary standards proposal limited to existing discharges, or does it allow for new or increased discharges?
A. As far as I understand, it would be limited to the existing discharges.
Q. Based on your answer to that question, can you point to anywhere in the Department's proposal where it specifies that it is, in fact, limited to existing discharges?

And I'll give you a moment, but perhaps another way to phrase the question would be is that limitation expressed in the plain language of the temporary standard or in the Department's underlying testimony?
A. I don't readily see that it's expressed explicitly in the proposed rule.
Q. Would you base your conclusion that it's limited to existing discharges to the Department's testimony, then?
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A. Yes.
Q. Turning to a different issue, Mr. Nylander, you raise concerns regarding compliance and other economic costs incurred by the Department and the regulated community associated with the preparation of use attainability analyses to determine whether a particular water body should have a -- have its designated uses downgraded; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does water quality pollution itself have economic and financial costs?
A. Yes.
Q. For example, there may be heightened costs associated with a water treatment facility trying to clean up polluted water for municipal purposes, correct?
A. That's -- that's an example. Yes.
Q. As another example, might there also be costs to New Mexico's farms and ranches from lost or contaminated or reduced crop yields from polluted irrigation water?
A. I can't give you a yes or no answer on that because, basically, you know, we're talking about a temporary reduction in a specific requirement, a little bit lower standard or criteria.
Q. Forgive me. I'm not talking about temporary
standards specifically.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm talking about if -- as a general
proposition, if you have a water body that degrades from a primary contact use to a secondary contact use or there's a reduction in -- from a Clean Water Act -- more broadly, a Clean Water Act $101(a)(2)$ use to a non-101(a) (2) use, that the increased pollution might have costs.
A. I'll give you a generic yes on that.
Q. Might there also be costs of cleaning up or restoring degraded water quality?
A. There could be. Yes.
Q. And may there also be costs of public health from people who may swim, drink or otherwise use polluted water and become sick?
A. Yes.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: No further questions.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
Chevron.

MR. ROSE: No questions, Mr. Hearing Officer.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

Freeport.

MS. CHAPPELLE: No questions, Your Honor.
MR. CHAVEZ: Los Alamos, I'm assuming --

MR. DOLAN: No questions, Mr. Hearing Officer.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much.
I would then like to move to the Commission, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, for any cross-examination of this witness.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY THE COMMISSION:

MR. CHAVEZ: I will query the Commission on who has questions.

Commissioner Hutchinson.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Good morning, Mr. Nylander.
MR. NYLANDER: Hello, Commissioner Hutchinson.
MR. HUTCHINSON: In the temporary standards,
there's a requirement of the petition to come before the Commission.

We've heard testimony from the public that they would like to have these issues brought before a public hearing.

Would you support such a change in that -- in the proposed rule to require a public hearing?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Hearing Officer,
Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, no. I don't
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think $I$ would support that, because, basically, as I grasp the Department's temporary standard approach, what they're basically doing is equivalent to a site-specific criteria, which we heard earlier discussion of with respect to copper and -- by Chino Mines.

And so it's a -- it's really a site-specific criteria, but the difference is it's only applied for a limited amount of time instead of full-time. So the copper -- for instance, the copper site-specific criteria, if approved, is more or less permanent, but a temporary standard for a criteria is only approved for a certain amount of time.

And so they're really equivalent in that sense of process, and -- and I think a public meeting with a -- in front of the Commission would be adequate.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Okay.
So if -- if it's brought before the Commission -- we've had all of these various activities take place between the applicant and NMED so the Commission would be receiving a request for that temporary standard.

Do you anticipate, then, that the public participation is going to take place in that preceding process, or is that something that's going to be held in a public meeting with the Commission accepting comments
from the public?

MR. NYLANDER: Well, I envision --

Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Hutchinson, I envision that the Department, if they did receive a petition, that they would have some form of public information gathering or public participation of some kind, as they're processing the petition and -- and getting it ripe for -- for bringing before the Commission.

But when they bring it before the Commission, it's really tantamount to a water quality standard hearing, because you are changing a water quality standard. And so there would be a public hearing process there for a change in a water quality standard.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you for that answer, because $I$ was thinking along the same lines, that since it -- we're calling it a temporary standard, but the section -- and this is on page 4 of the september 4 th document, and this is item 7 now -- that temporary standards may be implemented only after appropriate public participation and Commission approval, but it doesn't mention that we're actually adopting the standard, even though it's called a temporary standard. Okay.

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. -- Mr. -- yes.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Some of these questions
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were -- that $I$ have were asked in the Department's cross. So I'll not restate those.

Did you participate in the triennial review where the current definition of waters of the state was adopted?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, I -- do you remember what year that was, what triennial?

MR. HUTCHINSON: I believe it was the 2009 . 2005 .

MR. NYLANDER: If it was 2005 or 2009 , I did not participate.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Okay.
There's a definition in our -- our jurisdiction -- let me get to that.

Under the jurisdictional authority for adopting water quality standards, it refers to the New Mexico statute, the Water Quality Act, and states water quality standards for surface and groundwaters of the state be based on credible scientific data and other evidence appropriate under the act.

Given your testimony yesterday and today, do you believe that the current definition of waters of the state meets the intent of the Water Quality Act?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner

Hutchinson, $I$ think the current definition of surface waters of the state or waters of the state in the standards, in my mind, goes beyond EPA's definition of -- of waters of the US.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you for that.
But would that current definition of waters of
the state be considered to have relied on credible scientific data?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, presumably that change in adoption presumably would have had to have been supported by credible data.

MR. HUTCHINSON: You mentioned the cost to the Department for addressing the rebuttable presumption and the resulting requirement for a UAA for the ephemeral waters additions.

Are there any other effects from not having these ephemeral streams identified in the State of New Mexico?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, $I$ believe you're talking about the preponderance of ephemeral streams that still reside under the category of intermittent waters in Section . 98 that are un- -- the nonperennial unclassified segments.

And if $I$ understand your question, you're
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saying if they don't ever get studied and moved into the category of ephemeral waters, is there a cost associated with that?

MR. HUTCHINSON: Yes.
MR. NYLANDER: I can't think of a cost that's associated with that, but $I$ would say that it presents a conundrum in the sense that it works against the definition of -- the Commission has for ephemeral waters and for intermittent waters, and seems it applies designated uses of primary contact recreation and marginal warm water fisheries -- or aquatic life -excuse me -- to nonperennial waters, and that seems a little ridiculous.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Are most of these segments that we're talking about here on federal lands in the State of New Mexico?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, no. Although the federal government does own a lot of land in New Mexico, there is still a lot of state land and tribal land and private property, and these -- these unclassified nonperennial waters are virtually everywhere and purportedly protected for the use of swimming and fishing.

MR. HUTCHINSON: So state land management agencies, Department of Game and Fish, others, federal
land management agencies would be obligated to consider the effect on those when doing their land management planning and actions?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. -- Commissioner Hutchinson, yes, I believe they would.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And are federal land management agencies required to consider water quality standards in the State of New Mexico?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, yes, they are.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Okay. I'll just go to the changes to the nine segments.

In the Environment Department's testimony, did you hear credible scientific data presented in support of moving from secondary to primary contact?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, as I stated previously in my testimony, I didn't find much in the way of credible scientific evidence justifying those upgrades.

MR. HUTCHINSON: How would you define credible scientific data?

MR. NYLANDER: Something with more weight other than just an anecdotal statement that somebody might have seen somebody swimming in the water or there's no reason to believe that somebody might not
swim in the water or -- it would be -- it would actually be a series of observations and documented observations and something with a lot more -- a lot more scientific weight than just a guess, that people could swim in the water.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you.
Mr. Chairman, that's all I have.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner DeRose-Bamman, followed by Commissioner Tongate.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Nylander, I want to make sure I understand that your proposed -- the current proposal for the temporary standards language.

In your rebuttal testimony, which $I$ think the language may be changed a little bit from your proposed -- from your petition -- your testimony, I should say, in -- let's see -- the new section -- your proposed language for the new Section 10 , subsection $F$, paragraph (4)(a), "A petition for a temporary standard variance shall: identify the current applicable standards, the proposed temporary standard, the permittees, and the surface waters of the state." (As read.)

So you're no longer saying that the permittees need to be listed; is that correct?
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MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner DeRose-Bamman, that is correct. We offered this morning in my testimony that if the Commission wanted to have a full, comprehensive temporary standard rule, that those kind of additions and that were put out in the San Juan Water Commission's language would be necessary.

However, we agreed that if the Commission wanted to focus on a more narrow temporary standard and just focus on criteria, that we would -- we would then have no objection, and we wouldn't insist that the word "permittee" or "designated use" be added to the Department's proposal.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: And that's -- I'm glad you brought that up. That's in paragraph (2) -- or subparagraph (2), which is really the one $I$ wanted to talk to you about. Thank you for helping me focus on the right paragraph.

So what would the temporary standard look -how would it look different if those other -- I understand now designated uses may be -- we don't need to include that, but what about -- why would it look different if we were able to add permittees to this list of the application?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
DeRose-Bamman, if the Commission were to add permittees
and/or -- and also designated uses, it would be a more comprehensive tool that would very closely -- closely mimic EPA's final rule on water quality standards variances.

But if you prefer to approach this as more of a site-specific criteria change on a short, temporal period, then you wouldn't -- then you wouldn't need the words "permittee" or "designated use."

And I -- I testified that the language that the Department has proposed in their latest revised petition of August or September of this year -- that we have no objection to that language.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: So by not including your suggestion to add "or permittee(s)," it's not being any more restrictive. We still -- by still -- the permittees still can benefit from these temporary standards applying to the water body segment, and even if it wasn't applicable just to them, a permittee could still --

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, yes. The answer is yes.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Okay.
Okay. Moving to the question about the changes from secondary to primary contact -- I'm sorry. Let me go back to the temporary standards for just one
second.

With the Environment Department, they had described the use of antidegradation review as -- in the limits that would be based on antidegradation review.

Have you seen the use of antidegradation review before?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, yes, I have.
MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: And in what -- what situations?

MR. NYLANDER: I believe the last time I was present at an antidegradation review sort of discussion, it had to do with the outstanding national resource waters. And that was the subject. I have not - - $\quad$ have not seen it at any other activities.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: A question was raised earlier on cross-exam that -- regarding technology-based and water quality-based effluent limits. And the -- I believe the question was, again, the application of a temporary standard, what kind of effects will it have on a - for a discharger, essentially, in terms of the effluent quality and the impact to the stream.

So there is the -- the rule -- or the EPA rule does not allow a variance when the technology-based limits are above anything less stringent than the technology-based limits; is that correct?

MR. NYLANDER: That is correct.
MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: And so does the proposal meet that requirement? Does the Environment Department meet that --

MR. NYLANDER: The Department's proposal does. Yes.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: And in most cases, when a -- well, what kind of situations would there be -would there be a limit in place for a permittee already in the permits that's a water quality-based effluent limit, already existing, and then the permittee identifies a need to apply for a temporary standard? Do you know of many situations where that would exist?

So -- is that clear?
MR. NYLANDER: Yes.
I think -- I think to get at the heart of what you're questioning, if a temporary standard were granted for a stream segment that was receiving a discharge from a permittee, and, in essence, a water quality criteria was basically lowered -- I don't mean make less stringent -- for a specific amount of time, so that work could be done on that water body -- as I understand the Department's proposal, at the first opportunity they have, they would use that revised criteria in establishing water quality-based effluent limits in any
discharge permit that goes into that segment.

So I think if you have a less stringent criteria, it could result in a water quality-based limitation and permit that if it's based on it could be a little bit more forgiving than, say, the previous permit condition.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Okay. I don't -- yeah. I'm not sure if the language actually is very clear on how the standard would -- the actual number would be set in the permit. And I realize it -- there's a translation procedure usually between a standard and the permit limit that is outside the standards themselves.

Now I'd like to move on to the secondary prime -- secondary to primary contact changes.

MR. NYLANDER: Um-hum.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: In looking at the criteria that are specified in 98 -- Section 98 for intermittent waters and Section 99 for perennial waters, they do -those sections do specify secondary -- or primary contact, but the criteria that are specified in those sections are different than the general criteria for primary contact in Section 900 .

Do you know the basis for those -- those levels?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, no, I do not.

I'm suspecting that that was an attribute of the outcome of the 2009 triennial review, because the published definition of those criteria have a different number for bacteria.

And I'm trying to look for those in the standards.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: You are in your testimony saying there is another option to use to maintain the designated use as secondary contact but to require -specify criteria that are protective of primary contact, is what EPA's approved; is that correct?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, yes, that is correct. You can retain a secondary contact use for recreation as long as you have the bacterial criteria set that is protective of the primary use designated use. In other words, it's equivalent.

So you still label it as secondary contact, but you're protecting it up to the degree of primary contact.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: But you did not -- did you propose that -- numbers associated with that option in your testimony, Mr. Nylander?

MR. NYLANDER: No, I did not. And it would actually be just whatever the published numbers are in the standards for primary contact use.
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And I'm having difficulty thumbing through the standards to find that citation, but -- oh, here it is.

Page 39 of the current standards, at least in my copy, primary contact, the bacterial limit would be 126 colony-forming units per 100 mL . Secondary contact, the bacteria requirement is 548 colony-forming organisms per 100 mL .

So as $I$ say, if you retain a secondary contact designated use but elevate the criteria to the primary contact criteria of 126 , then you're fully supporting the EPA's lol(a)(2) goals for recreation. That is allowed by the EPA.

MR. HUTCHINSON: On that point?
So you're really not changing anything, it's just a matter of semantics at that point.

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, the very subtle difference is that you didn't upgrade the designated use to primary contact and -- and then find yourself down the road needing to do a UAA study to ever downgrade it again.

You can simply keep that a second contact -in fact, you could go back to all of your standards that have primary contact and change them all to secondary, as long as the criteria that goes along with that were the criteria earmarked for primary. So you're just
keeping the criteria rigorous, but you can call it a different designation, a subcategory designation under recreational use.

There are some advantages to that in the sense that you don't find yourself at some point in time having to do a UAA, and that's a cost savings.

MR. HUTCHINSON: So you'd only be required in the semantic change to do a UAA, but if you change the criteria, you don't have to.

MR. NYLANDER: That's correct.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Thank you.
Thank you, Commissioner.
MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Looking at the language from the final water quality standards regulation document that the NMED counsel helped us direct, there -- the footnote on page 51024 -- and it's footnote 14, it's in the bottom of the middle column -- where it's specifically saying that a secondary contact recreational use -- recreation use is not really a subcategory of $101(a)(2)$ uses.

And this goes back to the documentation that was given to support the change from secondary to primary.

This phrase, "there is a low likelihood of
full body immersion in water or incidental ingestion,"
do you know what low likelihood means?
MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner DeRose-Bamman, no, I do not. It's not defined in this footnote.

I believe when compared to the definitions for secondary contact and primary contact, you know, the primary contact says you have to have some prolonged exposure and a very much possibility of ingesting an appreciable quantity of water, whereas a low likelihood would be, you know, you riding in a boat or you're wading in a stream and it's low likelihood that you would be ingesting water.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Does that mean zero?
MR. NYLANDER: No, it doesn't mean zero. I mean, people can fall out of a boat and then clamor back in, and that's still not a prolonged immersion in the water.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: I don't have any more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Tongate.
MR. TONGATE: Good morning, Mr. Nylander.
MR. NYLANDER: Good morning.
MR. TONGATE: As a preface to my question, I
just want you to be aware that your reference to the
schizophrenia of the Environment Department, my opinion of EPA and their methods has not changed significantly over the past 23 years. I don't feel like I'm personally schizophrenic.

MR. NYLANDER: I appreciate that.
MR. TONGATE: Commissioner Hutchinson asked some of the questions $I$ was going to ask regarding the presumable -- rebuttable presumption, and he mentioned federal and state agencies and their land use planning.

You said that that would be impacted by the fact that they're -- all potential water bodies were presumed to be intermittent unless proven otherwise.

Do you think there would be a huge amount of petitions from those agencies in order to be classified as ephemeral?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
Tongate, $I$ believe my -- my answer to Commissioner Hutchinson basically regarded the fact that if federal and state land resource agencies have water bodies on their land that fall under the definition of intermittent waters, as published in 20.6.4.98, and they're nonperennial unclassified waters, they haven't gone through any UAA type study, that when they do land management activities, that they would have to take into consideration what the state standards and designated
uses are for those water bodies, which include the livestock watering, wildlife habitat, primary contact recreation and marginal warm water aquatic life.

So they would have to be aware that those waters are truly under this goal of being protected for those kind of designated uses.

And I don't know if they would -- if they would come to the Department for a -- for a review of their land management activities or to make sure that they're not somehow compromising the water quality standard in that section for those kind of water bodies.

The agency that has nonperennial unclassified waters might decide to do some restoration work and -and want to apply as a petitioner to take advantage of a new temporary standard, something like that, but I -- I just don't -- it's uncertain, because the whole universe of the state's waters is now embedded in that . 98 section of the standards.

I mean, that's pretty much everything except for the segments that are in the classified segment of the standards and -- and listed under ephemeral waters. So you have the preponderance of New Mexico's water bodies, including everything that comes under the definition of waters of the state embedded in .98 and presumably with uses as goals that include fishing and
swimming.
So I see it as a -- as a conundrum. I see it as a possible point of conflict in the future, because -- and these -- these -- the standard at . 98 and .97 -- these standards were adopted in 2009 as a result of EPA insistence that their rebuttable presumption must prevail.

MR. TONGATE: In regard to private land owners or farmers, ranchers, do you foresee the impact on them as far as having to file a petition?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
Tongate, $I$ don't -- $I$ don't see a burden as far as filing a petition, because -- I'm presuming you're saying a petition for a temporary standard, for instance?

MR. TONGATE: Well, I'm -- reclassification of a water body.

MR. NYLANDER: I do -- I do see a burden in the sense that all of those unclassified nonperennial waters that might be on private land are now being protected for swimming and fishing under these standards that exist, and -- and so private land owners may have an issue with something they do on their land that might compromise the goal of that standard.

And it's a little more confusing than that,
because the standards are now enforceable under the Water Quality Act as a result of the Water Quality Act amendments in 1993. So it's -- it's -- there's a large gray area there that, you know, people could create some mischief.

MR. TONGATE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Mr. Hearing Officer, considering where we are timewise, and we still have additional Commissioner questions that we probably should defer until after lunch, I will defer back to you for a public comment session.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

At this time, what $I$ want to do is take public comment. Upon the conclusion of public comment, we will break for one hour for lunch.

So -- and if the witness -- please feel free to leave your documents there as we'll continue with you right after lunch.

So looking into the audience, is there anybody here for public comment?
Please approach, sir.

Please approach.
Please have a seat, state your name, and
you'll be sworn in for the record.

JON KLINGEL
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT
THE REPORTER: Would you state your full name and spell it, please.

MR. KLINGEL: Jon Klingel, J-O-N
$K-L-I-N-G-E-L$.
I just have a few brief comments today dealing with New Mexican mollusks and aluminum.

My name is Jon Klingel. I've been a resident of New Mexico for about 38 years. I'm a retired biologist by profession.

I was originally scheduled to provide
technical testimony regarding Segment 128; however, that issue has apparently been resolved, at least temporarily, and $I$ understand my testimony has been withdrawn. Although I'm a member of the board of Amigos Bravos, I provide my comments today in my individual capacity. My comments are related to aluminum.

New Mexico has 23 species of extant mussels and one species presumed extirpated. Many of these species are currently in trouble, listed as New Mexico endangered or threatened, candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act, and other status categories
of concern.
New Mexico currently has a standard for aluminum concentration based on hardness of water, according to my understanding. West Virginia proposed what $I$ understand is a similar standard. Letters from the US Environmental Protection Agency and the US Fish and Wildife Service regarding that proposal made it clear that the standard did not protect mussels. West Virginia withdrew their proposal.

Some comments from the Fish and Wildlife Service letter:
"Freshwater mussels are among the most endangered groups of organisms in North America."
"As currently proposed, the revision to water quality standards would not be protective of native freshwater mussels. Based on our review of the literature, potential exists for the application of this hardness-based criterion to severely modify the feeding behavior of federally listed mussels."
"Furthermore, a study conducted with two different freshwater mussels demonstrated that as filter feeders exposure to and accumulation of aluminum are not significantly related to water hardness. In both species, the ambient $p H$ had a significant effect on the accumulation in the gills, whereas the effect of water
hardness was only of minor importance."
"The Service contends that hardness should not be considered in setting the standard to protect mussels."
"Based on these studies, we recommend the chronic standard for the protection of all native freshwater mussels be no higher than 250 micrograms per liter dissolved aluminum with no hardness adjustment." (As read.)

One additional comment from the EPA letter:
"The proposed chronic values generated using West Virginia's proposed hardness-based equation are approximately three to six times higher than the chronic criteria value recommended as protective of mussels by US Fish and Wildife Service." (As read.)

It seems likely the current New Mexico standard based on hardness of water does not protect our mussels.

But it gets worse. I contacted a biologist who specializes in mollusks and crustaceans, and I asked her if aquatic gastropods related to mussels were sensitive to this type of contamination or was it just mussels that were sensitive.

His answer, and I quote, "They are equally
sensitive."
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We have 37 species of aquatic gastropods in

New Mexico. They include both federal and state endangered species as well as other status categories of concern.

In summary, this means to me that our aquatic mollusks are unprotected from aluminum poisoning. This includes a total of 60 extant species of mollusks. They occur in at least 17 New Mexico counties.

Legal status of these:

Five are federal endangered.

One is federal warranted but precluded.

That's precluded from listing on the Endangered Species Act by higher priorities but will probably eventually be listed.

One federal candidate. That's the first step towards being listed on under the Endangered Species Act.

Eight species are New Mexico endangered.

Nine New Mexico threatened.

Nine New Mexico endemic species. They occur nowhere else in the world.

Twenty-one species are species of -- New Mexico species of greatest conservation need.

Ten Forest Service in Region 3.

And three are Bureau of Land Management
sensitive in New Mexico.

The bottom line, many of our aquatic mollusks are already in trouble. Water quality problems are likely one of the primary reasons. This Commission clearly needs to set standards that protect our wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, sir.
MR. KLINGEL: Questions?

MR. CHAVEZ: There will be no questions. This is just public comment at this time.

MR. KLINGEL: Okay.
MR. CHAVEZ: Appreciate it.

MR. KLINGEL: Sure.

MR. CHAVEZ: Is there anybody else who would
like to provide public comment at this time?
Sir, please come forward.
MR. MORGAN: Good morning.
MR. CHAVEZ: Please state your name for the
record and get sworn.
MR. MORGAN: My name is James P. Morgan.
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JAMES P. MORGAN
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MORGAN: May I proceed?
MR. CHAVEZ: Please proceed.
MR. MORGAN: Okay.

I have comments and considerations with
respect to the hardness-based aluminum standard. Okay?
I'm a retired instructor and research chemist.

I do not have any specific experience in the matter of aluminum chemistry or toxicity, but $I$ have made it a point to research what information is available.

And my comments are only mine. I do belong to several water conservation organizations in Northern New Mexico, but my comments are simply mine. Okay?

And I have three basic considerations with respect to the chemistry involved with the hardness-based aluminum standard that $I$ would ask the Commission to consider.

The first consideration is that the values -the concentration values generated by the hardness-based standard are exceptionally large compared to what they had been previously, as $I$ think people are aware, and I think that the Commission needs to consider if even
these water concentration standards for aluminum are even -- or would be within the New Mexico surface water quality, because there are solubility constraints for aluminum. And that has to be considered with respect to these aluminum concentrations.

The second comment and consideration is that in the studies that were done to determine the toxicity levels it must be certain that the concentrations used were obtained from the reaction media, not simply from concentrations that were added to make the solutions. And that is a critical factor with respect to the development of the parameters in the hardness-based equation and in the determination of both the slope and the bias of values.

And what $I$ think is true is that for all those studies that were used those concentrations were simply either not determined, not available, or they were not used in the determination of the basic parameters for the hardness-based equation. That's a critical factor.

The third comment and with respect to the chemistry is that it is a basic tenet of chemical thermodynamics that it is not permissible to treat the content of a solid as having a concentration other than one. And unfortunately, that was done in several of the calculations that were used in the formulation of the
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hardness-based standard.
So those are my comments and considerations with respect to the aluminum hardness-based standard. But $I$ think it is really contingent upon the Commission to consider all of the proper documentation that should be required for the analysis of this hardness-based standard, should not rely on secondary information or opinions.

I think it should be the responsibility of the Commission to examine any documentation that was used to formulate the hardness-based standard.

As far as recommendation, I would say that if it is not found that the hardness-based aluminum standard meets at least those three criteria, then it should not be maintained. If it was not to be maintained, then some other aluminum standard should be in place, either the previous standard in New Mexico, which is -- was dissolved-based consideration, or the current federal standard, which is total recovery, or possibly even the ligand possibility that is being considered by the EPA.

So that concludes my comments, and $I$ would be willing to entertain any questions.

MR. CHAVEZ: Sir, at this point, we appreciate
that. This is just public comment.
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MR. MORGAN: That's it?

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you very much.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

Anybody else in the audience want to give
public comment at this time?

Please approach, ma'am.

MS. BONIME: My name is Karen Bonime, and
that's spelled

B-like-boy-O-N-like-Nancy-I-M-like-Mary-E.

MR. CHAVEZ: Please swear the witness in. KAREN BONIME
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. BONIME: One of the things I'm concerned
about --

MS. GREENWALD: Can't hear you.
MS. BONIME: Oh, sorry.

One of the things I'm concerned about when $I$ hear about increasing the standards for aluminum allowed into our surface waters is that some of our surface waters are becoming, with, of course, a lot of treatment, part of our drinking water, and -- such as the Rio Grande. I believe 40 percent of Albuquerque's
water is now taken from the Rio Grande project, and it may increase in the future.

And the reason I'm concerned about aluminum in that water is the connection that has been made between ingestion of aluminum and the development of Alzheimer's disease.

I'm also concerned because of the river water that is used for agriculture. I'm sorry, I can't cite evidence on this, but $I$ have read that when chemical fertilizers were first introduced, aluminum uptake by plant roots increased substantially, and there was concomitant increase in certain diseases human -- among humans. I'm sorry, I can't tell you which they were. It's been almost 50 years since $I$ read this.

But $I$ would like the Commission to look at possible increases in -- in crop plants uptake of aluminum, which might result from increased aluminum dissolved in the river waters, in the surface waters. And $I$ know we're talking mainly about ephemeral waters, but some of these ephemeral waters do end up in the larger streams, $I$ believe.

Am I right on that?
MS. GREENWALD: Yes.
MS. BONIME: Anybody?
MS. GREENWALD: Yes. You're right.

MS. BONIME: Okay.
So adding aluminum to the ephemeral waters
means possibly adding aluminum to the food we eat and to our drinking water. I'm very concerned about that, and I hope that the Commission will -- will take that into consideration in evaluating any changes to the standards.

Thank you.

I'm a member of the water groups, and although I don't speak for that organization, I'm speaking for myself. And $I$ do not have a degree in chemistry or anything, but $I$ do have a bachelor's degree from Harvard University, and $I$ read a lot of scientific literature.

So I'm grateful for the opportunity to offer my comments. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, ma'am.

Anybody else wish to give public comment at this time?

Sir, please come forward.
MR. FLOOD: My name is Michael Flood. I'm a resident of Angel Fire, New Mexico.

THE REPORTER: Spell your last name, please.

MR. FLOOD: Flood, F-as-in-Frank-L-O-O-D.

MICHAEL FLOOD
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. FLOOD: I am retired. I occasionally serve as a consultant in chemistry and toxicology. I received my PhD in chemistry from Columbia University in 1970. I spent time in Brazil as a National Academy of Sciences overseas research fellow.

I was a postdoctoral fellow in inorganic chemistry at Stanford University from 1973 and '74. I was then assistant professor of chemistry at Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin, for three years, and one of the courses I taught included a course in aquatic chemistry.

I spent 18 years in the government, both EPA and FDA, not related to this at all, just as a chemist -- resident chemist. But from 1995 until I retired last year, $I$ served as a staff scientist at the Washington, DC law firm Keller and Heckman. I performed risk assessments for directing incidental additives in the diets of humans and livestock.

I specialized in toxicology during this time. Some of the projects with which $I$ was involved included the safety of aluminum compounds when present as
incidental components in the diets of livestock. I am familiar with the mammalian toxicology of aluminum.

I believe my background is relevant to this discussion in that the aluminum present in natural waters may ultimately be ingested by humans, whether directly as drinking water or indirectly through plant and animal food containing aluminum from these waters. The higher the aluminum concentration in these waters, the higher the potential human exposure.

So therefore, $I$ speak in support of the proposal to return the aluminum standards to the previous ones set by EPA, that is 750 milligrams per liter and 87 milligrams per liter for acute and chronic exposure based on total recoverable aluminum. Efforts should be made to minimize the aluminum concentration in an aquatic system.

As you probably may know, aluminum is the third-most common element in the earth's crust and the most common metal. Aluminum is not known to have any beneficial use in the human body. It is not an essential trace element. However, it is not inert, but a known neurotoxin, as demonstrated in numerous toxicology studies on rats and mice.

In fact, toxicology studies on aluminum have been summarized in at least four recent national or
international documents. The more -- the most recent one is that of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, JECFA, in 2011.

Long-term studies as well as reproductive development studies have shown neurobehavioral effects such as impaired learning in maze tests. Aluminum concentrations have increased in the brains of those animals.

The JECFA evaluation established a provisional tolerable weekly intake for aluminum of 2 milligrams per kilogram body weight per week. A weekly intake was deemed appropriate than a daily intake due to the cumulative nature of aluminum after exposure.

JECFA concluded that for adults estimates of mean dietary exposure to aluminum-containing food additives may approach the weekly provisional tolerable intake. But for children, dietary exposure can exceed the PTWI by up to twofold. These estimates assumed low aluminum contribution from drinking water on the order of .1 parts per million.

Given the known toxicity of aluminum, it is prudent to go with the earlier EPA recommendation. I think any studies to raise that limit, which are the current limits of New Mexico, which apparently are the least conservative in the nation, should at least be
up-to-date studies in accordance with established protocols, perhaps protocols approved by EPA.

The current New Mexican standard exceeds EPA acute criteria of 1988 by factors as high as 13 percent and chronic criteria by factors as high as 46 percent. I think for the safety of the people in New Mexico, these should be revisited.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you.

I speak as a personal representative.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much, sir.
Anyone else wish to give public comment at this time?

Seeing none, I'll go ahead and -- ma'am, please step forward.

MS. DIAZ'-D'OUVILLE: Thank you, sir. SYLVIANA DIAZ-D'OUVILLE
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT
THE REPORTER: And state and spell your full name, please.

MS. DIAZ-D'OUVILLE: My name is Sylviana
Diaz-d'Ouville.

And I'm not coming as any particular
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individual with information about science or anything else. Basically I'm coming as an appalled citizen of an organization that would permit any more pollutants into our water.

New Mexico's water is so precious. Ephemeral ponds pouring so much life to the brief moments they are there. I do not understand why anybody would consider allowing more pollutants into the very precious water that we have, and the fact that the population is growing and demanding on it more, demanding more water.

I come from a mining community. There was a tiny, little, narrow creek at one point. It was a pretty, little creek. We had Russian olives, we had willows. But then the copper mine over at Santa -- at Santa Rita started letting things down. Pretty soon it was a green, nasty-looking puddle.

We were fascinated with it, because whenever it really foamed up, it foamed all this multi-colored foam. And it was hard. But we couldn't walk in it. It would rot our shoes out. Couldn't play in it. There was no such thing as playing in it. And it would kill all the trees and all the little tadpoles we get from time to time.

We cannot permit any more toxins, whether it's
aluminum, chromium or whatever else some idiot polluter
decides. It is cheap and easy, and we're an easy state to dump into, to dump into our water.

I suggest we keep our standards really, really
high and keep any more pollutants from entering what precious water we have left.

Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, ma'am.
Anyone else wish to give public comment at this time?

Seeing none, we're going to break until 1:15, at which point we will resume the hearing.

Thank you.
(Proceedings in recess from 12:08 p.m. to
1:15 p.m.)
MR. CHAVEZ: We're back on the record.
At this time, $I$ would like to continue with
questions from the Commission.
So, Mr. Chairman, I'll turn it back over to you.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer.
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CHARLES L. NYLANDER
having been previously duly sworn or affirmed, was examined and testified further as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION (Resumed)
BY THE COMMISSION:
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Tongate, you had left off.

Commissioner Dawson.
MR. DAWSON: My question was already asked by another Commissioner.

Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Okay.
Commissioner Waters.
MR. WATERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Nylander -- and I appreciate -- I've
listened to the questions from Commissioner Hutchinson and DeRose-Bamman, and that was, you know -particularly the questions regarding the -- the change of use designation for the streams from the secondary to primary, and the questioning on that.

Also I listened to the exchange between yourself and the counsel for the Environment Department, and $I$ think that clarified some things, and it, if you'll excuse the expression, muddied up the water for some other things.
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So I guess what $I$ need to do is clarify it in my mind. So excuse me if it sounds like I'm repeating some of the questions.

But is it your understanding that from what the Environment Department counsel addressed with you, that the upgrading the designation from a secondary to a primary use designation does not require a UAA?

MR. NYLANDER: That is my understanding and my belief, that you don't have to do a UAA if you're upgrading the use, you only have to do it if you're downgrading.

MR. WATERS: Downgrading the use. Okay.
And is it your position that the Environment Department basically did not have enough empirical evidence -- per your quoting of the EPA handbook in question, that they did not bring to bear enough empirical evidence to justify the change of this use designation from a secondary to a primary?

MR. NYLANDER: Yes, it is, Commissioner. I didn't find the evidence really compellingly supportive of upgrading those uses to primary. It was more speculative based on anecdotes and on basically, I think, their rebuttable presumption understanding that they just wanted to do it.

MR. LONGWORTH: Mr. Chairman, on that point?

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Yes.
MR. LONGWORTH: I'm sorry.
Commissioner Waters, just on that point?
MR. WATERS: Um-hum.
MR. LONGWORTH: Mr. Nylander, we talked -- you said empirical evidence.

Was there any quantitative or qualitative evidence provided to make the change from -- to upgrade the -- these nine segments?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Longworth, there were statements in the reasons for the change under different segments that talked about people observing people swimming in the water or web site information promoting the use of water for the public, those kind of things. They were more qualitative.

I think -- I didn't remember seeing any real demonstrative, quantitative information that -- you know, with documented observations and dates and -- and that sort of thing, to say that people indeed were using that water for swimming.

I think -- the example, I think, of Brantley Reservoir, $I$ think they did say that the web site for that recreational area does provide for boating and for SCUBA diving and game fishing and that sort of thing.

So they're tying in some collaborative and
corroborating statements, but $I$ didn't think that in total, when $I$ looked at all nine segments -- I didn't think that it kind of met the threshold of real sound evidence that those uses were attainable.

MR. LONGWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you, Commissioner.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Back to you, Commissioner Waters.

MR. WATERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Well, following up on that, then, are you
aware of any regulatory reason or any -- anything out there that would prohibit the Environment Department from providing a more empirical justification for the upgrading? Is there anything out there that would prohibit them from doing that, for -- in the regulations or the statutes?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Waters, no. I don't think anything would prohibit them from gathering more information.

And as $I$ stated, EPA has already, in both the Water Quality Standards Handbook and in their Record of Decision on the 2005 triennial, indicated that another option for protecting secondary contact waters for occasional primary contact use would be just to raise the bacterial criteria for those segments, in line with
what's protective of primary use, and leave the standard at secondary.

And I -- in answering a question to
Commissioner Hutchinson, I said the advantage of that is just that -- that EPA will approve that as fully protective of the 101 use for recreation, but it then allows you not to in the sometime future have a primary contact designation. And you'd like to lower it, and when you lower it, you have to do the use attainability analysis.

So the shortcut way to do it without putting yourself in jeopardy would be leave it secondary contact and just increase the bacterial criteria to that for primary.

MR. WATERS: Thank you.
That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Okay.
Commissioner Sayer.
MR. SAYER: I just had one question.
It seems to me that the gist of you and your clients' concern -- and $I$ think it's reasonable -- is the cost associated with compliance, if we're talking about more fishable/swimmable waters, if we're talking about a narrower temporary standard, and if we're talking about, you know, your concerns about ephemeral
designations.
So correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems to me that that is the gist of your concern, is the cost associated with -- with all of those and the transactional cost issues as you identified them in your declaration.

Is that -- would that be a fair assessment on my part?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Sayer, yes. That's a -- that's a fair assessment.

And I feel like the parties that went through the UAA process to downgrade their designated uses for waters that were previously in Section 98 for nonperennial -- nonperennial waters, that they had to have some kind of an associated business cost in mind as to why they would have taken the effort to spend money on doing the UAA to move themselves over into the ephemeral water category that has a little bit more relaxed designated uses.

And so there has to be some motivation from a business standpoint of why you would want to get out of that intermittent water category and over into the ephemeral category.

And $I$ think that just -- this is all tied up with the rebuttable presumption adoption in the
standards and the fact that the whole universe now is out there with streams that have this fishable/swimmable designated use and primary contact and marginal warm water fishery and -- and that there are -- it's costly to have to go through the process to put those in the ephemeral category if you truly think that that's where they belong.

And I just -- I find it kind of, oh, a ridiculous proposition to protect all of the 100,000 miles of streams and water bodies, wetlands, playas and so forth, for swimming and fishing and -- and the fact that those uses, you know, in common sense are not attainable. It mixes -- it mixes the whole thing up.

MR. SAYER: SO I think it's probably indisputable, probably, that in a perfect world we would all want fishable/swimmable waters everywhere, you know, in a perfect world. But we have limitations that we all recognize, and certainly costs -- the directed transactional costs associated with compliance. And attaining those -- those standards certainly is relevant and reasonable.

I guess my question, though, is, as you've acknowledged and others have noted here this morning, this afternoon now, there are direct and indirect costs associated with water that is not fishable/swimmable,
right?
And so I'm wondering if your client has done any cost assessments to demonstrate or to -- they could show the Commission that would say, look, it is more costly to designate more waters fishable/swimmable, it is more costly to do these UAAs, than it is to protect the water and to have a higher -- you know, a higher use designation.

I mean, does that make sense?
MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Commission -- Commissioner Thayer -- Sayer, it does, and it doesn't, in that -- you know, my -- I guess my -- my point really is that right now the standards protect all the unclassified nonperennial waters of the state for swimming and fishing.

And when you look at the definition of waters of the state, and you see all the categories that it applies to -- I mean, we're talking about all the arroyos, the washes, the wetlands, playa lakes -certainly this state is not intent on trying to create fishable waters out of an arroyo or swimmable waters out of an arroyo.

And I'm just saying that the way that that category reads in Section 98, that it's -- it would be an impossible task to really meet those designated uses
in all those kinds of water bodies, and yet, because of the wording now in that section of the standards, that's what it -- that's what it portends to do.

And I -- I think that EPA in recent
correspondence has said that, well, now that, you know, primary contact and marginal warm water fisheries has been adopted for all these nonperennial waters of the state, we need to start talking about wetlands, and we need to start developing a, you know, more rigorous program on wetlands.

And I'm just saying that these are typically common sense-wise water bodies that you never envisioned in your whole life would ever be swimmable/fishable.

MR. SAYER: I guess my question, though, is -because I think -- I understand what you're saying, but it seems to me it's premised on the position that the direct and indirect costs of the position you're advocating are greater than the direct and indirect costs of the position that the Department has taken in the rule as they -- as they have put it forward.

MR. NYLANDER: Yeah. Mr. -- Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Sayer, yes. I mean, I am testifying that there is some really significant cost implications involved in the way it's set up now.

MR. SAYER: So that was my question, is have
you articulated those costs? Has your client done anything to say here are the costs?

Because I see your -- your declaration --
MR. NYLANDER: Right.
MR. SAYER: -- and it seems to be rather conclusory without any, you know, substance to back it up.

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Sayer, in my -- in my direct and rebuttal testimony, I did include some cost information that did show that basically there were costs for the Environment Department to do the UAA analyses on the 19 segments that they -- that they've proposed for adoption in this triennial, that they spent money on outside consultants, they certainly spent money on internal resources.

They would argue that, you know, divided -all the money they spent divided into the 19 segments, that it wasn't very much money. But it's still money.

And then I also provided information about the five segments being moved into the ephemeral category that Chino Mines is proposing, and there the cost estimate was north of $\$ 150,000$ that was spent over a four-year time period to accomplish that.

And I'm just saying that it's going to vary
from petitioner to petitioner how much money it will
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cost them to get a water body out of Section 98 and into 97, and -- and that even the most simple level 1 hydrology protocol sort of analysis -- most consulting firms I've talked to, that would be a minimum of $\$ 10,000$, just to go through that initial screening process.

So I -- you know, statewide with over 100,000 miles of these kind of streams and -- I just think it's going to have unintended cost implications for the state.

MR. SAYER: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Chairman, no --
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Okay.
Mr. Nylander, a little bit of a follow-up from the two previous Commissioners' questions.

You've talked about your proposed alternative of moving from secondary to primary and changing the bacteria level.

Going with that hypothetical, if that was done, and a water body couldn't meet that bacterial criteria down the road, we find out that they can't hit that higher level, what would be the process and the cost associated with then lowering the bacteria level back down to where it was originally as a secondary contact?
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MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Dominguez, I -- I think if we're talking about those nine segments that have been proposed to be raised from secondary contact to primary contact, if you do make that change to primary, you're going to adopt the primary bacterial criteria in any case.

And if you leave the use at secondary and in -- and elevate the bacterial criteria to what would normally support primary, either way, if the stream then is shown ultimately that it's not meeting that particular criteria, then a water body goes on the 303 (d) list, and there will be efforts made to try to figure out where the source of the bacteria is coming from.

And if it's point source or nonpoint source contributions and -- and ultimately there may be some - if there's an NPDES permitted discharger on that segment, ultimately they may get a more restrictive permit requirement for bacteria, that sort of thing.

But $I$ think there -- whenever a stream is not meeting a criteria, then you could just presume that there could be cost implications for trying to correct that.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Right. And that's part of the -- I was just trying to come up with somewhat of a
comparison, because you've focused on that if down the road one of those that has been moved to primary wants to be moved back to a second it requires a UAA and the costs associated with that.

So I'm trying to compare that, since you've focused on the -- the cost and the process to go through that, compared to your proposal of just changing the bacteria level, but there's still going to be something involved with that. And so I'm just trying to compare those.

MR. NYLANDER: And, Mr. Chairman, I think the distinction is that if the criteria either way are the primary contact bacteria criteria, and if they're not met, then down the road there may be some costs in trying to solve the source of the -- of the increased bacteria.

But the real benefit, as I mentioned to Commissioner Howard -- Hutchinson, is the cost avoidance of staying at secondary contact, that you don't find yourself having to do a UAA. If you go to primary contact and at some point in time you say, gee, this stream just really can't -- bacteria-wise it can't attain that, and we want to -- we want to downgrade it to secondary with a more relaxed bacteria criteria, you would have to perform a UAA to do that.

KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS
110 Twelfth Street, Northwest, Albuquerque, New Mexico

So it's cost avoidance to leave the use at secondary contact and a -- and if you want to meet the thrust of the $101(a)(2)$ goals, then raise the bacterial criteria, but you are protecting yourself from the -from the cost of a UAA.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Okay. Thank you.
One other quick question.
You, during your oral testimony, had proposed the concept of this Commission creating a task force to look at methods as such challenging EPA's rebuttable presumption.

If -- if that's already been challenged in the court system and EPA won that challenge, what leads you to believe that there is a path or something that EPA would be amenable changing if there's already court precedent set?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, that's a very good question.

And, you know, in the -- in the 2000 court case that upheld the rebuttable presumption in that case, in a different state -- I don't know the facts and circumstances regarding that court case, but what $I$ have hoped for is that a working group developing a sound white paper and position on the rebuttable presumption 101(a) (2) uses being assigned to all unclassified
nonperennial waters, as it is now in
Section 20.6.4.98-- that there would be hope that they could see that that puts the state in a ridiculous position, and that -- and that they might be able to find a way to work with the state to refine the standards in -- both in that section and in other related sections dealing with these ephemeral waters, these nonperennial waters. I mean, anything that's nonperennial is in that ballpark.

So I don't think that $I$ would give up hope just because there's been a court case that -- and especially depending on now the rule -- the waters of the US rule that's been stayed now nationally by the 31 states that -- that litigated it -- it's hard to tell how EPA's going to come out on the waters of the $u$ d rule and whether they'll draw back in.

They may end up eliminating jurisdiction over ephemeral streams and over some of these tributaries and things.

So I'm hopeful that there will be a positive outcome that -- that the rational minds and common sense would say surely you don't expect $u$ s to swim in a wet meadow or fish in a -- in a dry playa lake. And, you know, I -- $I$ can't think of any reason why not to try.

In my previous tenure with the Environmental

Improvement Agency, Environmental Improvement Division, we fought those kind of battles every day with EPA, and I think this one is worth exploring to see if you can have a rational leg to stand on.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Fair enough. I'm inspired by your optimism of EPA's rationale.

With that, Commissioners, any follow-up questions?

Commissioner Hutchinson.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Something that got changed in my mind about the temporary standards.

The way that $I$ was reading the way the temporary standards are proposed, this would apply to any activity, but $I$-- in questioning the Environment Department and -- and other questions that came from the Commission, it -- for me, it created the impression we were only talking about permitted applicants going for the temporary standards.

But in your testimony, you talked about temporary standards being utilized by watershed restoration groups, soil and water conservation districts on stream restoration and erosion control.

Is it your impression that these are just restricted to permitted applicants, or -- or is this the whole world of activities out there?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hutchinson, it's my belief that it would apply to the whole world, that the -- for example, the -- a watershed group in San Juan County, maybe associated with the San Juan Water Commission, might find that the selenium criteria in that part of the state just couldn't be met, and they got their heads together and said we ought to petition for a temporary standard on the selenium criteria and have some time to do some work in the watershed, whether that's best management practices or some kind of land use, some kind of control of sources.

But they might have a -- do a convincing study that shows that they really could maybe improve the meeting of that selenium criteria through some work, in which case a temporary standard on the Department's focal point of just applying a criteria would be helpful.

They could -- they could get a time-limited period when they wouldn't have to worry about meeting the exact number for selenium today, they could get some relaxed criteria that they could work with over time to -- to basically try to improve the characteristics of that watershed.

And so it's a valuable tool for anyone interested in watershed restoration.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Pattison.
MR. PATTISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Commissioner Tongate asked a question about the effect on farmers and ranchers, and my -- I'd like to be a little more specific, and that's playa lakes, completely closed pieces, no chance of anybody swimming in a lake or cattle would water and so forth.

What's your thoughts on the effect of all this on those land owners?

MR. NYLANDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Pattison, right now playa lakes is enumerated in the definition of waters of the state, and therefore it is subject to the requirements of 20.6.4.98, if it is a nonperennial unclassified waters of the state.

And so by being included in that category, the designated use goal for those playa lakes would be primary contact recreation and marginal warm water fishery.

The cost implication for ranchers and farmers that might have that on their -- playa lake on their land is that if they -- I think -- I'm not certain if $I$ can really say what they all might be, but $I$ think there would be some business costs involved in -- in saying, well, I can't meet those water quality goals on that
particular playa lake so I'd like to move that over into an ephemeral category under the .97 section of the standards, and in order to do that, I'd have to spend money doing a UAA to show that those uses are not attainable on my playa lake.

And I don't -- further than that, I really -I really can't conjure up what the unanticipated costs are, but $I$ think it makes me nervous when you have a rule that applies to almost everything in the state, that -- that is listed in the definition of waters of the state, and it says the goal for those things is to be fishable and swimmable.

I just find that threatening, if you will.
MR. PATTISON: Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: If there's no more questions from the Commission.

Seeing none, Mr. Hearing Officer, I'll turn it back over to you.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
At this point, I would like to look to public for any cross-examination of this witness.

MS. GREENWALD: To the public?
MR. CHAVEZ: Yes, ma'am.
MS. BONIME: Not just comment but
cross-examination?
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MR. CHAVEZ: Ma'am, it will be
cross-examination of the witness limited to only those things brought up in testimony.

MS. BONIME: Right.
MR. CHAVEZ: It's not public comment.
MS. BONIME: Right.
MS. GREENWALD: Can I -- can I cross-examine?
MR. CHAVEZ: Yes.
Please have a seat, ma'am.
And just let me remind you it's limited to only those matters that have come up. There could be an objection from counsel, at which point I'll--

MS. GREENWALD: All right.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MS. GREENWALD:
Q. I want to describe the only ephemeral stream that $I$ am familiar with and to -- for you to apply what you're asking for to that ephemeral stream. Okay?

For years I lived in Dixon, New Mexico, which is downgradient from Ojo Sarco. So in Dixon the Embudo River runs through there, but the Embudo doesn't run through ojo sarco. Ojo sarco can be interpreted to mean dry spring. But the springs in ojo sarco run certainly in the early part of the year, and people use it for watering their animals and for sometimes gardening.

And then that stream sometimes dries up. But what almost always dries up is the stream as it flows through the canyon, toward the Embudo. So there's a canyon between Ojo Sarco and Dixon. And that stream goes over a waterfall into a pool.

And it's a famous -- famous -- it's a favorite destination of people who want to swim and jump off the rocks into the pool in the early part of the summer, and then by the late part of the summer, the stream has dried up.

So I'm assuming that would be an ephemeral stream.

Would that be true?
A. Mr. Chairman, in answer, $I$ think that would probably be classified as an intermittent stream, if it has water in it certain times of the year and -- you know, an ephemeral stream is just one that runs in -- in response to precipitation. So a flash flood in an arroyo or something would be an ephemeral situation.

But a stream as you described, that has some spring flow contribution in the early spring and -- and has a permanent pool, that sounds to me like it might better fit in the intermediate water category.
Q. Uh-huh. And that's not addressed by your testimony, written or oral, the intermittent streams.
A. It is. If -- if that particular stream segment is not already classified, then it, too, is one of the 100,000 that are in the current standards under 20.4.6.98 as nonperennial unclassified waters.

And so it -- that stream presently has uses and criteria assigned to protect that stream.
Q. Well, my concern is that since this spot is only known to the local people, and --
A. And all of us that now know about it.
Q. Well, now -- now you do know about it. I guess maybe that's not -- not good.

But -- but it -- I don't know how many places there are like that in New Mexico that might be unknown to -- or was -- or were unknown to the people here.

And I just wish that, you know, our criteria would protect the children that swim in that pool in the early part of the summer, in a place that --

MR. CHAVEZ: Ma'am, if $I$ can stop you right there.

MS. GREENWALD: -- very few people would -- I think I'm about to stop at the end of this sentence.

MR. CHAVEZ: But, ma'am, I just -- what $I$ want to make sure is that you're asking a question of the witness. This is not a time to make opinion --

MS. GREENWALD: Uh-huh.

MR. CHAVEZ: -- or make comment to the Commission.

MS. GREENWALD: Okay.
Q. So do you agree with me that you would like to see that stream and that swimming hole protected?
A. Yes.
Q. Uh-huh.

And how do you think that best can be done?
A. Well, currently the way the standards are written, it is protected at least by the wording in the standards for those kind of designated uses. So no - it is protected at current time.

Now, if the persons that own that land and that particular pool if --
Q. BLM.
A. BLM. If they ever wanted to, you know, come in there and do something with it and -- and maybe alter it, they might have to take notice of this water quality standard and be careful not to -- not to do anything detrimental to the protection of those uses.
Q. What concerns me is that, you know, who knows about these uses, you know?
A. Right.
Q. Like -- yeah.
A. Well, thank you very much.
Q. Okay.

Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, ma'am.
Is there anybody else in the audience that would wish cross-examination -- cross-examine this witness?

Seeing none, I would like to go back to counsel for any redirect.

MS. MCCALEB: I have just a few questions, please.

MR. CHAVEZ: Please proceed.
MS. MCCALEB: Thank you.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MCCALEB:
Q. Mr. Nylander, during the Bureau's cross-examination, Ms. Becker walked you through the new EPA rule.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And she asked you several questions about

EPA's UAA requirement; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe you testified that language in the rule states a UAA must be performed to show fishable/swimmable uses are not
attainable before a non-101(a) (2) use can be designated; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you testified the same with regard to a downgrade of the use, that a UAA is required; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Mr. Nylander, have you seen anything in that EPA rule that indicates that all preexisting secondary contact designated uses must be upgraded if a UAA has not previously been performed?
A. I do not see anything in the rule.
Q. And with respect to the nine segments that the Bureau proposes to upgrade to primary contact, isn't it true there wouldn't be any UAAs because at the time they were designated UAAs were not required?
A. That is -- that is my opinion. Yes. That's correct.
Q. And in fact, EPA previously approved the secondary contact designations.
A. That is correct.
Q. So what is the applicable standard for determining whether the nine segments should be upgraded?

Is that found in 40 CFR Section 131.20?
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A. I believe it is. Yes.
Q. And do you have that in front of you?
A. I don't.
Q. I can give you a copy.
A. In my mind, $I$ think $I$ have an idea what it says, but --
Q. I'll just give you my copy. And could you please read that rule for us?
A. "The State shall from time to time, but at least once every three years, review applicable water quality standards and, as appropriate, modify and adopt standards. Any water body segment with water quality standards that do not include the uses specified in section $101(a)$ of the Clean Water Act shall be re-examined to determine if any new information has become available. If such new information indicates that the uses specified in Clean Water Act section $101(a)(2)$ are attainable, the State shall revise its standards accordingly." (As read.)
Q. And your testimony before this Commission has been that no such information has been -- has been provided; is that correct?
A. I -- my testimony was that the information that was provided was not very substantial.
Q. Thank you for that clarification.

Mr. Nylander, could you please turn to page 24 of your rebuttal testimony.

And at the bottom of that page, there was a sentence that Ms. Becker questioned you about that states "I disagree with the assertion that a UAA must support the -- must support the existing designated use of secondary contact."

Do you see that?
It's after the long indented quote.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And do you recall Ms. Becker questioning you about that sentence?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you please clarify the context in which you made that statement?
A. I believe I made that statement in the context that -- I believe the testimony of Ms. Pintado, that the UAA must -- must exist to -- to basically underpin a designated use of secondary contact.

I -- I see no -- nothing in the rules or requirements that says that has to be in the file drawer, if it's an existing designated use. If you were trying to assign a brand new use of secondary contact, you may end up having to do a -- no. I'm sorry. I'll take that back. Never mind.

I'm getting confused myself.
Q. Let me ask a follow-up question to clarify. You're stating that you see a distinction
about when a UAA is required between instances where you're designating a use in the first instance or downgrading a use or you have a preexisting designated use; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And of those three instances, when is a UAA required?
A. A UAA is required if you're going to downgrade a 101(a) (2) designated use to a lesser subcategory.
Q. And is a UAA also required by EPA if in the first instance you are designating a non-101(a) (2) use?
A. No. I don't believe there -- it is.
Q. I'd like to move to some questioning by Commissioner Hutchinson.

He asked you about the public hearing requirement for the Department's temporary standards proposal.

Do you recall that questioning?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you please confirm for the Commission what the EPA rule says about temporary standards with respect to whether they're considered a water quality standard?
A. Yes. The EPA rule considers a temporary standard a water quality standard, and as such, if a petitioner here in New Mexico were to request a temporary standard in -- that would have to go before the Commission as an amendment or change to the water quality standards, the process, and so there would have to be a public hearing on that kind of activity.
Q. Thank you. Commissioner Hutchinson also asked you a question about whether there are any costs associated with the designation of an ephemeral water as an intermittent water in Section 98.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Does the fact that 30 UAAs have been performed since the last triennial review in order to move segments from a Section 98 classification to a Section 97 classification as an ephemeral stream give you any thoughts about costs associated with the original designation as an intermittent water?
A. Yes. I would -- I would think that the 30 segments that the parties that had a desire to move those out of 98 and into 97 -- that they had to have some business costs motivation to go to the effort, to spend money on a UAA and show that they qualify for the

Section 97 listing, which has a little bit lower set of -- less -- less stringent set of designated uses and -- and criteria.
Q. Moving on to a question by Chairman Dominguez, he asked you about the case upholding EPA's rebuttable presumption.

Do you recall that question?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Mr. Nylander, do you know whether that case is binding in New Mexico?
A. I do not.
Q. And back to another question from Commissioner Hutchinson, he asked whether the whole world could use the temporary standard provision or just permittees.

Do you recall that line of questioning?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could I please refer you to the Department's second amended petition, their most recent proposal for the temporary standards provision?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And could you read the first line under Section F.(1) there, please.
A. Section F.(1) says "Any person may petition the commission to adopt a temporary standard applicable to all or part of a surface water of the state as
provided for in this section and applicable Subsections in 40 CFR Part 131.14."
Q. And in addition to that, there was the question about the use of this provision to implement restoration activities.

And restoration activities are addressed in Section F.(1)(a).

Do you see that there?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you anticipate it would be only permittees doing restoration activities, or would it more likely be agencies or watershed groups and other such organizations?
A. I believe it would be -- it would be all of the above. I think that watershed groups and agencies would be the likely group to want to do restoration, and a permittee on a case-by-case basis might, but I think it's more the land management agencies and the -- and the watershed-based groups and the environmental groups that might want to collectively do a watershed restoration project.
Q. And could you please turn to the new EPA rule at page 51037?
A. Okay.
Q. On the far right-hand column, the last
paragraph, about three-quarters of the way through that paragraph, there's a sentence beginning "EPA added this new factor."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you read that and provide -- could you just read that sentence, please?
A. "EPA added this new factor for when states and authorized tribes wish to obtain a water quality standards variance because they expect a time-limited exceedance of a criterion when removing a dam or during significant wetlands, lake, or stream
reconfiguration/restoration efforts."
Q. Thank you.

And so does that provide support for the conclusion that the temporary standard could be used globally rather than just by permittees?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. Mr. Nylander, several Commissioners have questioned you about your testimony concerning increasing the bacteria criteria to primary contact levels rather than upgrading a secondary contact use.
Do you recall those questions?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you please provide the cite to the water

Quality Standards Handbook that supports your testimony?
A. Yes. The Water Quality Standards Handbook Chapter 2, Designation of Uses, it's 2.1.3, Recreation, and $I$ discussed in my testimony today the use of Option 2 to assign the secondary contact use, but also upgrade the bacterial criteria sufficient to support primary contact recreation.

My testimony was that that would be protective of the Clean Water Act Section $101(a)(2)$ goals.

Furthermore, I alluded to the fact that in the EPA's Record of Decision on the 2005 triennial review, that EPA stated that they recognize another option, the state can designate secondary contact and establish criteria that protect for primary contact.

And so in that Record of Decision, the text goes on, but they do acknowledge that that is a way to assign a subcategory of the recreation use, which is secondary contact, but still meet the protective goals of 101(a)(2) fishable/swimmable goals by assigning the more stringent primary contact bacteria limit.

MS. MCCALEB: Thank you.
I have no further questions.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Ms. McCaleb.
At this time, I would like to bring forward
Amigos Bravos, presentation of their case.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Schlenker-Goodrich, is it my understanding that rebuttal testimony will be included in this direct?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Yes.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I'll go through that in my intro.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
Please proceed.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Good afternoon,
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Mr. Hearing Officer.
My name is Erik Schlenker-Goodrich. I'm with Western Environmental Law Center, and I represent Amigos Bravos.

I want to emphasize at the outset that our expert, Dr. Deke Gundersen, is only available today. In accord with that time limitation, what we are going to do, and after conferring with other parties, we are going to consolidate our direct and rebuttal testimony specifically on the issue of aluminum standards and Amigos Bravos' proposal to change the aluminum standards, and what we are going to do is then segment out the other Amigos Bravos issues to address later on in this hearing.
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So with the blessing of the Hearing Officer, I'd like to proceed in that format.

MR. CHAVEZ: Please proceed.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Also, I would like to
note that our two witnesses on this are Ms. Rachel Conn and Dr. Deke Gundersen. My hope is to present both of their consolidated direct and rebuttal testimony and then have both sit as a panel for cross-examination. Would that be appropriate, Mr. Hearing Officer?

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes, sir.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Thank you. Let me begin with you, Ms. Conn.

THE REPORTER: One second.
RACHEL CONN and DEKE GUNDERSEN
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, were examined and testified in direct and rebuttal as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF RACHEL CONN
BY MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH:
Q. Ms. Conn, could you please state your name for the record.
A. My name is Rachel Conn.

And good afternoon, Mr. Hearing Officer and
Mr. Chair and members of the Commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify
today.
Q. Ms. Conn, could you please briefly state your qualifications for the record.
A. I am the projects director and interim executive director for Amigos Bravos.

Amigos Bravos is a nonprofit river conservation organization dedicated to protecting and restoring the waters of New Mexico.

I have a BA in environmental biology and have worked for the past 17 years in the environmental field with an intense focus on -- intensive focus on water quality policy and protections.

I began my professional career working for the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection in data assessment, and $I$ have also worked for a nonprofit in Colorado assessing and addressing water quality problems associated with gold mining.

For the past 15 years, $I$ have worked for Amigos Bravos directly on New Mexico water quality policy and protection issues. As part of this work, I help New Mexico communities learn about and then use the Clean Water Act to protect and clean up their rivers, streams and other waters by giving trainings around the state on water quality standards, total maximum daily
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loads, national pollutant elimination system permits and other Clean Water Act topics.

I've also served on the advisory board of the clean -- national Clean Water Network for the past nine years, where I assist on guiding national Clean Water Act advocacy.

I have provided technical testimony related to the Clean Water Act requirements before this Commission on multiple occasions, including during the last two triennial reviews, as well as rulemaking processes designating and promulgating rules governing outstanding national resource waters.
Q. Ms. Conn, Amigos Bravos has submitted proposed changes and supported prefiled written testimony regarding New Mexico's aluminum criteria; is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Can you please summarize what Amigos Bravos' proposed changes are?
A. Amigos Bravos proposes to revert back to the EPA $304(a)$ recommended criteria for aluminum. These are 750 micrograms per liter for acute and 87 micrograms per liter for chronic.
Q. Why are you proposing these proposed -- why are you proposing these changes?
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A. For a number of reasons.

One, as Dr. Gundersen will outline in his
testimony, New Mexico's current hardness-based criteria is based on flawed science and incomplete data.

Two, the current hardness-based criteria is not protective of aquatic life.

Three, EPA has expressed new concerns about the hardness-based criteria during their review of west Virginia's preliminary proposal.

And four, we are concerned that the
hardness-based criteria doesn't take into -- other parameters into account. Notably, it does not take temperature into account, which is problematic here in New Mexico given temperature is one of the number -largest causes of impairment in the state.
Q. The hardness-based aluminum criteria were approved by EPA after the last triennial review, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is it that Amigos Bravos is now proposing to revert back to the pre-2009 criteria?
A. There are a number of reasons.

The main reason is that since the last
triennial review we have received a lot of concerns from
our membership. This concern was expressed to us
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primarily during the process for removing the aluminum TMDL on the Red River, which came as a direct result of downgrading, weakening the aluminum standard.

It was during this time that a number of our members and partners expressed concern about the new hardness-based criteria and its negative impacts on aquatic life.

Another reason that we are proposing this now instead of raising concerns during the last triennial review is that during the previous triennial review we did not have the resources or capacity to adequately address the issue. We have since been able to raise a limited amount of funding to do so, and so we are -- we are doing so now.
Q. You alluded to some concerns regarding the West Virginia proposal and that to a degree was a catalyst for Amigos Bravos' proposal today.

What concerns did EPA express regarding that proposal?

And I'm referring directly to Dr. Gensemer's exhibit for Chevron, this is Exhibit 8.
A. Yes. This was a January 30th, 2014 , letter from EPA to West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection.
And in this letter, EPA -- and as

Mr. Schlenker-Goodrich pointed out, this is CMI's Exhibit 8, which is attached to Dr. Gensemer's rebuttal testimony.

So in this letter, EPA expresses concerns that West Virginia's hardness proposal, which was based on the same GEI study, the same study which we based ours here in New Mexico, our current hardness based criteria -- it's the same as what was being proposed in West Virginia.

So EPA expressed concerns that this proposal did not incorporate the latest studies on aluminum toxicity to aquatic life.

In addition, the letter expresses concerns by the EPA and the US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding aluminum toxicity to mussel species. Specifically they were concerned that the hardness-based criteria would not be protective of mussel species.
Q. Do you believe that EPA's concerns expressed with regard to West Virginia's proposal are relevant to New Mexico?
A. Yes. I believe they're very much so relevant here in New Mexico, because we have numerous freshwater mussel species here in the state. Specifically, there are 23 species of mussels that are currently found in New Mexico waters. We've provided those species in

Supplemental Exhibit L.
Q. In the course of reviewing West Virginia's aluminum proposal, did you find other information that is relevant to concerns regarding New Mexico's hardness-based criteria?
A. Yes. I found an opinion report regarding West Virginia's hardness-based aluminum proposal prepared by Dr. Carys L. Mitchelmore, an aquatic toxicologist from the University of Maryland. This opinion report mirrors and reinforces the concerns expressed by our expert, Dr. Gundersen.

Specifically, it states that there is a lack of peer-reviewed studies to support the hardness based criteria. In addition, it expresses concerns that studies used to justify the hardness-based standard were not designed specifically to look at the relationship between aluminum toxicity and hardness. It also states that aluminum toxicity depends on many factors other than water hardness.

Bottom line, this opinion report is a detailed accounting of why the hardness-based criteria are not defensible.
Q. Fundamentally to ensure adequate protection for aquatic species in New Mexico, Amigos Bravos contends that reversion back to the EPA-recommended
$304(a)$ aluminum criteria is based on sound scientific evidence and would remedy the substantial underprotection for aquatic species provided by the current hardness-based aluminum criteria; is that correct?
A. Yes. It is still the case that the only nationally recommended criteria for aluminum is the $304(a)$ criteria, which Amigos Bravos is proposing that we revert back to here in New Mexico.
Q. And this position is supported by not only your testimony, but the prefiled written testimony of Dr. Deke Gundersen and the oral testimony of

Dr. Gundersen to follow; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Conn.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF DEKE GUNDERSEN
BY MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Gundersen.
A. Hello.
Q. Could you please state your name for the record?
A. Yes. Deke Gundersen, D-E-K-E, and it's not short for anything. People ask.
Q. You are here to testify in support of Amigos Bravos' proposal regarding New Mexico's hardness-based
aluminum surface -- aluminum surface water criteria and the change back to the pre-2009 EPA-approved $304(a)$ criteria; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you concisely summarize your qualifications on this issue?
A. Well, primarily my work with aluminum has to do with my PhD dissertation. I spent three years looking at the effects of hardness, dissolved organic carbon in pH, how they influenced aluminum toxicity in rainbow trout at a weakly -- weakly alkaline pH. Now that work we generated to publications from that work.

In addition, I have a pretty diverse background in environmental toxicology. Some of the current projects that I'm working on, we're looking at metals and organic contaminants in white sturgeon in the San Francisco Bay delta. I'm also looking at organic chlorine pesticides in marine mammals in the Pacific Northwest Coast.

Just recently got done publishing a paper that looked at mercury and fish in Antarctica. And then even further back, I've dealt with looking at partially combusted crude oil as a result of the Gulf War when they lit all the wells on fire, we looked at the toxicity of partially combusted oil on marine life.

MS. GREENWALD: Excuse me.

Could you move that microphone a little closer to you --

MR. GUNDERSEN: Closer? Okay.
MS. GREENWALD: -- or speak a little slower?

Thank you so much.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Okay. No worries.
Anyway, I've done a lot of different things.

I also serve on some water quality advisory
committees in State of Oregon that looks at surface water quality, as well. And $I$ belong to a variety of professional societies, including Society of Toxicology and Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, just to name a few.

Another project I'm currently working on is looking at the use of fungi to break down polyaromatic hydrocarbons in street sweepings that are collected in my local area.

So I've kind of done a little of everything, including spent a fair amount of time focusing on looking at the effects of aluminum and what role hardness plays in that.
Q. And your qualifications are more fully set forth in Section $I$ of your written testimony; is that correct?
A. Correct.

MS. BECKER: And for a moment, let me turn back to Ms. Conn.

Ms. Conn, your qualifications are also more fully set forth in your prefiled written direct testimony; is that correct?

MS. CONN: Correct.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Thank you.
Q. Dr. Gundersen, regarding Amigos Bravos' proposal, do you support that proposal?
A. I do.
Q. As an initial matter, why are protective aluminum criteria important? What is the problem with aluminum in surface waters?
A. Well, aluminum is toxic to aquatic life, particularly organisms -- particularly structures on these organisms that have to do with respiration and ional regulation. And in addition to this, the toxicity of aluminum is very complex, because there's more than one species that elicits toxicity, and that's heavily influenced by pH.

To add on top of this tox -- or to add to this complexity, then we have various water quality parameters that also influences aluminum's toxicity to aquatic life.

So it's a pretty complicated picture.
Q. Can you explain the basic difference between EPA's 304(a) recommended aluminum criteria, which Amigos Bravos has proposed to revert back to, and New Mexico's current hardness-based aluminum criteria?
A. Well, the big difference is that the current New Mexico hardness-based criteria would allow for more aluminum into local surface waters versus the former EPA criteria. So just based on comparing the two, the EPA criteria would be more protective just because it allows for lower levels of aluminum in surface waters.
Q. Would you characterize that difference as the -- that the current hardness-based aluminum criteria is substantially less protective than the $304(a)$ recommended criteria?
A. I would say it's substantially different in just looking at the relative difference in the two numbers.
Q. What is the basic state of the science regarding aluminum toxicity? And what about -- well, let me leave it there. What about -- what is the basic state of the science regarding aluminum toxicity and specifically the state of the science regarding the interplay between hardness and aluminum toxicity?
A. So if you look at all the metals out there
that have been studied, aluminum is probably one of those metals that has the least amount of research backing it.

If you look at lead, for example, so some states have adopted hardness-based criteria for lead. And if you look at the number of studies that were utilized to derive those equations, vast number, huge more number of studies that are used to derive those criteria.

So one of the problems is there's just not a lot of research relative to some of these other metals where we've derived these hardness-based equations.

In addition to that, there's not been much work with aluminum toxicity at the sort of alkaline pH range, and particularly there's not been much work done looking at the effects of hardness at this pH range. There's really only a few studies that have looked at this particular pH range, although the current criteria is all the way up to pH 9.0 , which is well into the alkaline pH range.
Q. EPA guidelines explain that a change in water criteria -- water quality criteria should be based on, quote, unquote, sound scientific evidence and that criteria were, quote, unquote, substantially over- or underprotective; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In promulgating New Mexico's hardness-based criteria, that criteria was based on a study prepared by GEI; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Was the GEI study, in your expert opinion, the requisite sound scientific evidence sufficient to change the aluminum criteria?
A. So I don't know. If you look at the EPA document, it's pretty strong language that says you got to provide sound evidence that it's overprotective. And if you look at those -- at least the reports that I've looked at done by GEI, they mention a couple of studies that were utilized for the EPA criteria -- one I believe was striped bass, the other was brook trout -- and that those studies were problematic.

And I'm not really arguing that fact. But they didn't provide -- so there's supposedly -- one of the -- the rationale for adopting this new equation is all these new studies. Right? So it's time to update this thing.

So if there's all these new studies, I didn't at least see in any of the reports where they said, well, here's a few studies here that demonstrates that the existing criteria are well overprotective. Because,
for example, $I$ could provide studies right now that would sort of show that the EPA criteria are just barely protective, if you look at particular species like mussels, for example.
Q. In evaluating the GEI study, you provide, on page 5 of your written direct testimony, Table 1, which shows that existing EPA aluminum criteria, GEI's equations for New Mexico, Colorado and West Virginia, and equations used by the Arid West Water Quality Research Project.

Can you explain the relevance of this table?
A. So my --

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: And again, that is -just briefly, that is page 5, Table 1, of Dr. Deke Gundersen's written direct testimony.

MR. GUNDERSEN: So I guess my point here is you have all these hardness-based equations and each one of them are slightly different in some way, which sort of, to me, reflects there's a lack of clear understanding of what studies to use, what species to use to derive these equations.

In addition, which I think Dr. Gensemer even pointed out, some state agencies, like Colorado, looked at the original equation and changed them in such a way that they would actually be more protective than the way
they were originally submitted. And then, of course, you have West Virginia, where that hardness-based equation ultimately was not utilized.

And so I guess my point there is to say look at all this variability in coming up with these equations, which one's right, which one's wrong, why are they being changed, why are some state agencies making them more protective.
Q. (BY MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH) On page 6 of your direct written testimony, you address GEI's calculations specifically for New Mexico, which served, again, as the basis for New Mexico's current hardness-based aluminum criteria, and you identified concerns that GEI omitted two studies pertinent to ensuring that aluminum criteria are protective of important recreational aquatic species like rainbow trout, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In your expert view, what was the bottom line impact of these omissions on New Mexico's hardness-based criteria? Did it effectively weaken the level of protection for aquatics, in particular recreationally important species like rainbow trout?
A. I guess my answer to that, I can refer to Dr. Gensemer's rebuttal to my testimony where he stated that both rainbow trout studies, one by Thomas, et al.,
there were some flaws. He pointed out that calcium was measured and not hardness, and it was also difficult to determine the duration of that particular study.

The other study happens to be my work, and -and one of the limitations he pointed out to that study is that the range of LC 50s -- that's a concentration that will kill half of a fish that you expose to aluminum. Anyway, the range of LC 50 s was too narrow, which is mentioned in the EPA guidelines.

Which $I$ don't discount those things that he pointed out. I guess my question would be -- is why were these studies deemed acceptable in the Arid West study that Dr. Gensemer was a part of?

I mean, that was, I think, developed in 2006 . So three years later all of a sudden we decide to do studies now are not deemed acceptable. I'm not exactly sure what changed over that period of time.

Dr. Gensemer went on to say that, well, let's use the three lowest LC 50 s from my work and plug that into the equation, see what we get for a pooled slope. A pooled slope is one of those constants that's in the hardness-based equation.

And correctly he came up with a number of
1.2189. And --
Q. Can I stop you there, Dr. Gundersen?

In terms of these recalculations that

Dr. Gensemer did, you are referring to Dr. Gensemer's rebuttal testimony on pages 12 and 13 ; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you. Sorry.

You may continue.
A. Oh, no worries.

So anyway, the original pooled slope was
1.37 -- I'm rounding up a bit -- and he came up, he said, well, if you used my data, the rainbow trout, which is a recreational sensitive species -- if you use that data, you come up with a slope of about 1.22.

And his argument was, well, those aren't really very different from one another, which number-wise, $I$ guess, I would agree with him on that.

If you plug those -- if you utilize those two different numbers in the hardness-based equation, and let's say we do that for a hardness of 100 milligrams per liter, you get distinctly different values.

If you use the slope that Dr. Gensemer comes up with, the 1.2 , which is based on rainbow trout, you actually get substantially more protective aluminum criteria. In fact, it reduces the amount of aluminum allowed in surface waters by half if you use that new slope, at least based on my calculations.

So even though the two slopes aren't significantly different or there's not a lot of difference numerically when you plug them into this type of equation, it can make a substantial difference, is my point here.
Q. So you're not necessarily challenging

Dr. Gensemer's calculations on pages 12 and 13, but
Dr. Gensemer does characterize the difference in the pooled slope as only a difference of a -- and reading from page 13 of Dr. Gensemer's rebuttal testimony, as a minor degree change, effectively, and you fundamentally disagree with that, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You also express concerns on pages 7 and 8 of your written direct testimony that GEI not only omitted key studies, but also included certain studies that were riddled with, in your view, problems, including incorrect calculations for hardness, failure to make necessary measurements, failure to report key test concentrations and failures to validate analysis, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you provide an example?
A. Yes. So there is -- there's several studies, but probably one that comes to mind -- so again, keep in
mind that GEI said, okay, it's time to update the criteria, we got a lot of new studies, some really good information, and we need to look at these things. So GEI looked at the new studies, and they also critically evaluated the original ones that were used for the original EPA criteria, and they were fairly critical of those studies.

There's one paper by Kimball that, first of all, if you look at the paper, it's not peer reviewed, and to be quite honest with you, I'm not even sure what it is, like if it's a master's thesis, an undergraduate student did it. It's really just not clear to me. It's very poor quality, in my opinion.

But aside from that, one of the biggest problems $I$ have is the acute LC 50 that they came up with for the daphnia that was used in part of the calculation for the criteria. At the low concentration, the reported pH was around 8. At the high aluminum concentration, the pH was reported at 5. That's a difference of three pH units.

And as you probably know, $p H$ is a logarithmic scale. And as we already stated, aluminum solubility is affected by pH. So what was going on in the low aluminum chamber had to be a lot different than what was going on in the high aluminum chamber.

I see this as a really gross difference in pHes, and $I$-- $I$ don't think the study should be allowed.

And so again, it just sort of questions the validity of coming up with these equations. You're throwing out some studies because there wasn't a broad range of pH, but you're keeping others -- or broad range of LC 50 s , but you're keeping others which have a gross change in pHes. So --
Q. Could you provide a sort of plain language understanding of what LC 50 means?
A. Yeah. So that's just a -- it translates to a lethal concentration that will kill 50 percent of your test organisms in the laboratory when you're looking at -- when you're exposing them to aluminum. How much aluminum would it take to kill half of that population, sort of the standardized measurement used in toxicology.
Q. Overall what was the consequence of including these -- let me retract that.

The first thing, with regard to the Kimball study, you address it in your written direct testimony on pages 8 and 9?
A. Correct.
Q. And also in your written rebuttal testimony on pages 3 to 6?
A. Correct.
Q. Overall with these problematic studies, not just the Kimball study, what -- what was the consequence of including that? Did they result in more or less protective hardness-based aluminum criteria for New Mexico?
A. Well, my honest scientific answer to that is I don't know. And the reason $I$ say that, to me, it's more about the validity of these equations. I don't know if it's valid or not based on these studies. You've got some studies that shouldn't be allowed, you got others that are.

And so it just makes me question the validity of the overall process of -- of coming up with these equations, again noting the fact that GEI stated there's a lot of new data out there that we can use to write these equations.

Again my question is why are you using studies like these?
Q. On pages 8 and 9 of your written direct testimony, you explain that aluminum has distinct chronic and acute toxicity impacts; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you -- just as also -- statement LC 50, can you describe what is the difference between a
chronic and an acute toxicity impact?
A. Well, acute means -- usually these are short-term toxicity tests, typically they can be 96 hours, where we're looking -- probably the most notable thing we look at in this case is mortality. It's easy to measure.

Chronic studies typically are up to around 30 days, and we look at things like does it affect growth, does it affect reproductive success, things like that.
Q. And so given these distinct toxicity impacts that you explain in your written direct testimony on pages 8 and 9, and specifically at near neutral pH, there's greater growth inhibition but less deaths than at weakly alkaline pH? Can you discuss this?
A. Well, that's just what we found in the study that I did. So at near neutral pH, we didn't see much mortality, but we definitely saw inhibition of growth in rainbow trout. At more alkaline or weakly alkaline pH at around a pH of 8 , we did see mortality in that case. And the two differences between those pHes that -- is at near neutral $p H$, most of the aluminum is insoluble. At weakly alkaline pH, a fraction of that aluminum is soluble, and then another part of that also is insoluble.

So that's the difference that we see between
those two pHes, and we attributed the effects of mortality that we saw at weakly alkaline pH due to the presence of soluble forms of aluminum.
Q. In your written direct testimony on pages 11 and 12, you discuss hardness.

And just as background, when you're measuring hardness, you're looking at both calcium and magnesium; is that correct?
A. Primarily, yes.
Q. In your testimony, you explain that it is -in your testimony, you explain that it is calcium, not magnesium that mitigates aluminum toxicity; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But again, the hardness-based criteria measures both calcium and magnesium.
A. Correct, primarily. Yes.
Q. So as a hypothetical, you could have two distinct water segments, one with a hardness level of 100 milligrams per liter, but with a far higher ratio of calcium, that is protective of aquatics, and you could have another water body segment that has the same concentration of hardness, a hardness level of 100 milligrams per liter, but with a far lower ratio of calcium, and that would be far less protective, because
there will be far more aluminum toxicity; is that correct?
A. Well, it's just a difference in the amount of calcium in the two. So one would be more protective than the other. This has been shown in studies looking at other metals. This has not been shown in studies with aluminum yet, at least to my knowledge.

But it has been shown, like I say, looking at other metals where they expose organisms to -- I believe it was copper, is the one I'm thinking of, at the same hardness, but they altered the amount of calcium that made up that hardness, and they found the higher calcium levels offered more protection than the same hardness level that had less calcium.

Again, also sort of pointing out how complicated all of this really is.
Q. Beyond hardness, there are other parameters like pH that may be more important --
A. Correct.
Q. -- in assessing aluminum toxicity?
A. Correct.
Q. On page 10 of your testimony, of your written direct testimony, you explain that there is a severe lack of scientifically defensible evidence regarding the effects of alkaline pH in the 8.0 to 9.0 range on
aluminum toxicity.
A. Correct, yeah. Like I said, there's not been a lot of work in the alkaline pH range, and particularly looking at the effects of hardness on aluminum toxicity at the alkaline pH range. In fact, my work suggests that hardness is not even protective at all at the alkaline pH range.
Q. And these pH values are seen in New Mexico?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, common?
A. Yeah.
Q. What happens to aluminum toxicity at higher temperatures?
A. So some studies indicate as temperature goes up so does aluminum toxicity.
Q. Therefore, could aluminum toxicity under the current hardness-based standard, which does not take -well, does the current hardness-based criteria take temperature into account?
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q. Therefore, could aluminum toxicity under the current standard pose a problem in temperature-impaired waters?
A. Yeah. And I'd be particularly worried about species that are sensitive to temperature. So like
rainbow trout, for example, they get stressed out when they're exposed to high temperatures. Then on top of that, with increased temperature, aluminum -- some evidence suggests that aluminum becomes more toxic, as well.

So you have sort of two things working against certain sensitive species like rainbow trout.
Q. This is sort of a classic example of a cumulative impact.
A. So to speak, yes.
Q. And New Mexico's one of only two states that use hardness-based criteria, correct?
A. To my knowledge, yes.
Q. And Colorado is the only other state?
A. As far as $I$ know, yeah.
Q. And you alluded to this before in your testimony, but the Colorado standard is, in fact, a little bit more robust than New Mexico's; is that accurate?
A. They have altered, I believe, the chronic equation to make it more protective.
Q. So would it be accurate to characterize New Mexico's aluminum criteria as the weakest in United States?
A. I would say it allows for more aluminum in
surface waters. Yes.
Q. On page 4 of your written direct testimony, you note that West Virginia had proposed to use hardness-based aluminum criteria, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In that testimony, you state that EPA rejected West Virginia's proposal for hardness-based aluminum criteria.

But to clarify, EPA did not reach a final decision regarding that proposal, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is it because it was withdrawn from consideration by West Virginia?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. EPA, however, did express serious concerns regarding certain aquatic species with West Virginia's proposal; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And EPA's concerns are identified in

Dr. Gensemer's rebuttal exhibit, Number 8; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. What were those concerns?
A. There were -- there were concerns over certain sensitive species, particularly freshwater mussels, and
in particular, they were very sensitive to aluminum, and they also mentioned that $p H$ was critically important at looking at the text -- the toxicity of aluminum to freshwater mussels. And that hardness had a very minor role in protecting those species from the toxicity of aluminum.

And I believe they also suggested that the -there was additional data concerning aluminum toxicity that the state needed to look at, as well.
Q. In that letter on page 2, EPA specifically states that $p H$ was a, quote, unquote, critical factor, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you review Amigos Bravos' Supplemental Exhibit L?
A. I did.
Q. Do the mussel species noted in Exhibit L raise, in your view, concerns similar to those raised by EPA for West Virginia?
A. Yes.
Q. Are these species effectively similar to -are they -- how are they similar to the species -- the West Virginia species similar to the species in New Mexico?
A. Well, some of the research that I looked at on
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these mussel species belonged to the same genus in the studies that I've looked at. So I looked at certain mussels and found that they're fairly sensitive to aluminum as the same genus that you would find here in New Mexico, some New Mexico waters.

Yeah.
Q. Given EPA's letter, Gensemer's rebuttal Exhibit 8, the EPA letter, and the presence of mussels in New Mexico, is it your expert view that New Mexico's hardness-based aluminum criteria remain sufficiently protective of aquatic life in New Mexico?
A. Can you rephrase that?
Q. Given all the information that you've presented in testimony and discussing EPA's letter, Gensemer's rebuttal Exhibit 8, and the presence of mussels in New Mexico, is it your expert view that New Mexico's hardness-based aluminum criteria is sufficiently protective of aquatic life, specifically mussels, in New Mexico?
A. I would be concerned for mussels present in New Mexico's waters, and one of the reasons being is that some of the levels -- some of these studies that $I$ have seen where they show toxicity is actually -- these are levels that are near the original EPA criteria. I think I've seen levels of 500 micrograms per liter
that's sort of where these mussels exhibit toxicity in some of these studies.

So I wouldn't be very confident that the current New Mexico criteria would be protective of these sensitive species.
Q. Earlier in the day today, a wildife biologist, Mr. Klingel, presented some information regarding not just mussels but gastropods.

Would you agree with Mr. Klingel's
characterization that there are similar toxicity impacts to mussels and to gastropods?
A. I'd say it's possible. I mean, they're both mollusks. But other than that, I couldn't -- couldn't say anything further.
Q. On page 4 of your testimony -- written direct testimony, you note that EPA's working to revise the 1988 aluminum water quality criteria, the $304(a)$ criteria; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. In that revision process, EPA is evaluating criteria that would use multiple parameters, not just hardness, but also pH, dissolved organic carbon and temperature; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's sort of a full range of key
parameters for assessing aluminum toxicity.
A. Yeah. I mean, a lot of those parameters have been shown -- or at least some studies indicate that a lot of those parameters are actually more significant than hardness in affecting or influencing aluminum's toxicity to aquatic life.

And so that's kind of another question that I have, is why did you come up with a hardness-based equation when there's other parameters that actually have a more profound effect on aluminum toxicity?
Q. So this reinforces your conclusion that New Mexico's current standard by focusing solely on hardness is -- well, I guess I'm characterizing it this way -simplistic and not scientifically defensible and not protective of aquatic species across the entire 6.5 to 9.0 pH range?
A. Correct.
Q. Until EPA completes its evaluation process, EPA's $304(a)$ aluminum criteria, while imperfect, remain EPA's only recommended criteria, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Notably, the efficacy of these criteria while again imperfect is supported by 20 years of direct observation in surface waters, unlike the hardness-based criteria, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Therefore, reverting, as Amigos Bravos proposes, to the pre-2009 aluminum criteria of 750 micrograms per liter acute and 87 micrograms per liter chronic toxicity is substantially more protective of aquatic species.
A. Correct.
Q. And is it your expert opinion that reversion to this criteria is premised on sound scientific evidence?
A. Yeah. I do. I mean, for me, it's just based on the uncertainty that $I$ have for the current New Mexico criteria. I really don't know how protective they would be, and so $I$ think the safest thing is to go back to the EPA criteria, and particularly, you know, looking at some of these sensitive species like mussels where it indicates that toxicity is near the original EPA criteria.

You know, in addition, some of the work that $I$ did showed that hardness -- so I looked at the toxicity of aluminum to rainbow trout at alkaline $p H$, and we found that really hardness didn't have any effect. We saw no difference in the LC 50 s when we changed the different hardnesses. And so with alkaline pH, we saw no effect with hardness.

And for me, that essentially says that if you utilize the New Mexico criteria, let's say, anywhere greater than 100 milligrams per liter hardness, that if hardness doesn't have an affected alkaline pH, then you're going to be adding more aluminum to the water than sensitive species can tolerate, if the research that $I$ have is true.

And I would go further in saying that more work needs to be done to validate that. But if hardness is not protective, and you say you can continue to add more and more aluminum as the hardness goes up, you're going to exceed some of these LC 50s that I generated from some my -- some of my work.
Q. So to be clear, would reversion from the hardness-based criteria to the EPA-recommended 304 (a) criteria remedy substantial underprotection of aquatic species -- of aquatic species?
A. Correct.
Q. To illustrate this point, could you turn back to Table 5 on page 1 of your written testimony?
A. Table - -
Q. Table 1 .
A. Table 1. Yes.
Q. And could you illustrate how that substantial underprotection works in terms of the data in this
table?
A. So if you look up where it says Current New Mexico Standards (Total Recoverable Aluminum), if you look at my work at alkaline pH, first of all, it says hardness has no effect or very little effect on aluminum toxicity, and we came up with LC $50 s$ of around 6,000 micrograms per liter, for just about all the different hardnesses we looked at. Okay?

MS. CONN: You might want to clarify that -what you're talking about is the alkaline pH and what that is.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Above pH 7. Yeah. So alkaline pH above pH 7 .

So anyway, we came up with an LC 50 of around 6,000 micrograms per liter, and we said that hardness doesn't have any effect.

So if you look at this table and you look up on the column at the very top where it says Mean Hardness, and you look at 150, and you go down to the current New Mexico standard, it says that you can allow 5,960 micrograms per liter of aluminum and everything's going to be all right.

Well, I just told you that rainbow trout exposed to 6,000 micrograms per liter we saw 50 percent mortality, and we found that hardness did not seem to be
as protective to those species.

So that seems problematic to me.
Q. (BY MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH) So fundamentally, that means a lot of dead fish.
A. Could be. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

No further questions.
MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. So at this time, if I
understand correctly, you still have more direct from these individuals, or are you done in entirety?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: No. My direct and rebuttal is completed.

MS. CONN: On aluminum.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: On aluminum only, not relative to any of the other Amigos Bravos proposals.

MR. CHAVEZ: So that's what I'm saying.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Yeah. So there's
continued testimony on in particular temporary standards and a little bit on Chino Mines' proposal.

MR. CHAVEZ: So we're going to move to cross right now on these issues that have been presented.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Yeah, specifically on aluminum.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.

So keeping in the -- do we mind going in the
same order, or did we agree that -- okay.
So if I can go to NMED first for
cross-examination on these issues.

MR. VERHEUL: Sorry. I apologize for the delay.

Mr. Hearing Officer, would now be a good time to renew our objection to the additional exhibits proposed by Amigos Bravos?

I was waiting for Mr. Schlenker-Goodrich to
move all of his exhibits into evidence --
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Maybe - -
MR. VERHEUL: - - but I want to do this at a time for everyone.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Maybe I -- I will
formally move for the admission of our prefiled written testimony and our exhibits into the record.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.

MR. VERHEUL: And we renew our objection to those exhibits on a number of grounds. And this gets back to what each of these exhibits are.

MR. CHAVEZ: Just real quick, do you have a copy of those exhibits handy so $I$ can --

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Unfortunately, no. I gave all my hard copies to Pam. I only have an electronic.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. Not a problem.
MR. VERHEUL: Our primary objection is
procedural. And by procedural, I don't mean a
technicality that lawyers use to keep things out of
evidence. By procedural, I mean, as my co-counsel referred to earlier with regard to some of the other exhibits, the element of litigation by surprise.

These are -- these are complex, technical -complex, technical documents that take some amount of time for experts to assimilate and to respond to. Logistically, Bureau staff has been here in this hearing so they've been unable to really review these documents and come up with a valid response to them.

But more importantly, you know, counsel for various parties test- -- or spoke earlier today about the need for a robust rulemaking process by which parties are able to exchange information amongst each other, respond to each other's proposals, really understand where the differences are and -- and then, you know, come into the hearing and present those differences to the Commission itself.

If filing deadlines are not enforced in these types of hearings, and things can be filed all the way up until the morning of the hearing itself, then it's really not possible for us to just present our
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differences in opinion that we've worked out to the Commission, then we're still working out those differences amongst ourselves.

We agree that it's important to have a process by which all the parties communicate with each other, come to an understanding of what the differences are, where we still disagree, and also understand where we have agreements.

I think the Department has shown in this
triennial review in working with various other parties, including Amigos Bravos, that we're absolutely willing to understand other parties' concerns and to come to agreements prior to coming to hearing.

If -- if we're able to file things up until the last minute and filing deadlines are not enforced, then we're really unable to do that.

And furthermore, there is -- there's really no incentive for the parties to get together prior to the hearing, again, in respect for the Commission's time, and -- and really present a cogent set of here's where we differ, here's why, so, Commission, you can now make a decision.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. So timeliness is a big basis of --

MR. VERHEUL: Timeliness.

You know, and $I$ would also add substantively, you know, there are -- there are four things that Amigos Bravos has put forth.

The first was a -- not really an exhibit but a set of comments or proposed changes, $I$ think, on -- on the Department's proposal regarding temporary standards.

That's a great document that would make the basis for a great discussion that we would have liked to have had with them prior to this hearing. At this point, $I$ think it's got to be considered untimely only because I'm not sure whether you consider this rebuttal testimony, but in any case, it's -- it's coming in beyond any deadline for filing any sort of testimony.

The EPA guidance, which was, I believe, their Exhibit K, that was referenced in the Environment Department's petition and statement of basis. So we really don't have a strong objection to that substantively.

However, when you get to Exhibit M, Exhibit M is a position -- or rather an opinion paper. They're not, to my knowledge, producing the author of that paper to sit here for cross-examination and to val- -- you know, to provide -- provide his expert credentials such that he could validate the opinion in that paper.

An opinion paper, as far as $I$ know, is not
peer reviewed. Dr. Gundersen just testified as to peer review being an important component of scientific credibility for these types of things.

And then the list of mussels itself, which I believe was Exhibit L, that in and of itself -- it's a list of mussels, but that in and of itself is not necessarily any kind of -- it doesn't have any probative value towards whether or not these mussels are going to be impacted by the aluminum standard in New Mexico.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Mr. Hearing

Officer --

MR. CHAVEZ: One second.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: -- if I may take these in turn.

MR. CHAVEZ: One second.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Or, Lou, you go -you want to go first?

MR. ROSE: Yeah.

I have similar objections, but $I$ wondered if you wanted to wait for Mr. Schlenker-Goodrich to respond.

MR. CHAVEZ: No. I'm sorry. No. I want to take -- I want to take everybody's objections, and then I'll have you --

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Perfect.

MR. CHAVEZ: -- respond, because this is -yeah.

MR. ROSE: We now get to the lawyerly part of all this, right?

MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Rose.
MR. ROSE: I concur with the Department's objections to Exhibit $L$ and $M$ on somewhat different grounds, however.

I don't object to the admission of their prefiled direct and rebuttal testimony and the exhibits attached to it.

As to Exhibit L, it's a list, but there's no testimony of what the derivation of the list is, how relevant it is. I'm not sure what weight -- there's nothing to give the Commission any idea of what weight to give it, other than it's a list.

And so without being able to -- without being able to question how the list was developed, who developed it, is it proper, we don't see that it's admissible in this proceeding. I'm less concerned about the timeliness of it.

And to M, I concur in the Department's objection in that it's a -- it's being offered -- the predicate is the attachment of the EPA letter to West Virginia that was attached to Dr. Gundersen's rebuttal.

That was offered only for the purpose of showing that EPA did not substantively make a decision on the West Virginia proposal. It wasn't being offered with respect to any of the substance of the letter, only what EPA's action was in terms of the West Virginia proposal.

What Exhibit $M$ is is a substantive document that was submitted -- at least from what $I$ could tell, submitted in the course of the West Virginia proceeding. What it amounts to is substantive evidence that's being presented outside of the technical case, outside of the parties being able to develop rebuttal testimony and respond to.

If this had been submitted in support of their position initially, we would have had the opportunity to develop responsive technical evidence. Now, as it stands, we're unable to do so.

And so I'm not sure what weight the Commission can or should give to it, but given the timeliness, we think it's inappropriate to admit it for the purpose of trying to establish problems with the existing state standard without us being able and any other party being able to file a technical response to that and indicate and explain to the Commission why they shouldn't rely on the information in that exhibit.

And on those grounds, we would object to Exhibits $L$ and $M$.

MR. CHAVEZ: I'd like to move to Freeport at this time for any comment.

MS. GREENWALD: Could I ask Amigos Bravos a few questions?

MR. CHAVEZ: No, ma'am.

MS. GREENWALD: Concerning these exhibits?
MR. CHAVEZ: No, you cannot. I'm sorry.

Freeport? Comment?

MS. CHAPPELLE: Thank you, Your Honor.
Actually, we don't -- we agree with some of the -- not some of the questions that have been raised, concerns have been raised, and $I$ think those were well stated, and $I$ don't have anything further to add.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

San Juan?

MS. MCCALEB: Mr. Hearing Officer, I'd like to state I have -- San Juan Water Commission has no objection to the introduction of the prefiled written direct and rebuttal testimony. I think Mr. Rose stated succinctly, as did the Department's attorney, the concerns with the technical exhibits and the importance for the expert witnesses to have time to consider those in advance of hearing.
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I would like to point out for the benefit of the parties that one of the exhibits -- and I'm sorry, I don't have the exhibit number -- it may be $K$--

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I think it's C-2, if you're referring to the variance document.

MS. MCCALEB: Yes.
I was going to point out that it has previously been introduced as part of Mr. Nylander's exhibits, Exhibit K. Okay.

Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: So $K$ has --
MS. MCCALEB: $K$ is in the record.
MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
MS. MCCALEB: Yes, sir.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Yeah. Amigos Bravos' Exhibit $K$ is in the record as San Juan Citizens -- San Juan Citizens -- San Juan Water Commission Exhibit C-2.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
So before -- before you go, so I'm going to admit the evidence as part of your prefiled.

With regard to essentially $K, M$ and $L, K$, since it's already part of the record, is not an issue, and that's allowed in.
(Exhibits Amigos Bravos A through K admitted into evidence.)

MR. CHAVEZ: So let's discuss M and L.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: There was also an issue, Mr. Hearing Officer, regarding the propriety of submitting proposed changes, as well.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
So if you can address those three issues, and
I would like you to focus on the issue of timeliness, which $I$ do have a concern with, and as to each substantive value.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: So let me focus first -- before $I$ get to proposed changes, let me focus on the exhibits. I think that they're a little bit easier issues to deal with.

MR. CHAVEZ: Please.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: And there are distinct issues with both in terms of propriety of their admission.

Exhibit $L$ is a list of mussel species in New Mexico. This was developed from New Mexico state agency documentation. The Commission is fully entitled to take notice of the presence of mussels. There is no probative value one way or another of the presence of mussels. It is simply a commonly known fact.

In any judicial proceeding, there are provisions for courts to take judicial notice of just
these sorts of facts. For example, if you look at the Federal Rules of Evidence, there is a Rule 201 that provides for judicial notice of fact.

And if $I$ can read from Rule 201(b), the kinds of facts that may be judicially noticed, this includes facts that are generally known within the trial court's territorial jurisdiction, here in New Mexico, or can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.

So the fact that there are mussel species in New Mexico, I think, is a generally known fact.

Can they be accurately and readily determined?
As $I$ mentioned, the information from mussels in Exhibit L, as Exhibit L says, was derived from BISON, which is a state agency program, to identify mussels.

So I think that it is a simple question of saying are there mussel species in New Mexico? Yes. To exclude this evidence would suggest that the Commission would operate with the exclusion of knowing the common fact that there are mussel species in New Mexico.

Now, what the Commission wants to do with that information is, of course, at the Commission's discretion. But to pretend in this Commission proceeding that mussels don't exist seems a bit odd to me.

MR. CHAVEZ: Is this the most recent list that exists in the -- in the general public?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: This list was -- I believe if you look at Exhibit $L$-- get to it -- it notes the date that it was derived from the Biota Information System of New Mexico, BISON-M, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, October 8, 2015 .

So as of that date it is, as far as we can understand, the most recent list.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. Please proceed.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: So that is Exhibit L.

Now, Exhibit $M, I$ agree -- let me -- well, I'll address the timeliness issues with both.

With Exhibit $M$, we understand that it is a substantive document. The question, and as Mr. Rose himself noted before, is that in terms of introduction of evidence to rulemaking proceedings, that pretty much all evidence can and should be considered so long as it is relevant.

So our view is that Exhibit $M$, which is an opinion report, is, in fact, relevant because it deals with the hardness-based aluminum criteria that was withdrawn in West Virginia, but is very close and, in fact, was derived from the same expert consulting group as the one for New Mexico.

So it does have probative value.
Now, acknowledging the timeliness component, the Commission can certainly give what weight it desires to that opinion report. I'm not expecting the -- this opinion report to carry the day. In fact, it's not necessary for Amigos Bravos to carry the day.

All it simply does is affirm that what we are looking at here in New Mexico raises issues that are similar to the issues in West Virginia. And so to the degree that we want to be consistent on how we are addressing aluminum toxicity issues, it does have some measure of probative value.

So that's Exhibit M.

With regard to proposed changes, I have come before this Commission since, I believe, 2004, 2005 . I've been -- I've participated in the prior two triennial reviews. I also participated in the designation of the outstanding national resource waters for the Valle Vidal and, I believe, two separate rulemakings dealing with antidegradation rules.

In every single one of those proceedings, all of the parties in the course of those proceedings had submitted, even during the course, new proposed changes based on discussions that had taken place.

So I'm cognizant of in an ideal world it would
be best to try to work out these proposed changes in advance and to try to get the Department's perspective on that. I acknowledge that.

I don't live -- and $I$ don't think any of us here live in an ideal world. And so to preclude our ability to introduce proposed changes at this time, many of which are addressed to discrepancies between the testimony submitted by the Department and the plain language of the rule itself, will undermine our ability to engage in correct rulemaking.

Now, if the Department doesn't want to talk to us during the proceedings about those proposed changes, they're certainly entitled to take that position. But we are certainly entitled to raise those proposed changes to help inform a good rulemaking process.

Amigos Bravos has opposed the temporary standards provision, but we understand that there is significant interest in this standards provision here in New Mexico. So our only intent is to provide recommendations about how that can be structured.

Every recommendation, by the way, is tied to testimony that has been submitted by either Amigos Bravos or the Department or the San Juan Water Commission, for that matter. And so it is appropriate to raise those issues.

I would also submit that it is improper to preclude that on evidentiary grounds. This is an evidence. This is a proposed change to the rules. And the question of whether or not it may be considered by the Commission is not an evidentiary issue, it is whether or not it is legally a logical outgrowth from the underlying testimony submitted by the parties. And we submit that it is a logical outgrowth.

Now, if the Department contends that it is not a logical outgrowth of the proposed testimony, we will be willing to engage in argument about that. I think the most appropriate time to do that would be in our written closing arguments after the hearing.

But $I$ would submit that that is very much not an evidentiary issue. I would submit that it is very much against the practice of this Commission for at least as long as $I$ have practiced before the Commission, and I'm sure the other parties and counsel here can attest to that fact, that $I$ think all these parties have probably submitted proposed changes in the course of the proceedings, including the Department itself, and that the validity of those proposed changes is addressed not as an evidentiary issue, but whether or not it is a logical outgrowth of the underlying testimony already presented to the Commission.
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MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. So notwithstanding the timeliness of everything, I want to get to that, and you say that this is not evidentiary in nature.

You entered in 2014. Why -- why are we just seeing that right now? I mean, why -- why didn't these issues come up with all the other parties before the start of this hearing to possibly get to some agreement?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I think, very
candidly, we started to prepare for this issue several weeks ago. And in preparation, we were taking a very hard position that the temporary standards proposal was inappropriate and that did not sufficiently protect New Mexico's waters.

So our interest in recognizing and reading some of the tea leaves of how this Commission proceeding may play, our interest was ensuring that at the very least the temporary standards proposal was constructed in the best possible way.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
I'd like to go to the parties on this limited issue. It's not evidentiary in nature. Now -- okay. But if you can address that.

MR. VERHEUL: I would just say that I would agree with counsel for Amigos Bravos that posthearing filings would probably be both the most appropriate and
logistically the best time to address the logical outgrowth argument.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
MR. VERHEUL: We believe that's more complicated than could be addressed in the limited time that we have here for the rest of the week.

MR. CHAVEZ: So are you asking me, then, to -are you renewing your objection on that portion of it?

MR. VERHEUL: Yes.
MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
Chevron, any thoughts on that?
MR. ROSE: We take no position on the supplemental filing as to the issue that counsel for the Department just addressed other than to recognize, I think, as Mr. Schlenker-Goodrich said, that most of these -- I mean, there's probably going to be even more changes being proposed by parties in response to this in their closing arguments and final changes to the Commission.

So it's becoming -- it's an iterative process, and historically the proposals have changed over time. And so this -- this appears to be one part of that process. And I suspect that when you see the final proposed changes they may be somewhat different than the parties originally proposed, simply because it takes
into account Commission questions and cross-examination.
So I think it seems to me that that's going to happen. Maybe that's the better place to address it, rather than the way Amigos Bravos is choosing to do it now, that may be reserving it for posthearing submittals is more appropriate.

As to the admission of the other exhibits, I think $I$ said my piece on that so I --

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.

MR. ROSE: -- won't say anything more than that.

MR. CHAVEZ: So -- so we can almost put this to bed.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Can I say one more?

MR. CHAVEZ: Go ahead.
MR. VERHEUL: I'm -- our contention is simply that there's got to be a window by which all parties have to submit everything prior to the hearing, and that window has to allow the Commission itself time to digest all that documentation, and then anything additional that isn't brought up verbally at the hearing is probably, as Mr. Rose suggests, better left as a posthearing filing, assuming that it's in response to something that came up during the hearing.

But, you know, preserving that window of time
between which the final point where parties can submit things and the Commission actually has to hear oral argument -- again, that's just respect for the Commission's time and for the time that we're taking in this hearing.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: If I may make two quick points.

MR. CHAVEZ: Final word.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: You know, I'm -- the concern with dealing with this in only a posthearing submission is -- and the intent in our providing it on Monday instead of a posthearing submission was that so that we could bring this out and allow for some measure of cross-examination by either the parties or the Commission itself.

You know, what Mr. Verheul is suggesting could be problematic, because if the Department -- and I'm assuming from the basis of the conversations that we have had over the course of the last few days -- decides that they want to make alterations to their proposal, Amigos Bravos wasn't aware of those at that time, the Commission was not aware of those, nor were any of the other parties.

So to limit it to postsubmission filings
precludes the ability of all the parties while we are in this room to have a dialogue, to tease out whether or not these are good or bad ideas. And so you would be -essentially be precluding and constraining the ability of the parties to modify their proposals on the basis of the evidence and the discussion that has arisen in the course of these proceedings. That's why we have these rulemaking hearings.

The second thing I want to say, very quickly, is on this overall timeliness issue, as apparently had it been distilled down to, what's good for the goose is good for the gander.

If these exhibits are precluded purely on the basis of timing, I would note that we did provide these on Monday in advance of the hearing. Yesterday everybody in this room witnessed when Chino Mines presented new exhibits that $I$ wasn't even aware of until they were providing their technical testimony regarding public participation components.

I did not specifically object to them, even though, frankly, I was a tad annoyed getting them right before the testimony, because $I$ understand that if notice happened from Chino Mines, and we were making an argument that there was improper notice, it would seem a little formalistic to suggest that that evidence should
be precluded.
MR. CHAVEZ: That evidence in your -- those are two different, obviously, documents and issues. So I know why you're pointing towards Chino for that, but two different areas that we're looking at.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: My only point, Mr. Hearing Officer, respectfully, is that $I$ don't think that these documents can precluded -- be precluded purely on the basis of timeliness and that my objection to their preclusion on timeliness -- that there needs to be something a little bit different from that.

And I recognize that, for example, in
particular Exhibit $M$, which is a technical document, an opinion report, is a bit distinct from that.

But the Exhibit $L$, dealing with mussels and just the notice of presence of mussel species in New Mexico, is not very different from the several sets of minutes that Chino Mines presented for the simple proposition that notice, in fact, did occur.

So I think that the mussels exhibit is very similar and analogous to the exhibits submitted on notice and public participation. In fact, the minutes were more substantial because they were multi-page explanations of a variety -- of all these community workgroup meetings, whereas Exhibit $L$ is a one-page
document that stands for the proposition that, hey, New Mexico has mussels.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. I'm going to allow Exhibit L, and myself and the Commission will be able to determine what weight to provide that evidence.
(Exhibit Amigos Bravos L was admitted into evidence.)

MR. CHAVEZ: As to the proposed changes, I'm not going to allow that. I think the significance of bringing that in and not having the parties be able to have a full discussion on that, but just having the Commission -- having these significant changes before them without much discussion is potentially problematic.

So I will not allow that as -- the same for Exhibit M. I'm not going to allow that.

While $I$ note your argument that it does have some probative value, $I$ think considering we don't have anybody to testify as to that document, and -- and I'm going to address timeliness in a second -- there's a little bit of timeliness with -- intermingled in there. I'm not going to allow that document.

With regard to timeliness, I understand your arguments, but -- this would go for you and any party -considering the nature and significance of getting these documents in a time right before -- and it was --
everybody had the day off, it was Indigenous People's Day. I think that that really put the parties in a bind. They weren't filed technically until the first day of the hearing.

And once again, $I$ know you're going to argue that some other parties were able to do that. I don't think that their evidence was of the substantive nature of which you provided.

So having said that, once again, I'm going to allow Exhibit $L$ and not allow Exhibit $M$ or the proposed changes.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Mr. Hearing Officer, I would like to reserve the ability to argue that in legal briefs with our closing argument.

I'd also ask for you to move -- I would also move for you to reconsider that, because essentially what you are saying is no one has the ability to provide proposed changes that are a logical outgrowth of their testimony, and if that is the case, then Amigos Bravos will be forced to move to object to every single proposed change that is made that has not yet been discussed, which would limit every party here from making changes to any of their proposals.

And $I$ think that that could, frankly, grind this entire rulemaking process to a halt, and $I$ would
encourage you to perhaps ask other counsel for their perspective on this. I think that it's very problematic, thinking through the consequences.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: So respectfully. MR. CHAVEZ: On that issue, would you like to address that?

MR. VERHEUL: It's unclear whether counsel is referring to some sort of chilling effect by which we're all now unwilling to put forward any changes or new proposals?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I would say that under the ruling from the Hearing Officer, that if parties are precluded from making proposed changes, and if there's clarification that we can present these proposed changes only in posthearing submittals, maybe that's a remedy for this, but at this point, there's not simply a chilling effect on it, but there -- as I understand this ruling, that there is an absolute preclusion from submitting new proposed changes that are a logical outgrowth of any of the existing proposals or testimony that is before this Commission.

That would raise -- if Amigos Bravos is precluded from doing that, but other parties are entitled to, that would raise, in my view, a significant
due process concern that would be subjected to judicial review.

MR. VERHEUL: I just want to make a clear distinction. Parties are free to change their minds and change their positions verbally at hearing. We've seen that done several times before.

The difference between doing that at the hearing and what Amigos Bravos has attempted to do with regard to their written prehearing -- barely prehearing submissions is that was in -- that was not in response to any testimony that was heard at the hearing. It was in response to nothing. It was -- it was just something to get in the record at the last minute.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: We will be elucidating the reasons for each of these changes in our oral testimony from Ms. Conn, if we are allowed to do so.

MR. CHAVEZ: Chevron, on that specific issue?
MR. ROSE: We have no argument on that other than to say, you know, what the parties have said before, that it ought to be as broad -- I mean, what we're trying to do is get the best rule in front of the Commission, and as long as the parties are all given the opportunity to question and cross-examine on specific proposals, that that's what you have to weigh.

And not knowing the specifics, that's what we would ask for, that it not be totally precluded, but at the same time there be some sense of timing involved in what you're going to allow and what you're not going to allow.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay.
Ms. Chappelle?
MS. CHAPPELLE: You know, listening through various issues, it kind of sounds like we are getting caught up on potentially some evidentiary kind of analysis on top of -- layered on top of kind of a rulemaking process.

So from my perspective, it seems like the solution, obviously, is it is a rulemaking, we want to get to the best final result, it is a, you know, natural process where as we go through testimony, et cetera, those things can be refined.

I think the issue is that something was filed in writing kind of prior to that process unfolding at hearing that's got folks trying to think through that issue, and --

So I don't really have a good recommendation for you, Your Honor, on how to get through that, but $I$ think there is validity, obviously, in the concerns raised by NMED with respect to kind of the last-minute
nature of that and what to do with it essentially procedurally and what -- what probative value that carries with it at the beginning of a hearing.

And so I think that's probably part of the issues that folks are trying to think through. So if there's a way to kind of get through that and move forward to the rest of the hearing, whether it's letting them have that conversation with their witnesses now and dealing with it in the posthearing process, briefing process, maybe that's a way to do it.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
San Juan.
MS. MCCALEB: I don't have a lot to add to what other counsel have said. I would like to make a point and recognize, as has been said by Mr. Erik -- by Mr. Schlenker-Goodrich -- I'm sorry, Erik.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: No worry.
MS. MCCALEB: -- and Mr. Rose, that has been the practice in the past, that the parties could -- and even the Department in the past has shown up on a particular day of hearing with a new draft of proposed language, with changes.

The one distinction has been $I$ do not recall in the past where that has been accompanied by a detailed statement of basis, which $I$ think is a
distinction. But $I$ think it is very useful to have the opportunity to have a written document with the words on that document that the parties can then address verbally.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Mr. Hearing Officer, can $I$ make one more final statement?

MR. CHAVEZ: One more.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: It will be very, very brief.

I recognize the timeliness issue, but as Ms. McCaleb had referenced, in the past parties have submitted, including the Department, in prior Commission proceedings proposed changes on the very day and presented those.

Yes, we provided a statement -- a basis for that, but if anything, we are trying to be overly respectful and try to give everybody as much of a heads-up as possible.

So if we were entitled to submit proposed changes today for our -- for our proposal with regard to temporary standards, that are a logical outgrowth of Ms. Conn's testimony, and that we support those through testimony, oral testimony, from my understanding, that seems to be perfectly appropriate.

All we did by submitting it on Monday was give as much heads-up notice as we were able to do reasonably to all the parties. So if anything, we're identifying so that the parties can prepare, and I understand that is less time, but it's more time than if we just raised it today during our oral testimony.

So if anything, it seems that we've done more than has been required by prior practice before this Commission.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

So what I am going to do is I'm going to take it under reconsideration and have all parties -interested parties address it in posttrial briefing, like immediately after. We'll set up a time -deadlines and timelines for that.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

THE REPORTER: Could we take a few minutes?

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes.

We can take a five-minute break and come back.
Thank you.
(Proceedings in recess from 3:23 p.m. to
3:37 p.m.)

MR. CHAVEZ: At this point, we would like to
continue with the cross-examination of these witnesses on the limited issues that have already been brought up in direct.

You may proceed.
Oh, one more thing before we proceed. We need to on the record itemize the exhibits that have been approved.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: As I understand it, Mr. Hearing Officer, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Amigos Bravos' prefiled proposed changes, prefiled written testimony submitted with our notice of intent to submit technical testimony and our prefiled rebuttal testimony and all of the exhibits associated with those prefiled testimony, which are Exhibits A through L -- no. I'm sorry. I'm getting confused.
I'll just say simply all of the exhibits provided with the prefiled notice of intent and rebuttal testimony have been exhibit -- admitted.

With regard to the Monday filing, there is a pending motion for reconsideration regarding Section III of that Monday filing. And to be clear, that was Monday, October 12.

With regard to the exhibits that were also associated with that, Exhibit L, which pertains to mussels, was, in fact, admitted into the record.

Exhibit K, which was the variance procedure, is essentially moot because it was already admitted as Exhibit $C-2$, attached to the San Juan Water Commission's testimony.

And Exhibit $M$, the Carys report, has been precluded.

MR. CHAVEZ: Is that clear?

I would say Exhibits A through J that were prefiled are admitted.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: And Exhibit L.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. Thank you.

You may proceed.
MR. VERHEUL: Thank you.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. VERHEUL:

MR. VERHEUL: Good afternoon, Dr. Gundersen.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Hello.

MR. VERHEUL: I only have a few questions.

You criticized a paper in your verbal
testimony today -- or I should say a manuscript, I
believe it was the Kimball manuscript; is that right?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.

MR. VERHEUL: And you criticized it in part
due to its lack of peer review; is that correct?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.

MR. VERHEUL: Would you say that peer review is an important component of scientific credibility?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Yeah, in my opinion. Yes.

MR. VERHEUL: Isn't it true that the 1988 EPA guidance on aluminum that Amigos Bravos would prefer the state return to -- isn't it true that that guidance also utilizes that same Kimball manuscript?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Yes. And that's kind of my point, though, was, okay, we're reevaluating the criteria, perhaps putting together hardness-based criteria, going back and looking at all the studies. How did they miss that, $I$ guess, is my comment.

MR. VERHEUL: Okay.
So, then, since you brought it up, EPA's -EPA's reevaluation $I$ think that they're in the process of doing right now of -- of aluminum criteria -- does -does what they're doing right now, that work -- does that include a hardness-based component?

MR. GUNDERSEN: My understanding is they're looking at a biotic ligand model which would incorporate a variety of water quality parameters, including dissolved carbon, pH , temperature and hardness, I believe.

MR. VERHEUL: So hardness is one of those.

MR. GUNDERSEN: I believe so.

MR. VERHEUL: So the answer is yes, it does include a hardness-based component?

MR. GUNDERSEN: They're looking at it.

MR. VERHEUL: Okay.
Would a reversion to the 1988 EPA guidance --
would that address your concerns about higher
temperatures enhancing the toxicity of aluminum?
MR. GUNDERSEN: It would more than the current criteria.

MR. VERHEUL: Is it true that at low hardness, that the current criteria that we have in New Mexico for aluminum -- those current standards are actually more protective of aquatic life than a reversion to the 1988 EPA - -

MR. GUNDERSEN: There's that one single point where that is true, and $I$ believe it is for the chronic value at a hardness of 25. Other than that, that's not true.

MR. VERHEUL: Okay.
MR. GUNDERSEN: So just one instance.

MR. VERHEUL: Are you aware that more than half the water bodies in New Mexico are characterized as having low hardness?

MR. GUNDERSEN: What do you -- define low
hardness for me.

MR. VERHEUL: I don't have a definition for that.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Yeah. So I don't know.

MR. VERHEUL: What would you consider low
hardness?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Well, I'm just trying to understand what you're referring to --

MR. VERHEUL: I understand --

MR. GUNDERSEN: -- by low hardness.
Less than 20? Less than 10? Less than 30?

Generally, you know, 30 or lower I consider you getting down there in the low hardness range.

MR. VERHEUL: Okay.

Getting back to peer review, one of the studies that you cite in your work -- I believe it's Stubblefield, et al., 2012 --

MR. GUNDERSEN: Um-hum.

MR. VERHEUL: -- isn't that an abstract of a conference paper?

MR. GUNDERSEN: That is correct.

MR. VERHEUL: Isn't it true that abstracts of conference papers do not undergo peer review?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Not what $I$ would consider a rigorous peer review. The abstracts are accepted for
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presentation at the conference. And it was just more personal communication between me and Dr. Stubblefield about some work that $I$ believe Dr. Gensemer is part of that work, too. Ultimately that will be published.

MR. VERHEUL: Okay.
But at this point, it's not published --
MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. VERHEUL: -- in a peer-reviewed journal.
MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Hearing Officer, just for
a second.
The microphone that picks you up is not the handheld. It is the one --

MR. GUNDERSEN: Oh. And I shouldn't be looking at him.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Well, you should be leaning a little bit closer to that --

MR. GUNDERSEN: Yeah. I get you. I'll try to look around.

MR. VERHEUL: I won't be offended if you're not looking at me --

MR. GUNDERSEN: Okay.
MR. VERHEUL: -- when you're answering.
MR. GUNDERSEN: All right. There we go.
MR. VERHEUL: I understand you worked on the
toxicity of aluminum on aquatic life back during your time as a PhD candidate; is that right?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. VERHEUL: Is it true that you have not studied the toxicity of aluminum on aquatic life since 1995 ?

MR. GUNDERSEN: True, yeah, pretty much true.
MR. VERHEUL: You've compared -- in your
testimony today, you've compared New Mexico's aluminum
standard with the aluminum standards in various other states such as Colorado; is that right?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. VERHEUL: And I believe it was your
testimony today and also in your written prefiled
testimony that New Mexico has the least stringent aluminum standard in the country; is that right?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. VERHEUL: Are you aware of the EPA repository that contains all states' water quality standards?

MR. GUNDERSEN: I know of it.
MR. VERHEUL: You know of it.
MR. GUNDERSEN: Yeah.
MR. VERHEUL: Have you reviewed that?
MR. GUNDERSEN: I have not.
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MR. VERHEUL: Are you aware that there are 24 states that don't have an aluminum standard?

MR. GUNDERSEN: I'm aware that -- I believe that Oregon is one of them.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Objection, only because Dr. Gundersen's testimony said that of the aluminum criteria that are -- have been promulgated he did not purport to reach out to every single state.

MR. CHAVEZ: I'm going to allow the question.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Only with that clarification, then.

MR. VERHEUL: Yeah. I believe the question was asked and Dr. Gundersen answered.

But just to clarify, you're aware that there are 24 states without an aluminum standard.

MR. GUNDERSEN: I'm aware there are states without aluminum standards. Yes.

MR. VERHEUL: If I said there were 24 --

MR. GUNDERSEN: I would believe you.

MR. VERHEUL: Okay.
I have no further questions.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

San Juan?

MS. MCCALEB: I have no questions.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, ma'am.

Chevron.

MR. ROSE: I can't pass up the opportunity so

I guess I need to.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I would note for the record $I$ am very surprised.

MR. ROSE: I know you're shocked and dismayed,

I can tell.

Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer.

For the record, my name is Louis Rose. I'm an
attorney with Montgomery \& Andrews here in Santa Fe,
representing Chevron Mining.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROSE:

MR. ROSE: And just a couple questions. I'll
start with Ms. Conn.

I think you testified in your direct exam
concerning the Amigos Bravos participation in the 2009
triennial review, did you not?
MS. CONN: Oh, yes. I thought you were
talking about my qualifications. But yeah.
MR. ROSE: No, no, no. I'm not going to go there.

And my recollection was, in fact, you were one of the witnesses for Amigos Bravos, as was Erik, in that proceeding, correct?

MS. CONN: Correct.

MR. ROSE: Did Amigos Bravos file any
objections to either Chevron's or Los Alamos' proposed changes to the aluminum standards?

MS. CONN: I don't think we provided testimony
or proposed or -- provided testimony and objection. I
do believe that we commented against it, if I'm remembering correctly. I'm not sure, though, at this point.

MR. ROSE: And once the standard was adopted by the Commission, I take it Amigos Bravos didn't appeal that standard to the Court of Appeals, did they?

MS. CONN: No.
MR. ROSE: With respect to the standards
review by EPA, did Amigos Bravos comment on EPA's consideration of New Mexico's standards for approval?

MS. CONN: You know, I -- we did comment on EPA -- we did comment to EPA on the process. I don't think we commented on the aluminum criteria specifically, though I'd have to go back to make sure what exactly we brought up in those comments to EPA.

MR. ROSE: And I take it you did not appeal EPA's approval.

MS. CONN: No. We did not appeal EPA's approval. No.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

And you haven't asked EPA to reconsider the approval or anything like that, have you?

MS. CONN: No, not of the -- no.

MR. ROSE: And correct me if I'm wrong, it's -- with EPA's approval of the standard, it isn't just the New Mexico standards approved, it's my understanding, and correct me, that then it becomes the federal standard for New Mexico, and becomes an EPA-approved standard? It is an EPA standard in New Mexico, is it not?

MS. CONN: It is the standard that EPA uses to -- when they're drafting NPDES permits and -- for Clean Water Act purposes.

MR. ROSE: Speaking of NPDES permits -- nice segue.

MS. CONN: You're welcome.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. We didn't set it up this way.

In terms of Amigos Bravos' proposed change to the existing standard, that is going with the EPA criteria, did you evaluate how many NPDES permits the change in the standard might affect?

MS. CONN: No.

MR. ROSE: So you have no testimony before
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this Commission as to how many municipalities', how many industrial facilities' discharge permits or NPDES permits might be affected by this change.

MS. CONN: No.
MR. ROSE: Okay.
Thank you.
Dr. Gundersen, just a couple quick questions
for you.
In your oral testimony and your written
testimony, you've referred substantially -- or a substantial number of occasions to the GEI study, as you referred to it.

And I believe that's the GEI report that was submitted to this Commission during the last triennial?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Essentially, yeah. But I'm aware there is a report to Colorado, I believe there's a West Virginia one. And I've read them all. So sometimes --

MR. ROSE: Probably more than --
MR. GUNDERSEN: -- I'm not sure which report I may even be talking about at some point. Yeah.

MR. ROSE: Well, and I haven't read the West Virginia or Colorado ones so kudos to you.

But what $I$ was getting at is in terms of this Commission's consideration of the standard in 2009, were
you aware of testimony -- other proposals before the Commission on aluminum? For example, Los Alamos' proposed changes to the aluminum standard?

MR. GUNDERSEN: I was not, no.
MR. ROSE: Were you provided or did you review
the technical testimony in support of Los Alamos' and Chevron's proposed changes to the aluminum standard?

MR. GUNDERSEN: In 2009?
MR. ROSE: Yes.
MR. GUNDERSEN: No.
MR. ROSE: Were you aware of the Department's
testimony concerning those standards?
MR. GUNDERSEN: No, I wasn't. Essentially, I was brought into the picture fairly relatively recently. So I'll make that clear. Yeah.

MR. ROSE: Okay.
And were you given in terms of review for this hearing a copy of the Hearing Officer's report to this Commission recommending the proposed aluminum standard?

MR. GUNDERSEN: I believe I was, but I have looked at a lot of documents. So I'll give you my answer like that.

MR. ROSE: No. That's fine.
And that's all the questions I have.
Thank you.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much.
We'd like to now go to Freeport.

MS. CHAPPELLE: We have no questions of the witness, Your Honor --

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
MS. CHAPPELLE: -- on this point.

MR. CHAVEZ: At this point, I would like to move to the Commission for questions.

Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Hearing

Officer.

We will now go to the Commission for questions.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY THE COMMISSION:

MR. HUTCHINSON: Want to start on that side first?

MR. PATTISON: I have no questions.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Hutchinson.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Just I can't get off of it.
Dr. Gundersen, good afternoon.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Good afternoon.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Would the elevation of
protective standards result in less available aluminum
in New Mexico stream segments?
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MR. GUNDERSEN: The elevation of aluminum standards -- can you give me --

MR. HUTCHINSON: The protective standards. In other words, go from the hardness to what Amigos Bravos is proposing.

Is that going to result in less available aluminum to our --

MR. GUNDERSEN: Oh, okay. I understand your question now.

Reverting back to the original EPA criteria would, in my opinion. Yes.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And, Ms. Conn, you did comment on Exhibit $L$ in your oral testimony here.

Who compiled that list?
MS. CONN: That was compiled by a combination of myself and our board member, Dr. Jon -- I don't actually know if he's a doctor -- Jon Klingel. He's a biologist. And it was compiled on the web site. The publicly available web site of the Department of Game and Fish has online all of the species in the state.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And did that web site provide locations that you might find these various species and mussels?

MS. CONN: It does provide the locations, what counties they're found in.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And why didn't you include that information in the listing?

MS. CONN: I think we wanted to -- to keep the -- I think these are statewide standards, these are standards that apply statewide, and so we thought the important information was that they're found in the state.

And what counties they're found in, I'm not sure, you know -- while $I$ guess that's interesting, and I think that Jon Klingel in his public comments gave some of that information, about there are 17 -- we can go back and look in the record. I think he said 17 counties that they're found in.

And so that information is readily available. We just -- we didn't provide it here. We didn't want to create a huge supplemental filing. We wanted -- our main point was to show that mussels do exist here in the state.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And wouldn't it have been more informative for the Commission to have stream segments also available for those various species?

MS. CONN: You know, I'm not sure if the database includes that. But yes, that probably would be useful to the Commission.

MR. HUTCHINSON: So you wouldn't be able to
tell the Commission if all of those mussels in the exhibit are exposed to high levels of aluminum?

MS. CONN: No.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you.
That's all $I$ have, Mr. Chairman.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Longworth.
MR. LONGWORTH: Hopefully, I just have a couple quick questions.

Going to the table -- let's see. It's
Dr. Gundersen's exhibit -- Table 1.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I believe it's page 5 of Dr. Gundersen's direct written testimony?

MR. LONGWORTH: Yes, sir.
I just -- I'm actually -- actually, just to help me out in this to understand some of the differences here.

So the current New Mexico standard is -- in the total recoverable aluminum, it appears that is more or less the same standard for acute as it is in Colorado; is that correct?

MR. GUNDERSEN: That's correct, yes. It's the chronic that's different.

MR. LONGWORTH: And so what did Colorado do to establish the chronic that's -- yeah. How did they change it?

MR. GUNDERSEN: In Dr. Gensemer's rebuttal, I -- apparently, he has a little more information on that. When he's up here, maybe you can ask him. But I don't know specifically what happened and how it got changed. But he -- I think he might have more information for you on that.

MR. LONGWORTH: Okay. Thanks.
And it's total recoverable, and -- and maybe you can help me, and maybe $I$ should ask this later -we've talked a lot about West Virginia standards, and in this it says proposed West -- proposed West Virginia which have been withdrawn or dissolved aluminum, and it has similar acute and then similar chronic.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. LONGWORTH: What's the difference between the dissolved aluminum standard and total recoverable aluminum standard?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Well, a dissolved aluminum standard would be less protective. Aluminum exists usually in two forms when it's in water. There's a portion of it that's not soluble, and then there's a portion of it that's soluble.

Usually a small fraction of that aluminum content is the soluble content, the larger bulk of it usually exists as an insoluble poly -- polymorphic forms
that we say. So they're just looking at that small, little fraction, not taking into account the total aluminum in that instance.

I guess my -- I was perplexed that you would have the same equation, yet you're now using it for dissolved when the equation, at least in the two other states, was derived for total recoverable. So my question was even how could you even have the same equation, and we're looking at two different forms of aluminum?

I don't know what the answer to that is, by the way.

MR. LONGWORTH: So let me make sure I understood what you said.

So the total recoverable is the total amount of aluminum that you would extract from a sample --

MR. GUNDERSEN: Essentially --
MR. LONGWORTH: -- where it's dissolved, which we're really only looking at the dissolved portion. So since it's a higher number, there would be -- actual total recoverable would be substantially higher in the West Virginia proposed standard.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. LONGWORTH: Okay.
And so West Virginia withdrew that standard,
right? And that's a lot of information we've been talking about.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.
MR. LONGWORTH: And so they're not really the same kind of standards, it's just the same formula, West Virginia applied it in a different manner, using dissolved versus total.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Yes. That's my understanding. Yes.

MR. LONGWORTH: Okay. Great.
That's all $I$ have.
Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Gundersen, in your testimony, it says you're aware of USEPA's plans for updating the national AWQC for aluminum and their consideration for a BLM-based approach to incorporate the effects of $p H$, dissolved organic carbon, hardness and temperature on aluminum toxicity, in an updated national criterion, and it goes on further and says that will be updated.

Is that supposed to be updated this year? Are they working on that? And do you know the status of that, what's going on with their study?

MR. GUNDERSEN: I'm somewhat familiar. It
was -- an update of it was presented, I believe, this fall at a local -- not local -- national toxicology meeting, and my understanding is that they're a little behind on progressing with developing that model.

But yeah. I'm probably not as connected to that. Again, I believe that Dr. Gensemer can probably give you more precise numbers and timelines throughout than $I$ could.

MR. DAWSON: Okay.
MR. GUNDERSEN: But I know Diana Eignor, I believe it was, presented that at the SETAC meeting. I thought it was -- actually, it was last fall. That's right. We've been doing this a while now, haven't we? Yeah. That was last fall, I believe.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. That's all the questions I have.

Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Pattison.
MR. PATTISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Are there mussels present in playa lakes in New Mexico?

MR. GUNDERSEN: I do not know.
MS. CONN: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
Pattison, I do -- I don't know the answer to that question either. It would be easy to look on the BISON
database.

MR. PATTISON: And is there an aluminum problem in playa lakes in New Mexico?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Again, personally $I$ don't
know.

MR. PATTISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Okay.

Okay. A couple of quick questions.
Dr. Gundersen, just so maybe you can help me understand parts of this better. So a follow-up question to an earlier question you responded to from the Environment Department.

If a state doesn't have an aluminum standard, does that mean that there's no protective measures for aquatic species as it relates to aluminum?

MR. GUNDERSEN: You know, the regulatory issues I'm not real familiar with, and $I$ don't know if it reverts back to the EPA criteria or not in that situation. But yeah. I'm not really a regulatory toxicologist. I don't know how that plays out.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: And maybe I'll look to
Ms. Conn, if she could help me.

MS. CONN: Mr. Chairman, could you repeat your question?

MR. DOMINGUEZ: If a state doesn't have an
aluminum standard, does that mean that there's not a protective measure as it relates to aluminum?

MS. CONN: Mr. Chairman --
MR. DOMINGUEZ: This goes -- this goes back to the point on 24 states not having an aluminum standard.

MS. CONN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I am not certain about that. I would guess if there was a reasonable potential, but I'm not sure what that reasonable potential would be based on if there wasn't a state standard. I'm not sure if EPA uses their national criteria for reasonable potential analyses when doing NPDES permits.

So I'm uncertain of that.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Okay. I was just trying to explore to help us look at where is New Mexico as far as our protective nature. So thank you for that one.

Ms. Conn, just a quick follow-up.
I notice you have previously in one of your responses and earlier during counsel's questioning -two different times you guys have referred to Jon Klingel's public testimony.

Is his public testimony technical testimony or his personal opinions?

MS. CONN: It was -- it was public testimony, Mr. Chair. Public testimony. I referred because I did
use his assistance in gathering the -- the exhibit from the -- the web site, the state's web site.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Okay. Thank you.
That's all the questions $I$ have.
No other Commission questions, Mr. Hearing Officer.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

At this point, I want to go to the public and see if there's any cross-examination for these witnesses.

Seeing none, so what $I$ want to do, for clarity -- are you now going to defer to Chevron for presentation of their direct case, or are you going to finish your case altogether?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: No. I believe -well, I'll defer to Lou and what Lou wants to do, with the exception that $I$ do have one redirect question.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. Other than redirect, I think we were going to go to my expert who then can only testify today. But --

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.
And my apologies.
MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: And that works for us.

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes. Redirect.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH:

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Dr. Gundersen, I have
a single question on redirect.

Commissioner Longworth was asking about what had happened in EPA relative to total dissolved and total recoverable.

If $I$ could have you recollect Exhibit 8 to Dr. Gensemer's rebuttal testimony, that was the EPA letter that was submitted to EPA -- or submitted -- I'm sorry -- to West Virginia.

MR. GUNDERSEN: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: In that letter, if I
remember your testimony correct, EPA expressed concerns that $p H$ was, quote, unquote, a critical factor, correct?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: And EPA also expressed concerns that the hardness-based aluminum criteria -- they had concerns about toxicity to mussels, and it wasn't properly accounted for; is that correct?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Were those concerns contingent on distinctions between total dissolved and
total recoverable aluminum, or were they concerns that were concerns whether or not it was total dissolved or total recoverable?

MR. GUNDERSEN: You mean their concerns with the proposed West Virginia criteria meaning that it was dissolved versus total recoverable?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Yeah.

Were the concerns about pH and toxicity to mussels dependent on the distinction between total dissolved and total recoverable?

MR. GUNDERSEN: I'm not sure. Having read that, I'm not sure if they -- I talked to -- I had one personal communication with somebody in EPA about it, and she expressed that there were concerns that they were using dissolved, but that's the extent of my knowledge on that.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: But fundamentally, EPA did express concerns with a hardness-based criteria relative to mussels and lack of consideration of pH?

MR. GUNDERSEN: Correct.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: No further questions.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

So at this time, let's bring up Chevron for their direct case, and most likely tomorrow morning the conclusion of your case.
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Correct?
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Rose, there is a bonus
for speed.

MR. ROSE: Well, I talked to
Mr. Schlenker-Goodrich, we could speed this up
considerably if he withdrew his proposal, but he was unwilling to do that. So --

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I did give it due consideration.

MR. ROSE: Do you want to swear him in?

ROBERT W. GENSEMER
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, was
examined and testified in direct and rebuttal as
follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Could you please state your name for the record.
A. Robert Gensemer.
Q. And with whom are you employed?
A. GEI Consultants.
Q. And in what capacity are you employed?
A. I'm a vice-president and senior
ecotoxicologist with GEI, and have been in this field of
aquatic toxicology and risk assessment for about 30 years, in both academic and consulting sectors.
Q. Would you give us a brief description of your educational and work background.
A. Sure. I received my PhD in biological sciences at University of Michigan in 1989 .

About the first half of my career, I was in the academic sector as a research scientist and assistant professor at Boston University, after which I transitioned over to the private sector as a toxicologist -- a consulting toxicologist, back around 16 years ago, and ever since I've been involved in that.

As I've been in that field, my primary areas of expertise have become toxicology of metals to aquatic organisms -- actually, that's been my primary focus ever since my doctoral work -- specifically working on the toxicology of metals to aquatic organisms and how these data are used to develop and modify ambient water quality criteria for protection of aquatic life according to EPA guidelines.

So with respect to metals toxicology and the kind of work I've done to support criteria, most of my experience is in conducting or reviewing primary laboratory research studies to evaluate the influence of how water quality characteristics influence organism
toxicity, and these are the typical constituents you've heard about today and throughout this hearing, such as hardness, alkalinity, dissolved organic carbon and so on, and how these influence both the bioavailability and toxicity of metals to aquatic organisms.

Most of my academic and private experience in this respect are with aluminum and copper. But for aluminum, my expertise highlights -- expertise highlights are it was the subject of my dissertation research and several related publications coming out of that process.

I started picking up aluminum again a few years later, working as a primary investigator for several projects within the Arid West Water Quality Research Project, which you've heard mentioned a couple times in this hearing. It was a program administered out of Pima County, Arizona a number of years ago.

I was collaborating with Mr. Steve Canton, who became part of GEI, as did I, a few years later, in which we collaborated on the development of the first hardness-based aluminum criteria concept as part of the Arid West Water Quality Research Project. That was back in the mid-2000s.

My experience of aluminum continued. I've been an expert witness for proposals to update aluminum
standards, first for aluminum here at the last triennial review in December, 2009, Colorado a year later for their basic standards hearing in 2010, and helped prepare the technical basis of a proposal for the West Virginia rulemaking with a report dated 2011 for the 2013 rulemaking, but my involvement was limited only to preparation of the expert report. I was not at all involved in any of the proceedings related to that proposal.

Most recently, since about 2008 , I've been a member of an expert science team conducting new scientific studies to support -- approximately to support registration of aluminum in Europe under the REACH program. That's capital R-E-A-C-H, which, for those who are not familiar, that acronym stands for the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals.

And while that's a European program that you might think has little value to New Mexico, the kinds of data collection activities that have been prompted by the REACH program over the last decade have generated a substantial amount of new toxicity studies for a lot of constituents, metals, organics and including aluminum.

And so this team just happened to be the one that funded a lot of work. And the way particularly the
metals consortia under REACH have operated is to plan the toxicity studies not just to be relevant for REACH registration in Europe, but also to assist the EPA in updating their aquatic life guidelines.

And so the kinds of studies that we designed and conducted were specifically for a dual purpose, both in Europe and United States.
Q. And could you discuss your role -- you mentioned you were involved in the last triennial review.

Could you discuss your role in that triennial review and the aluminum proposal?
A. Yes. I will. I was a testifying expert witness in the 2009 New Mexico triennial review. I was working on behalf of Los Alamos National Security.

The original direct testimony report that $I$ prepared was conducted as part of my previous firm, Parametrix. And so some of the citations you might see to that report is Parametrix 2009 or LANS 2009. That's the same report and exhibits that go along with that.

And then -- so that was a -- basically a parallel proposal alongside Mr. Steven Canton, who was the expert witness for Chevron Mining at the same triennial hearing.
Q. Dr. Gensemer, did you prepare direct testimony
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for this hearing?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do you adopt that testimony as your direct testimony in this proceeding?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you have any corrections or -- to that testimony?
A. Two small typographical errors --
Q. In the direct.
A. -- in the rebuttal testimony.
Q. Just the direct at this point.
A. Nothing in the direct.

MR. ROSE: We would offer Dr. Gensemer's
direct testimony and the exhibits into evidence at this time.

MR. CHAVEZ: Any objection?
MS. CHAPPELLE: None.

MR. CHAVEZ: Okay. Thank you.
I'll allow that into the record as Exhibit --
do you have a number on that, Lou?

MR. ROSE: No. It's in the record. So --
MR. CHAVEZ: -- as Chevron's Number 1 .

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you.
(Chevron Exhibits 1 through 7 admitted into
evidence.)
Q. (BY MR. ROSE) Dr. Gensemer, could you please summarize your direct testimony for the Commission, please.
A. Certainly. In my opinion, and as expressed in my prefiled direct and rebuttal testimonies, there is no technical basis to support Amigos Bravos' contention that the hardness-based criteria adopted by the New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission in the 2009 triennial review would not be protective of aquatic life in New Mexico.

These hardness-based criteria were derived according to EPA guidance. And $I$ specifically refer to the 1985 guidelines for derivation of aquatic life criteria, sometimes referred to as Stephan, et al., 1985.

And so the levels of aquatic life protection afforded by these criteria are completely consistent with the goals of the Clean Water Act and the New Mexico Water Quality Act.

These criteria were thoroughly reviewed by NMED and USEPA during the last triennial review, achieving approval by EPA in a 2012 Record of Decision for protection of aquatic life in New Mexico waters within the pH range of 6.5 to 9.0 .

Amigos Bravos was also a party to this 2009
triennial review and did not provide any comments on these criteria at the time. And I think it's important for the Commission to note that all the comments and virtually all the comments raised in their direct testimony for this hearing could have been made using information presented and available at the time of the last hearing.

In my opinion, returning to the $1988304(a)$ ambient water quality criteria for aluminum as the basis for New Mexico's water quality standards for aluminum would represent a retreat to an outdated scientific approach that does not address the importance influence on hardness on aluminum toxicity in freshwaters.

It's important to note that as a member of this REACH research consortium that I mentioned previously I'm keenly aware that the science regarding aluminum toxicology and the influence of water quality factors other than hardness continues to evolve, and that EPA is considering these data in upcoming updates to the national recommended criteria for aluminum.

However, in my opinion, this in no way invalidates the important effects of hardness. And so both myself and NMED in their -- I've noticed in their rebuttal testimony, prefiled rebuttal, have concluded that New Mexico's existing criteria are protective of
aquatic life in New Mexico.
And so, therefore, $I$ recommend that this
Commission reject Amigos Bravos' proposal to repeal New
Mexico's hardness-based criteria and turn to the 1988 national recommended criteria as a basis for New Mexico's water quality standards.
Q. Dr. Gensemer, did you prepare prefiled rebuttal testimony for this proceeding?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do you adopt that rebuttal testimony as your testimony in this case?
A. I do.
Q. Do you have any corrections or changes to that testimony?
A. Just two small typographical errors that have no substance -- technical substance and basis of my testimony, but just for the record want to make sure that these corrections are filed.

Want me to just call them out by page?
Q. Sure.
A. Okay.

So if we go to page 12 of the Gensemer prefiled rebuttal testimony, if you go to line 9, which is under Figure 1, the word at the very end of the second line -- of line 9 says "with." That word should
actually be "without." That's the first correction. The second correction is on page 20 -- page 21 of the Gensemer direct testimony -- rebuttal testimony -- excuse me. Rebuttal. On line 2, the start of that line reads "aluminate ion to the positively charged gill surface." That should actually read "negatively charged gill surface."

MR. ROSE: And with those changes, Mr. Hearing Officer, we would offer -- I guess we'll mark it as Chevron 2 and ask that it be admitted into evidence.

MR. CHAVEZ: Any objection?
Those are admitted as Chevron 2.
MR. ROSE: And that would include the exhibits attached to that. I think there's one exhibit.

Thank you.
(Chevron Exhibit 2 admitted into evidence.)
Q. (BY MR. ROSE) Could you briefly summarize your prefiled rebuttal testimony.
A. My prefiled rebuttal testimony was prepared specifically to respond to the technical concerns raised by the expert witness for Amigos Bravos, Dr. Deke Gundersen. The basic themes of his prefiled direct testimony were basically fourfold, much of what you just heard.

He cited several concerns over procedures that
were used six years ago to derive New Mexico's hardness-based criteria.

There was a claim that hardness has only a minor effect on aluminum toxicity and may not be protective at neutral or alkaline pH when compared to other water quality parameters.

There's an observation that little data exist for aluminum toxicity at pH range 8 -and-a-half to 9 . That's the very top end of the total range that the New Mexico standard encompasses, by the way.

And a claim that it is misleading to state that hardness ameliorates or protects against toxicity when studies show that only calcium ameliorates toxicity.

And so I'd be willing to summarize some of these key concerns and my basic responses to those concerns, but I'll refer the Commission to the details provided in my prefiled testimony.

So first I'll summarize some of my key responses to Dr. Gundersen's concerns over the procedures used to derive the New Mexico criteria.

As fully documented in my direct testimony, our proposal for the 2009 triennial hearing provided sound scientific evidence supporting development of New Mexico's existing hardness-based criteria equation.

That was derived according to EPA guidelines, as I've said previously, and that's been the subject of detailed review, and multiple rounds of review, direct testimony, rebuttal testimony, surrebuttal testimony, and other documentation, following all the way through the Hearing Officer's report and beyond.

This led to ultimate approval by NMED, the Water Quality Control Commission and EPA in the 2012 Record of Decision.

As documented in my rebuttal testimony, I'm fully aware of EPA's current efforts to evaluate updates to the national criteria for aluminum and that they're considering additional water quality factors such as pH and dissolved organic carbon.

I think it's also important to note that in my testimony $I$ explained a lot of the concerns that were expressed previously in Dr. Gundersen's verbal testimony and written testimony. I believe it's his Table 1 on page 5 of his direct testimony, if I'm correct, that showed different criteria equations for different reasons.

I provided all the detailed reasons explaining, to the extent that $I$ knew the reasons, as to why there's a difference. In some cases, that involved different regulatory proceedings that were not
necessarily technical in nature leading to differences, differences in how the state dealt with the chemical form, dissolved verses total recoverable.

There's a lot of history behind that that I outlined in my rebuttal testimony. Much of this was the basis of our testimony six years ago before this Commission.

It's important to note that the Arid West Water Quality Research Project equations were different for a number of reasons.

First, those equations were based on an analysis that predated the analysis for the 2009 New Mexico triennial, and were based on a rereview of information after that time. So there's no reason to expect that a few years later we necessarily would reach the same conclusion based on a re-analysis.

Also, one of the primary reasons we conducted that study was to explore application of EPA's recalculation procedure for site-specific criteria modifications. Site-specific -- in New Mexico since 2009 has the same procedure available to them, were based on differences in the aquatic assemblies in the species present in a particular location. You can modify the criteria to better suit what organisms actually live at that site.

And so the differences in equation that we show here at the bottom half of Dr. Gundersen's table on page 5 of his direct testimony just reflect that exploration. Those differences do not represent an uncertainty -- scientific uncertainty in any way. That is precisely the point of the study, is to explore that variability, based on what species may or may not be present.

Back to the water quality factors that EPA is considering, it's important to emphasize that the data that I am actually part of the program to develop explore the initial influences of pH and DOC. They do not invalidate the important role of hardness.

So it would really be a mistake to go backwards to criteria that includes absolutely none of these water quality factors. Hardness is still valid and should be included.

Dr. Gundersen expressed several concerns over the choices related to the inclusion or exclusion of various studies. These are challenging best professional judgment decisions that are always made in these kinds of proceedings.

But it's important to remember that all of the decisions that we made with respect to inclusion or exclusion of any of the toxicity studies that we used
were thoroughly vetted by NMED, the Water Quality Control Commission and EPA, as extensively documented in the administrative record, leading ultimately to EPA's approval.

Finally, as a -- as a somewhat minor technical manner, I respectfully disagree with Dr. Gundersen's conclusion that the mechanisms of toxicity of aluminum differ under acute versus chronic exposure conditions, as $I$ believe he mentioned aluminum is unique in that it affects aquatic organisms in two basic ways.

First, it causes an ional regulatory disturbance, is what we call it. Basically, the cationic metal binds to, best example, a fish gill and it disrupts its ability to maintain ion balance across that gill. It's an important function that can lead to an adverse effect on fish.

Aluminum does that, has that effect just like many other metals. But it also has this effect of once the pH is high enough, that -- or of -- not just high enough, of a certain range, that it becomes insoluble forms in aluminum hydroxide solution, this white flock you might see in certain conditions when this first forms.

This can also cause toxicity by basically suffocating the organism, that hydroxide is of a nature
that it actually binds to the gill surface and prevents oxygen exchange and other gas exchange and basically asphyxiates the organism.

So both mechanisms of toxicity actually apply under acute or short-term exposure conditions, as well as chronic or long-term exposure conditions. And so the way of the hardness criteria that we derive expresses really to some extent or implicitly expresses both mechanisms of toxicity.

And so the concerns Dr. Gundersen raised in his direct testimony in terms of what he sees as a difference in those mechanisms $I$ don't believe is valid or affect the -- certainly affect the scientific validity of these criteria.

Secondly, Dr. Gundersen claimed that hardness has only a minor effect on aluminum toxicity and may not be protective at neutral to alkaline pH when compared to other water quality parameters.

It's important to note that much of the evidence that Dr. Gundersen cited is a single study of his own from 1994 in one of the publications from his PhD dissertation. Conclusions from the single study, in my opinion, do not invalidate the conclusions we reached based on the analysis of many other scientific studies conducted under a variety of test conditions, including
more hardness and pH levels than tested in his own single study with one species.

As noted in our 2009 triennial direct
testimony report, while we recognize that overall there is a significant effect of $p H$ on aluminum toxicity over the full range of pH in nature, we were not able to derive a statistical relationship between pH and toxicity within the pH range of 6.5 to 9.0 , which is exactly how the national criteria are expressed.

They are specifically limited to waters with a range of pH between 6.5 and 9. And so when you just limit it yourself to the studies in that range, there was no pH relationship. So it's not to say pH is not important. It's just that the studies we had available at the time that were considered acceptable according to EPA guidelines we had no mathematical way of adjusting toxicity with pH.

Clearly, NMED and EPA agreed with this reasoning, as noticed by their approval in the last triennial.

And again, while $I$ recognize that new scientific studies of which I'm participating evaluate the influence of factors other than $p H$, including the Stubblefield, et al., presentation cited by Dr. Gundersen, for which I'm the fourth author, these in
no way invalidate the important effects of hardness in the pH range of 6.5 to 9.

And I'll also note that in that Stubblefield presentation those studies were conducted at a pH of 6.0 and so do not apply to the New Mexico criteria at all.

Indeed, to revert to the 1988 criteria which do not incorporate the influence of any water quality factors is a significant step backwards scientifically and could be underprotective in very soft waters and thus makes no scientific sense.

Third, Dr. Gundersen points out that little data exists for aluminum toxicity at the pH range 8.5 to 9.

And while this is a correct statement for the limited upper portion of the total pH range for which the New Mexico criteria apply, this does not invalidate the fact that the EPA approved the New Mexico criteria with full awareness of this limitation.

It's also important to note that Amigos
Bravos' own suggestion to revert back to the national criteria for aluminum suffers from exactly the same data limitation. Therefore, the outcome of Amigos Bravos' proposed solution does no more to correct the situation than the existing more scientifically reasonable hardness-based aluminum criteria.

Finally, as both $I$ and NMED pointed out in our rebuttal testimonies, a couple of newer studies -- I specifically refer to Poleo and Hytterod, 2003, Winter, et al., 2005 -- exposing fish to the chemical form of aluminum that predominates at pH values above 8.8 -- and I specifically refer to the negatively charged -- what's called the aluminate anion, $A-L-U-M-I-N-A-T-E$, chemical formula $A l(O H)_{4}-$, strongly suggests that the bioavailability and, as a result, toxicity of aluminate is very low to aquatic organisms.

Therefore, there's no reason to suggest that limited data at this end of the pH range means that New Mexico hardness-based criteria are not protective.

Fourth and finally, Dr. Gundersen claims that it is misleading to state that hardness ameliorates toxicity when studies show that only calcium ameliorates toxicity.

As pointed out in my own and NMED's rebuttal testimonies, $\quad$ believe this is not at all misleading.

This is because the hardness toxicity relationships underlying the basis of New Mexico's hardness criteria were based on empirical relationships between measured water hardness and toxicity. Because calcium's contribution to hardness is clearly included in any empirical measurement of water hardness, any
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effects of calcium ions on toxicity of aluminum will be incorporated into that relationship.

I believe that concludes my summary.
Q. Dr. Gensemer, were you present during the oral testimony from the Department on their direct case as well as Dr. Gundersen's testimony here?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Were you also here during the public testimony?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Do you have any comments or -- with respect to any of the statements made in the -- in those -- in those testimonies?
A. Probably the one comment I feel compelled to comment to, because it was raised in several places, was the concerns over protection of freshwater mussels that were first raised by US Fish and Wildlife Service and EPA in that letter that was attached as an exhibit to my testimony.

I just want to react to that by saying that I certainly note that EPA has voiced that concern, it's clearly documented in that letter. But just because a concern is raised and not -- does not necessarily mean that a criterion derived according to EPA guidance is not correct or not adequately protective of mussels.

To make that determination, we have to actually look at these studies -- and I've not looked at them in this kind of detail, just to make sure you understand that. You'd have to look at these studies to make sure that they're conducted with species that are appropriate and allowed for use, specifically North

America and resident species. This is required according to the '85 guidelines.

You'd have to find out that these studies were conducted with the correct procedures and test durations. You'd have to determine whether aluminum was measured and all the other criteria they laid out in the ' 85 guidelines.

And so without having conducted that kind of an evaluation of these studies, $I$ can't comment on whether or not that concern is actually valid enough to raise to the level to cause me any concern in the existing criteria.
Q. Do you have any further comments at this time?
A. No, I don't.

MR. ROSE: That concludes our direct case, Mr. Hearing Officer.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Rose.
At this point -- at this moment, I would like to go to NMED for any cross-examination of this witness.

MR. VERHEUL: We've got no cross-examination for this witness.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, sir.

Ms. McCaleb.

MS. MCCALEB: I have no questions.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

Amigos Bravos, do you have cross-examination
of this witness?

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: I do.

MR. CHAVEZ: Also, at this time, I'm going to ask if anybody's planning on providing public comment, if you can make sure you sign in right there at the entrance, $I$ would appreciate it.

Thank you very much.
You may proceed.
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Given the time, I was just going to note that $I$ was going to use my ability of the New Yorker to speak fast to get through these questions.

I will do what $I$ can. I am very respectful that we are in the third day of this.

BY MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Gensemer.

Fundamentally pH is an important factor in determining aluminum toxicity; is that accurate?
A. By fundamentally, across all conditions, possibly, yes.
Q. Is it an important parameter?
A. Yes.
Q. Does New Mexico's hardness-based aluminum criteria account for pH as a factor?
A. Not mathematically in terms of adjusting the criteria, but the -- but the New Mexico criteria are specifically limited to a pH range of 6.5 to 9.0 .
Q. I want to ask a particular question where the pH is over 7.5. How does the hardness-based criteria address aluminum toxicity where the pH is greater than 7. 5?
A. It addresses the effect of hardness using the equation that's set forth in the standards.
Q. Is there -- does the hardness-based criteria risk masking aluminum toxicity effects where the pH is greater than 7.5?
A. Could you restate the question.

I'm not sure $I$ understand.
Q. Where you have a pH of over 7.5, does the hardness-based criteria -- is it weaker -- is it a weaker tool to assess aluminum toxicity where the pH is greater than 7.5?
A. Given the data available and our interpretation of the '85 guidelines and how you derive criteria on the basis of hardness, it's equally valid over all pHes from 6.5 to 9.0.
Q. Do you believe that temperature is a factor in aluminum toxicity?
A. That has been noted in the literature. Yes.
Q. Is it the case that many -- are you aware of waters in New Mexico that are impaired for temperature?
A. I'm not directly aware of it. No.
Q. Did you take into account any
temperature-impaired waters when you were preparing the 2009 GEI report for the hardness-based aluminum criteria?
A. No. As per EPA guidelines, it's based on laboratory toxicity information and criteria derived according to those guidelines. It is strictly laboratory toxicity data.
Q. So does the fact that it doesn't -- that the standard does not account for -- how does the hardness-based aluminum criteria account for
temperature?
A. There's no explicit accounting for temperature in that equation. It's just based on the kinds of toxicity tests that were conducted to -- that we would include in the criteria calculation. And so to some extent, it's blind to temperature specifically for that criteria calculation.
Q. Did you say it was blind to temperature?
A. There's just no adjustment based on temperature. There was no analysis done to effect for that. But the way toxicity -- standard toxicity tests are conducted, they're generally conducted at a similar temperature anyway. So we would not anticipate seeing any temperature effects on the laboratory data we used.
Q. Would that pose a problem for New Mexico waters that are impaired for temperature?
A. Until or unless a criteria derivation solution is offered that determines whether or not temperature is, first and foremost, important enough to mathematically adjust the criteria, and, secondly, whatever that adjustment is, I can't say.
Q. So that seems to go more to the derivation of the calculations that you're saying that there aren't studies sufficient to build in temperature into that equation; is that accurate?
A. At the time, that was the case. Correct.
Q. But nonetheless, is there a concern, given those lack of studies, that aluminum -- that there may be increased aluminum toxicity to aquatics in temperature-impaired waters?
A. You know, a difficult question to answer in terms of, you know, all $I$ can really directly refer to, again, is how the laboratory-based criteria calculation method works.

In terms of application to different temperatures in nature, the simple answer is we don't know exactly how well that goes until or unless we determine it's important enough to adjust the criteria and see how that works in nature. But right now there's no adjustment made.
Q. Would it be accurate to therefore say that the hardness-based criteria -- you can't determine whether it's substantially protective of aquatic species in temperature-impaired waters, given the lack of literature?
A. I'm not sure it's correct to say -- well, the lack of literature at the time in terms of being able to see enough of a temperature range to do that analysis, again, we just don't know how much, in fact, that is good or bad.
Q. New Mexico's current hardness-based aluminum standard, is this -- is New Mexico's -- forgive me. Withdraw that.

Is New Mexico's current hardness-based aluminum standard more or less protective than the standard proposed by Amigos Bravos, putting aside your differences of which is more credible?
A. I'd say a lot of that has to do with the definition and interpretation of the word "protective." For me as a scientist working with the derivation of aquatic life criteria, what $I$ consider to be protective is specifically laid out in the 1985 guidelines -- EPA guidelines for derivation of aquatic life criteria.

So given that in my opinion the hardness-based criteria is scientifically more recent and more robust than the $304(a)$ criteria as a basis of Amigos Bravos' proposal, in my opinion, the New Mexico hardness-based criteria are more what $I$ would consider accurately protective.

And so it's not an issue of whether the concentration is higher or lower. I'd say the New Mexico criteria are more correct, more accurate.
Q. But you're not saying whether -- so you're saying that they're more scientifically accurate than the 1985 or $1988304(a)$ criteria?
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A. Correct.
Q. But as a fundamental matter of -- if you're a -- if you're a rainbow trout in a river, would you rather have New Mexico's current hardness-based criteria, or would you rather have the EPA-recommended 304 (a) criteria?
A. I personally can't comment on the motivation of a rainbow trout, but what $I$ will say is the way the science of toxicology works, it's a threshold-based analysis. When you are at a concentration below what is considered a safe threshold, just because you are farther below that level does not make it any safer or better for you.

So just because it's a lower number, so long as it's below that criteria, in my opinion, it's equally protective. You're no more protective the lower the concentration goes.
Q. Can $I$ refer you to Dr. Gundersen's written direct testimony on page 5, the Table 1.
A. Yes.
Q. And forgive me. I took the wrong binder.

Rachel, will you bring me the other binder.
And perhaps before I get the binder, there was some discussion when $I$-- with Dr. Gundersen about the approach to the 6,000 hardness level and that that would
approach the LC 50 value for fish?
6,000 aluminum level. I'm sorry. Let me get to that specifically.
A. Yeah. If you could help me refer to exactly what you mean.
Q. It is page 5 of -- again, of Dr. Gundersen's testimony, direct testimony, Table 1 .
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe he was looking over -- if you go, I think, to the hardness level -- mean hardness of 150, and you go down to the current New Mexico standards.

And he had mentioned that for rainbow trout that the LC 50 value was -- I believe it was 6,000 milligrams per liter.
A. Correct.
Q. And so this 59 -- 5,960 level, that very much approaches that LC 50 value, correct?
A. Yes. But $I$ will point out that Dr. Gundersen did not test their exposed rainbow trout in his 96-hour exposures to any hardness higher than 116 milligrams per liter. So that 150 value is not a direct comparison.
Q. It is not a direct comparison.
A. No, it is not.
Q. So you do not agree with the notion that this
is approaching that LC 50 value.
A. No, I do not. Actually, at the test hardness, the New Mexico criteria equation would return a number significantly lower than that.
Q. The pre-2009 aluminum standard proposed by Amigos Bravos is still -- in the states that do have aluminum criteria is used by all states with the exception of New Mexico and Colorado, correct?
A. Could you restate the question, please.
Q. I'm sorry.

That for all the states that have an aluminum criteria, every state uses the EPA-recommended 304 (a) criteria except for New Mexico and Colorado.
A. At this time, $\quad$ believe that's true.
Q. And the EPA-recommended national criteria for aluminum is still the only EPA-recommended criteria.
A. At this time, that's correct.
Q. In your rebuttal testimony on page 6, you note that the -- and I'll let you turn to that.
A. Thank you.
Q. You note that the equations used to develop hardness-based aluminum criteria, quote, unquote, represent the most appropriate and scientifically defensible criteria based on the database available at the time of the criteria proposals made in all three
states; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe that these equations based on current scientific and technical knowledge remain the most appropriate and scientifically defensible criteria?
A. Until or unless the analysis of the new data that EPA's reviewing, some of which I participated in development of -- until that work is actually worked through the system, been peer reviewed and published, I agree that this is the best current solution. Yes.
Q. On page 5 of your rebuttal testimony, referring to that EPA process, you note that you're involved in EPA's process; is that correct?
A. Indirectly.
Q. Indirectly?
A. Yeah. Our research team is providing information to EPA. We are not working with EPA directly.
Q. And EPA in that process is considering a biotic ligand model?

Is it ligand or ligand?
A. Depends how you pronounce it.
Q. Tomatoes, tomatoes.
A. Each is correct. Yes.
Q. Okay.

Regardless, they are considered a biotic ligand model that accounts for not only hardness, but other parameters, namely pH, dissolved organic carbon, temperature, and that model is premised on EPA's compilation and assessment of scientific and technical studies to date; is that accurate?
A. They are reviewing the biotic ligand model in addition to other simpler solutions. That's correct.
Q. Does this not suggest to you that even though you contend that the currently recommended 304 (a) criteria are dated, that use of the hardness-based criteria is problematic because it focuses on hardness to the exclusion of $p H$, dissolved organic carbon and temperature?
A. No. I do not, because to go backwards and ignore hardness is a less scientifically valid solution. Hardness may not be perfect, but it is better than not using any water quality adjustment.
Q. Doesn't the hardness-based criteria run against the grain of the current scientific and technical evidence that is informing how best to remedy aluminum toxicity?
A. I would -- I would instead articulate it as aluminum is working to catch up to the other metals. It is not working against the grain. It is behind in terms
of development of the science. But many of the same scientific properties do apply and will eventually apply.
Q. As referenced in your rebuttal testimony on page 4, GEI developed a hardness-based aluminum criteria proposal for West Virginia, in August 20, 2011; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And is this very similar to New Mexico's current hardness-based aluminum criteria?
A. I believe the criteria equations are the same.
Q. EPA expressed concerns regarding that
proposal, did it not?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And you provided a copy of EPA's letter as Exhibit 8, attached to your rebuttal testimony?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Those concerns -- and I understand that you said some of this during your direct testimony earlier. These concerns related to whether hardness-based aluminum criteria were protective of mussels and account for $p H$ as a critical factor; is that accurate?
A. Could you restate the question, please.
Q. That letter identified toxicity issues with
mussels and lack of accounting for pH as a critical
factor; is that accurate?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is it your expert view that the concerns raised by EPA regarding the West Virginia proposal are or are not relevant to New Mexico?
A. They would only be relevant to New Mexico if the studies were conducted of the -- of the type and relevance that could be used according to EPA guidelines, the '85 guidelines for derivation of criteria. Since I've not done that review, I can't provide a direct opinion as to whether there are -those specific studies cited are relevant or not.
Q. Is it your expert view that the concerns - oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me. That was the same question. Withdrawn.

Are you aware of mussel species in New Mexico that may, like West Virginia, be more sensitive to aluminum exposure and toxicity?
A. I have no knowledge of what -- direct knowledge of what mussel species exist in New Mexico or their sensitivity to aluminum or anything else.
Q. Does New Mexico's hardness-based aluminum criteria account for exposure or toxicity risk to mussels?
A. The New Mexico criteria, like any other
numeric aquatic life criteria derived according to EPA guidelines, is meant to protect the entire -- protect aquatic life generally at the levels of protection set forth in those guidelines. So it's intended to cover all aquatic life generally.
Q. In developing your 2009 proposal, did you include studies that addressed potential toxicity impacts to either mussels or gastropods as -- from the public testimony earlier today?
A. I have to go back and look, but I don't immediately recall that we had any acceptable studies for mussels or gastropods that we were -- that were available to us at the time.
Q. On page 20 of your rebuttal testimony, you agree with Dr. -- if $I$ understand this right, you agree with Dr. Gundersen that there was little data regarding aluminum toxicity at a pH range of 8.5 to 9.0 , correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you think that there was a risk of intensified aluminum toxicity at pH range of 8.5 to 9.0 ?
A. With the limited data we have available to us, I do not believe so. As indicated on the discussion at the bottom of page 20 and top of page 21 , that's the sum total of all $I$ know about it. But based on information, I do not have a concern. No.
Q. Do you believe that reversion to the pre-2009 standard, the EPA-approved $304(a)$ criteria, would better protect against that risk, given that uncertainty dealing with the science?
A. No, I do not. And as a -- to repeat what I said in my verbal testimony, the ' 88 criteria suffers from the same limitation so it does nothing to correct that.
Q. On page 5 of your rebuttal testimony, you refer to the Stubblefield, et al., 2012 presentation or report, correct?
A. It was a presentation.
Q. You were -- if $I$ understand it right, you were an author of that study?
A. Correct.
Q. What were the conclusions in the studies in this presentation relative to aluminum toxicity?
A. I don't recall at this time the detailed conclusions.
Q. If I understand your testimony right, though, you contend that those studies were conducted at or near a pH of 6.0?
A. Correct.
Q. Are these studies valid for evaluating the protectiveness of hardness-based aluminum criteria?
A. These studies were conducted as part of a larger program specifically to improve that database. So they're a specific example of a larger data set for that purpose. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with Dr. Gundersen's conclusion based on this study that application of hardness-based aluminum criteria are not practical or sound for waters with a pH below 6.5?
A. That -- no, I would not.

MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: No further questions. MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

Freeport, do you have any questions for this witness?

MS. CHAPPELLE: I do not, Your Honor.
MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Chairman, I'd now like to
move to the Commission for questioning.

But just real quick, for those of you who are here for public comment, we appreciate your patience. We just need to finish with this witness, and at the conclusion of this witness, we will get to your comments. So I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, questions.

BY THE COMMISSION:
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Hutchinson.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Good afternoon, Dr. Gensemer.
MR. GENSEMER: Good afternoon.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Do you know what are the pH characteristics of the waters in West Virginia?

MR. GENSEMER: I'm sorry.
Could you repeat the question.
MR. HUTCHINSON: Do you know what the pH characteristics are for the waters in West Virginia?

MR. GENSEMER: Not in any detailed way. I think generally they tend to have more waters in an acid pH range than New Mexico does, but other than that, I do not know specifically.

MR. HUTCHINSON: That gets to what I was
looking for.
And what about the hardness issues for West Virginia? Are you familiar with the hardness of -- in general of the waters of West Virginia?

MR. GENSEMER: With respect to what kinds of hardness ranges are encountered in West Virginia?

MR. HUTCHINSON: Versus New Mexico.
MR. GENSEMER: I -- I have no basis of -- or knowledge of differences exactly what's in West Virginia
or how they compare to New Mexico.
All $I$ know is there are certainly waters of enough hardness where there was a desire to go to a hardness-based criteria solution. There was, obviously, a benefit seen by doing so.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And in regards to the letter that West Virginia received from EPA, would it be more appropriate to classify that as EPA and US Fish and Wildlife Service raising concerns about mussel sensitivity to aluminum?

MR. GENSEMER: And that really is the sum total of what it does. It raises the concern but does not answer the question, I guess is how I would articulate it.

MR. HUTCHINSON: And did they -- did they note in their letter that their comments were preliminary in nature and did not constitute a final decision by EPA concerning the aluminum standards?

MR. GENSEMER: Yes, I believe so. They say almost exactly that in their concluding paragraph.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Thank you.
That's all I have.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Sayer.
MR. SAYER: Just one question. I think it's been addressed to some degree.
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But can you just articulate briefly why EPA has not yet adopted the hardness-based standard -- has not recommended a hardness-based standard?

MR. GENSEMER: Not being directly part of the EPA process, $I$ can't give you a direct answer.

All $I$ know from talking to EPA and Diana Eignor specifically -- I think Dr. Gundersen mentioned her -- she's the person at EPA who is in charge of this work -- they've just not finished with the work, and they've been unwilling to state with any certainty exactly what their solution is going to be.

So I have no idea directly what they're going through at this time.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner DeRose-Bamman.
MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
You had been involved with the project with the Arid West Project in Tucson, you said, or Pima County?

MR. GENSEMER: Yeah. This was -- it was called the Arid West Water Quality Research Project. It was administered out of Pima County in Tucson. It was an EPA Region 9-funded project. I can give you as much detail as you wish about that or we have time.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: And was it based on
information to study for Arizona waters, or was it kind
of a broader Southwest states issue?
MR. GENSEMER: Yeah. The project itself encompassed virtually all the Arid West states in a series of projects, not just the one that prompted the derivation of the hardness criteria, but it did include waters and analysis in New Mexico, Arizona, California, Colorado -- I'm probably missing -- maybe Utah, as well. I'm not sure. I can't remember the exact states. But it definitely included Arizona and New Mexico.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Do you know what standards apply in Arizona for aluminum?

MR. GENSEMER: Not off the top of my head right now. I'm sorry. I do not.

MS. DEROSE-BAMMAN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Dawson.
MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Dr. Gensemer, my question is you -- in your testimony, it says that you are part of the European Aluminum Association team which is studying mussels -studying the aluminum-based criteria.

Are you -- the study that you're conducting with the aluminum -- with the European Aluminum Association, are those species of mussels that you are studying with them -- are they -- are some of those species in -- also in North America, in New Mexico?

MR. GENSEMER: We are actually not conducting -- or have not conducted any tests of mussels that $I$ recall. The test species are list -- I think many of the species we addressed are listed in the Stubblefield, et al., presentation that might have been cited in one of the testimonies.

But we were not specifically targeting mussels in that study. We were working with a broad range of typically tested surrogate test species to meet the needs of European water quality framework directives and EPA criteria guidelines.

MR. DAWSON: Okay.
On the US -- the EPA, they're currently working on the updates.

In their studies, do you know are they -- are they using New Mexico -- or the North American, you know, species for their studies?

MR. GENSEMER: My limited understanding -- I don't know all the details -- I believe EPA is funding and in the process of conducting or soon to be conducting studies of mussels and they will be using North American resident species. I believe that is correct.

MR. DAWSON: Their report is supposed to be out sometime this year.

Do you know when?
MR. GENSEMER: By report, do you mean the updated criteria guidance or mussel studies?

I'm not sure --
MR. DAWSON: Yes.
MR. GENSEMER: For anybody who's worked with updates to national criteria with EPA, you never exactly know when it's going to be. So I can't say that -- I spoke with EPA most recently about four weeks ago at a workshop in Washington, DC, and I don't know more about when it will come out than $I$ did before that.

MR. DAWSON: All right. That's all the questions I have.

Thank you.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Commissioner Longworth.
MR. LONGWORTH: Thank you.
My question is pretty much similar to what $I$ asked before.

The West Virginia proposed standard is dissolved aluminum versus the standards in New Mexico and Colorado that are total recoverable aluminum.

Could the USEPA letter to West Virginia be in any way affected by the fact that West Virginia was proposing the standards dissolved aluminum, and it sounds like pretty high levels, and that dissolved
aluminum, from what $I$ understand from previous testimony, is something more of a higher concern than total recoverable?

MR. GENSEMER: Complex question, there's a complex answer. Let me see if $I$ can break it down.

I don't recall from the EPA letter to what extent dissolved aluminum per se was part of their concern. How different states have expressed the criteria, whether it's dissolved or total recoverable, is kind of a long story. I'm happy to try to summarize whatever it needs to help answer your question.

West Virginia is just like New Mexico six years ago, where their state criteria were based on dissolved metal, based on their interpretation of the 1988 national criteria. Which the point of fact is the 1988 criteria are actually -- they proposed use of a different assay altogether, something called acid soluble.

And $I$ don't know if $I$ want to take much of the Commissioners' time to try to go all through the nuances. It was a major discussion point during the last triennial review and led to the way the New Mexico standard is currently expressed, as total recoverable after prefiltration through numerical basis.

Is there any aspect of that you would like me
to drill into some more to help answer your question? MR. LONGWORTH: Mr. Chairman, no, no. That's fine.

Do you have any idea why West Virginia dissolved came up with similar values and New Mexico uses total recoverable?

MR. GENSEMER: Again, $I$ don't know all the details around what West Virginia did after we submitted our report. All the reports of GEI -- and when $I$ was at Parametrix previously, all the reports, I believe, proposed them as dissolved.

Our interpretation at the time was dissolved is more correct than total recoverable, understanding the national criteria at that time became ex- -- became interpreted by EPA as total recoverable basis.

It basically is, as anyone who will go back to the administrative record from six years ago will see -our conclusion at the time was dissolved was less wrong than total recoverable, put it in plain language.

But more to the point, West Virginia, just like New Mexico before, six years ago, their criteria already were expressed as dissolved. So I think -- so far as I know, the proposal was just carried forward with only changing to hardness-based criteria, not changing how they were expressed.

That's basically all $I$ know of West Virginia. MR. LONGWORTH: Okay. I appreciate that. Then, $I$ guess, my final question would be is given -- again, on this page 5 of Dr. Gundersen's report, Table 1, is the proposed West Virginia standard more or less -- or would provide for a higher amount of dissolved aluminum than the current New Mexico standard, for the same hardness?

MR. GENSEMER: I think it would really depend on having to look at the -- you know, the ratios of dependency between dissolved and total recoverable to see how different they would be based on their waters.

From my understanding, their dissolved and acid soluble concentrations they studied were all very similar. I don't know how it relates to total recoverable in their waters.

So without understanding the relative chemistries of both waters, I can't say. But the basis of the criteria derivation were all based on exactly the same laboratory tests, the exact same kinds of exposure systems in all cases. That's why the equations were the same.

MR. LONGWORTH: Oh, okay. Well, that helps.
Thank you.
MR. GENSEMER: Yeah.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Mr. Hearing Officer, that concludes Commission questions.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

So at this point, and let me remind you this
is not public comment yet, but is there anybody from the public that wishes to cross-examine this witness on the testimony he has provided?

MR. MORGAN: I would.

MR. CHAVEZ: Please come forward.

MR. MORGAN: I don't know if this is a
proper --

MR. CHAVEZ: Hold on, sir.

MR. MORGAN: -- question --

MR. CHAVEZ: Sir.

MR. MORGAN: Oh.

MR. CHAVEZ: If you can please come and sit
down --

MR. MORGAN: Oh, sorry.

MR. CHAVEZ: -- and state your name for the record.

Please sit down up here.

MR. MORGAN: Oh.

MR. CHAVEZ: Let me remind you that this questioning has only to do with the testimony he has
provided.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. I'm not clear about that, but may I ask my question and see if it is significant or not?

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes. It may be objected to, sir. But please proceed.

THE REPORTER: And give me your name, please.
MR. MORGAN: James Morgan.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORGAN:
Q. I commented earlier about the development of the slope value in the hardness equation and the fact that concentrations used were concentrations added to make the solution, but they were not the concentrations measured in the solution. And there's a factor of at least 10 for those different determinations.

The slope consideration should have been based on the actual aluminum content in the reaction vessel. For none of the species that were used to make the determination of slope was that done.

So that invalidates the slope parameter for the equation, and also the $Y$ intercept, because the $Y$ intercept is based on the slope.

So my contention -- or question to
Dr. Gensemer is is that correct, what I have stated?

MR. GENSEMER: Is that a valid question to answer?

It seems like it's direct to my question.

MR. CHAVEZ: Mr. Rose?
MR. ROSE: I have no objection.
MR. GENSEMER: I'd be glad to.
Without going back on all the individual
studies, $I$ can't be sure, but $I$ believe most of the studies did analytically measure total aluminum in a vessel, some did not. I recognize that.

But in the case of at least in these -- for the ones that didn't do that, we made the best professional judgment solution at the time, that EPA and NMED all reviewed and approved, that the concentrations based on what we call nom aluminum were close enough to what would have been analytically measured.

Because again, we're working with total aluminum here, not dissolved aluminum as the dose response factor. So we were -- I would say we were much closer to plus or minus tenfold accuracy in our determination.
Q. In the case of the Kimball studies for $D$ magna and the fat nose minnow -- in both of those studies, the samples taken from the reaction medium only showed values of less than one-tenth of what the LD 50 was
reported to be.
So -- and in the NSR study as well, which was a part of the slope determination for the fat nose minnow, again there were values stated in tens of thousands of microliters -- micrograms per liter.

And in all of these instances, those far exceed the solubility of aluminum at the pHes that were conducted in these experiments, and was noted in the Kimball paper over 90 percent of the aluminum simply precipitated out of solution.

So your stated LD 50 measurements were based on including all of the precipitate aluminum matter as a function of LD 50. And that is simply incorrect.

MR. CHAVEZ: Sir, if $I$ may, this is a time for cross-examination of the witness, and you're making public comment statements. So if you could ask a question. I'm sorry to cut you off, but we -- you know, this is a time for cross-examination only.
Q. (BY MR. MORGAN) So I asked if the slope and waters of determinations in the hardness-based determination are based on proper LD 50 determinations.
A. I believe that they are based on the testimony I've provided here and previously six years ago on that testimony, and $I$ would stand by that. I do believe they are accurate.
Q. Even though there's a difference in a factor of more than 10 or 20?
A. Depending on the basis of that question, it's important to note that even though concentrations of aluminum exceed solubility in these kinds of pH conditions, the organisms are, in fact, exposed to that precipitated phase, and it does contribute to toxicity. So the dose response can and must include all of the aluminum.

And that is the best way to toxicologically understand and interpret those data. So I believe that's the basis of why $I$ say that is correct.
Q. So you're stating that the concentration of a solid can be treated in the same manner as the concentration of a soluble substance, when, in fact, it is a stated factor of chemical thermodynamics that a solid can only be treated as having a concentration of 1 irrespective of the amount of solid present.
A. Well, first, I'm not an expert in thermodynamics. I do remember that from college chemistry to some extent. But these are basically suspended solids. The organisms are exposed and is a true concentration in the best particular toxic response to look at total recoverable of all the aluminum even if it exceeds solubility.
Q. But samples were a total recovery sample taken. So they did include both soluble and suspended. And those concentrations were less than one-tenth of what was reported to be the LD 50 measurements. So the LD 50 measurements were incorrect in that they used only the concentration that was used to make the solution, not the actual concentrations that were effective in the LD 50 determinations.
A. I don't recall the details of the Kimball
study. I apologize. So I can't give you a full response.

But I just will remind everybody, as I said a couple times today, that EPA did include that study in the '88 guidelines and considered it acceptable. I'm sorry. In the '88 criteria. Excuse me.

MR. CHAVEZ: Any further questions, sir?
MR. MORGAN: No, not at this time.
Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much.
Once again, anybody in the audience that
wishes to cross-examine this witness?
Seeing none, I'll go ahead and move back to Mr. Rose for any redirect.

MR. ROSE: No redirect, Mr. Hearing Officer.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I think at this point we're not going to conclude the hearing right now, not quite yet, but for today, any of the presentations of the parties, and I'd like to move to public comment, as we only have this room until 6 o'clock.

So at this point, do we want a five-minute break, or are we okay to just keep going?

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Mr. Hearing Officer, I would say given the time we should just continue and push through.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
In looking to the audience, can you raise your hand if you are going to provide public comment?

Okay. Thank you, guys. Thank you for showing up. We do appreciate that.

So everybody look at the clock and just understand given the number of you guys we have until about 6 o'clock. So just be mindful of how long you are speaking, the number of people we have here tonight.

So whoever wants to approach first, why don't you come up, have a seat, and we'll swear you in for your comment.

Actually right here, ma'am, in front.
MS. MARIAN NARANJO: Here?

MR. CHAVEZ: Center stage.

MS. MARIAN NARANJO: Center stage.

MARIAN NARANJO
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: Would you state and spell your name, please.

MS. MARIAN NARANJO: My name is Marian
Naranjo, $M-A-R-I-A-N N-A-\quad--$ or -- M -- there it is.
Let me -- okay.
(Speaking not in English.)

Good afternoon, Chairman --

MR. CHAVEZ: Ma'am, please feel free to have a seat.

MS. MARIAN NARANJO: Oh, thank you.

Good afternoon, Chairman and members of the committee.

As I already stated my name, Marian Naranjo. I'm a tribal member of Santa Clara Pueblo and founder and executive director of an organization called Honor Our Pueblo Existence, or HOPE.

Our organization's mission is "We embrace the pueblo teachings of love, respect and care, working together improving the life ways of our people in order
to provide an enhanced and sustainable environment for generations to come."

I am here today to provide public comment in support of clean water for all New Mexicans. Clean water is important to us as indigenous peoples for uses in ceremonies which require pure, clean water. HOPE and its members are concerned about a number of proposals to weaken water quality projections.

We urge the Water Quality Control Commission
to reject the temporary standards proposal to weaken water quality standards in small ponds and wetlands. Allowing pollution in small ponds and wetlands, especially where Los Alamos National Laboratory is located, could impact downstream communities that depend on clean water for drinking, irrigation, recreation and ceremonial uses.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Ms. Naranjo. Next.

KATHY "WAN POVI" SANCHEZ having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: Would you state and spell your name, please.

MS. SANCHEZ: My name is Kathy "Wan Povi" Sanchez, $K-A-T-H-Y$ W-A-N $P-O-V-I$, Sanchez, $S-A-N-C-H-E-Z$.

As stated, my name is Kathy "Wan Povi"
Sanchez, and I live in San Ildefonso Pueblo. And so I have dual citizenship. So I'm here as a citizen of New Mexico and also as a citizen of the sovereign nation of San Ildefonso Pueblo. I'm not representing SI, but I'm a citizen from there.

And I am concerned here with what I've heard. I sat through some -- a lot of the talk here about the toxicity levels, and $I$ am concerned about the quality of our clean water. And so I -- I am in support of clean water, because of the multilevel of interactive, holistic nature of our life giver, which is water. And as humans, we are vessels that hold the water for life in us, and it is not based on allowable harm.

I think when we talk about toxicity and the levels of certain chemicals or metals or things that
enter into water, we are talking two different ways of thinking.

And in my life as a native person, a lot of our teachings go back thousands of years, and a lot of talk about what gives life to water and who -- what water gives life to us is about keeping the water quality controls or standards that protect the most vulnerable in us, which is our -- our women, our children, our pregnant women, farmers, and all of life that is related to water. And we are water people. We are vessels that hold that water.

And so it's very important to talk about different standards, as far as expert testimony goes, that $I$ hope that our presentations as people in New Mexico that live here and have been here -- and our children are going to be speaking pretty soon, too -- is that you're also listening from many different levels of that interactive nature of what water means to all of us.

And the health of the water is -- also means the health of the people. And how we relate to water and the water molecules is very holistic in terms of how life in a desert -- high desert exist.

And so I would ask all of you to be listening for many different levels of point of expertise that
have been here and listening to aluminum standards that are there up in industry, that has come most recently for the profitability of what can be done and what the threshold of that allowable harm is in relationship to water, the fish, life and us, and how that two might bump heads, and how is the fluidity of that groundedness in our spiritual ways be also present in this discussion.

So I am thankful that you allowed me to be present to hear the expert testimonies that have been presented on both sides, and also the New Mexico Environmental Department, and their considerations of -of what standards is best for water to exist for us all to be alive here in high desert.

And I live right near the Rio Grande, and so I am really concerned about the quality of the water and the discharge that goes into that water and what it means for us, to be mindful of the next generations to come, because the toxic levels that we're talking about with just aluminum itself is just one element, and there's other metals, other interactions.

So there's that exponential harm or that interlay of the -- not just the cumulative pathway, but the multiple pathways enter us, and enter our water.

So I thank you for considering all the
different aspects of that.
Good night.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much, ma'am.
MS. EVELYN NARANJO: Good afternoon.
EVELYN NARANJO
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: Would you state and spell your name, please.

MS. EVELYN NARANJO: Evelyn F. Naranjo, $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{N}:$
(Speaking not in English.)
Good afternoon, members of the Water Quality Commission and the public.

My name is Evelyn F. Naranjo. My Tewa name is Than Povi, which means sunflower. And we're talking about water quality, and I'm one of the flower child, I guess you could say.

I live in the Pueblo of San Ildefonso, which is along the Rio Grande River. I am also a concerned member of the public, and $I$ am here today to provide a public comment in support of clean water.

Why I care about clean water is I'm a native indigenous human living being who, as $I$ stated earlier,
live by the Rio Grande. My people cannot -- I cannot go fishing. I cannot go swimming.

When I was a young child, I remember growing up, fishing was food. Water was swimming. We would go along the edge line, just jump in. No worry about the poison, the toxicity that's in there. As we were growing up, air pollution. Toxicity. We live right below Los Alamos.

And another thing is another concern about the chromium that's there. We're surrounded by poison. We know that.

As $I$ stated earlier, $I$ grew up just fishing, getting the trouts, catfish. Now for my kids to go fishing, you can't allow that. We don't allow them. We don't even allow them to go swimming.

Why? Because of the dangerous toxicity that's coming down. The worry that they eat that, what's going to happen.

But we know that's the two worlds that we're living in. There's people that live in three worlds, four worlds. My native people, my indigenous people, we went out hunting. Wood was abundant. Now it's limited because of the water.

I come from a generation of pottery making, my great grandmother, my sister that just spoke now. We
speak of the truth. Pottery making was our livelihood. Now it's also limited to get our clay portion. Horse manure, cow manure, our animals are affected.

We cannot feel comfortable in just going out there. When our men go hunting, as stated earlier, for ceremonial reasons, we have to be careful what they bring to us. Yes, it's a blessing when we do traditional living.

I talked about our trees, the endangerment. I am particularly concerned about a proposal that would allow temporarily weakening the standard of downstream from polluters.

To protect communities downstreams from discharges, $I$ urge the Water Quality Control Commission, and $I$ quote, to reject this temporary standard proposal. I believe that there are already structures in place and compliance schedules that provide the needed flexibility to dischargers.

In addition, I quote, $I$ urge you as a Commission to ensure that fish and the many recreational and economy -- excuse me -- economic interests that depends on healthy fish, food of the populations are protected by replacing and protecting, based on that aluminum standard with the EPA-recommended aluminum criteria as proposed by Amigos Bravos.

Finally, I would like to urge to reject the proposal to weakening water quality standards or to weaken water quality standards in small -- small ponds and wetlands and our lakes, allowing pollution in these waters which are found often in headwaters system -- we call it the head gates -- which impact downstreams communities that depends on clean waters for drinking.

As you see me pointing from the -- from the west side when the fires came, 2000 , it destroyed our mountains. It destroyed our animals. It destroyed human life, ancestors that we know. They cried. They're asking to be helped.

So I ask the Water Quality Commission to please think about this, allowing pollution of these waters which are often found in headwaters.

Also I'd like to talk about our drinking waters, very limited also, even to irrigate the gardens. People are asking us why don't you have crops, corn. I grew up with corn. We cannot do that now. It's very limited. Water is trickling down. It's not as abundant as we used to have it.

Wildife is also being threatened.
My family and $I$ depend on clean waters,
because I -- and I will say we love to go fishing. We would like again to go fishing. We would like again to
go swimming. We would like to again be holistically live to live that on the Rio Grande.

I'd like to talk about our unborn children that are not -- that are here -- that are not here, because that's part of their livelihood. As earlier said about the trouts, as earlier said about the mussels, mussels are living. If you go to the lakes, you go to the ponds, they are clinging to their life, on the stands of the bridges. They are also living fossils, as my sister stated earlier, about our life.

So I want to say thank you for allowing me to speak. I was sort of intimidated earlier when $I$ walked in, and $I$ said $I$ don't want to speak, but as $I$ hear testimonies, as $I$ hear all this being raised, I said I need to be -- I need to be a voice and be an advocate for our unborn -- our born -- unborn generations.

I'm a grandmother. I'm a single parent. I'm a great grandmother. And $I$ remember my great, great grandmother, Maria Martinez, saying it is our unborn children that we live for. Without them, we will not even be here.

So I say thank you very much for allowing me to speak and to have my voice heard. Thank you.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Ms. Naranjo.

ROBERT CHAVEZ
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: Would you state and spell your name, please.

MR. ROBERT CHAVEZ: Robert Chavez, R-O-B-E-R-T
$\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{Z}$.
Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman --
Mr. Chairperson and members of the committee.
My name is Robert Chavez, and I'm the youth coordinator for Communities for Clean Water Youth Council Initiative Project. I'm from Ohkay Owingeh and Santa Clara Pueblos.

I'm here today to offer comments on behalf of the youth council and -- and the Youth Council Initiative Project.

Water is the most important thing in life. Without it, we are nothing, absolutely nothing.

Therefore, $I$ urge you as -- as a Commission to observe the priority of life and replace the current aluminum standard with the EPA-recommended aluminum criteria as proposed by Amigos Bravos -- as proposed by Amigos Bravos, and to reject the proposal to weaken water quality standards in small ponds and wetlands to
ensure that all wildife in this area is protected.
It's a very important part of the ecosystem, and it deserves our protection.

Water is life, and never forget it. It's the most important thing that is here, the most important thing to us. We are made mostly of water.

Youth are very important to all of us. It is my job as youth coordinator to teach, to educate our youth, so that they may be informed, educated, when they sit in your positions one day, when they are the leaders of the community, when they are making decisions on behalf of the future generations, that they know water is life, and all life must be protected.

And we cannot protect life without the most important thing to us. A lot of you have it here in front of you today. You need it. Without it, we are nothing.

Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you. ZACHARY VIGIL having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: Would you state and spell your name, please.
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MR. VIGIL: Hello. My name is Zachary Vigil, $Z-A-C-H-A-R-Y \quad V-I-G-I-L$.

And I would just like to propose that all
the -- all water should be cleaned, and it should all have a -- some sort of living to it, and all the aluminum and toxins that are in the water are making just difficulties for everything that lives and to prosper.

So it's holding things back, and I think that it should be purged from that toxicity, and it could just -- people can just work towards making the water clean and put efforts towards that.

And I'd like to thank you for letting me make a comment.

And that is all.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, sir.

FRANK BREWER
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: State and spell your full name, please.

MR. BREWER: Frank Brewer, $F-R-A-N-K$
$B-R-E-W-E-R$.

Good afternoon -- good afternoon, Chairman and
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members of the committee. Greetings.
My name is Frank Brewer. I am from the
Pueblos of Santa Clara and San Ildefonso Pueblo. Sorry.
And being a tribal native, we cherish our water for it is sacred and used in most traditional ceremonies. More universal in common uses for clean water besides drinking and irrigation is recreation. My friends and $I$ go swimming in the summer. I would go camping with my family.

To sum it up to keep this brief, everything said is a tenth of a tenth of a fraction on how $I$ used water and how it is -- and was important to me. As I said before, $I$ am new to fatherhood, and already my awareness for life has noticeably changed. I want my children to have a happy and healthy life. I see water as an undervalued key to life, past, present and future.

I am here to ask this Commission for the highest standard of water quality, not only for our well-being, but for our children and our children's children and so on.

I urge you as a Commission to ensure the protection for animal, fish and man. Reject this temporary standards proposal as well as the proposal to weaken water quality standards for small ponds and wetlands.

And with that being said, I would like to thank you for public comment.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much.
ELIZABETH CHAVEZ
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: State and spell your full name, please.

MS. CHAVEZ: Elizabeth Chavez,
$\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{H} \quad \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{Z}$.
Good afternoon.
My name is Elizabeth Chavez. I'm from the Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo. And I'm here to comment on why I care about having clean drinking water.

I think it is very important to have clean drinking water in our homes not only for us, but for our children, our families and, yes, even our pets. If we don't have clean drinking water, it can most definitely affect our health and well-being.

It is also very important to have clean water in our rivers and lakes, not only for our crops, but we need it to keep the fish and animals safe. When animals and fish live in contaminated water, they become contaminated. When we hunt, go fishing, or even when we
go swimming, we have that chance of also becoming contaminated, because when we eat fish or animals that have already been contaminated, we have the chance to put in our bodies what went into theirs.

I care about the animal pop -- I care because animal population has gone down enough, and $I$ want my grandchildren to live long lives and to be able to live in an environment where they won't have to worry about -- worry about what's in their drinking water or what's in their surroundings.

Thank you.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Ms. Chavez.
It's good to see so many Chavezes speaking up. Strong name.

PETER CALVERT
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: State and spell your full name, please.

MR. CALVERT: Peter Calvert, $C-A-L-V-E-R-T$.

Good afternoon, Chairman and members of the committee.

A little bit about myself. I'm from Ojo
Caliente, kind of like northwest from San Juan Pueblo,
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where I live. I'm a concerned member of the public, and I am here today to provide a public comment in support of clean water.

I care about clean water because growing up alongside the Rio Grande and around it, I appreciate its properties it provides us with its abilities to provide arroyos and other traditional and cultural uses for me.

Being part Native American from San Juan
Pueblo, formerly known as Ohkay Owingeh, I am particularly concerned about a proposal to allow temporary or weaker standards downstream from polluters.

To protect communities downstream from discharges, I urge the Water Quality Control Commission to reject this temporary standard proposal. We believe that there are already structures in place like compliance schedules that provide the needed flexibility to dischargers.

In addition, $I$ urge you as a Commission to ensure that fish and the many recreational and economic interests that depend on healthy fish populations are protected by replacing the current much less protective hardness-based on aluminum standard with the EPA-recommended aluminum criteria as proposed by Amigos Bravos.

Finally, I would like to urge you to reject
the proposal to weaken water quality standards in small ponds and wetlands, downstream communities that depend on clean water for drinking, irrigation and recreation.

I depend on clean water on a daily basis for all my basic needs and other cultural traditions and using the Rio Grande, and also for my personal enjoyment.

And in addition to small ponds crisis, we need to please ask New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission to reject the proposed proposal to weaken standards for small ponds and wetlands specifically in Taos, Carson National Forest and Jemez Mountains, where animals drink from and farmers use for irrigation, for plants and animals, and also for cultural uses, because they store water for future uses as they act as a sponge for watersheds.

In favor for saving and protecting these areas for animals and Native American traditions uses we have been using for a millennium.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a public comment.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, sir.
MR. CALVERT: Thank you.

## VERONICA RAMIREZ

having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: State and spell your full name, please.

MS. RAMIREZ: My name is Veronica Ramirez,
$V-E-R-O-N-I-C-A \quad R-A-M-I-R-E-Z$.

Hello. My name is Veronica, like I stated before. I live in Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo.

I am concerned about the contamination in the water because it affects everyone, future generations. What happens to it now will affect it forever. It won't only affect us. It also affects our surroundings, fish, ecosystems and animals that drink the water.

So we are not only contaminating ourselves, but the water -- the animals and plants who don't have a say in what we do to the water. They just are affected by it.

We are on their planet, in a sense. They were here long before us, and we come and corrupt their living systems, their way of life, by contaminating their water and giving the water to our plants in which we all consume. We are their guests. They have been very patient with us, and $I$ think we need to start
giving back to everything, know we appreciate them.
I would like to propose that you make stricter water standards to protect us, our future generations and all life in general, to protect the aquatic life, too.

Thank you for your time.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Ms. Ramirez. MAYA PENA
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT
THE REPORTER: State and spell your name, please.

MS. PENA: Maya, $M-A-Y-A$, Pena, $P-E-N-A$.
Hello. My name is Maya, and I live in Santa Clara Pueblo. I am a concerned member of the public, and I'm here today to provide a public comment in support of clean water.

I care about clean water because I want every generation after me to use our rivers without restrictions and a fear of pollution that lies beneath the water's surface. I may be young, but $I$ know that every single action of today will affect the waters of tomorrow.

We use these rivers and streams on a daily
basis. We use it to water our crops. We play in it during the summertimes. And we use it in our ceremonies.

I pray that as our current leaders you
remember that when you make decisions on this council,
that water is connected to everything on this earth.

And thank you for the opportunity to provide this public comment.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much. STACEY LORETTO
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: State and spell your name, please.

MS. LORETTO: My name is Stacey Loretto $S-T-A-C-E-Y \quad L-O-R-E-T-T-O$.

Good afternoon, Chairman and members of the committee.

My name is Stacey Loretto, as I said. I live in Continental Divide, New Mexico, member of the Navajo Nation.

I am concerned -- I'm a concerned member of the public, and $I$ am here today to provide a public comment in support of clean water.

I care about clean water because not only do humans depend on water, but also wildlife. I am particularly concerned about the proposal that would allow temporary or weaker standards downstream. I am particularly concerned about a proposal that would allow temporary or weaker standards downstream from polluters.

To protect communities downstream from discharges, I urge the Water Quality Control Commission to reject this temporary standards proposal. Us Native Americans depend on clean water for traditional purpose. It is very important to keep our water resources clean.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comment.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you very much. BEATA TSOSIE-PENA
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, gave public comment as follows:

## PUBLIC COMMENT

THE REPORTER: State and spell your name, please.

MS. TSOSIE-PENA: Beata Tsosie-Pena, B-E-A-T-A $T-S-O-S-I-E-P-E-N-A$.
(Speaking not in English.)
With your respect, good afternoon, Chairman and members of this Commission.

Thank you to this Water Quality Control Commission for your support in protecting our precious desert waters and sole source aquifer here in New Mexico.

My name is Beata Tsosie-Pena. And I work with Tewa Women United's Environmental Health and Justice program. I'm also a member and resident of Santa Clara Pueblo and a mother of three children.

It is our duty to ensure that future generations have clean water inherently as part of the entire water cycle, starting with the top of our watershed on the Jemez Plateau.

As indigenous peoples, it is our cultural, spiritual and human rights to have water that is preserved and of quality safe for drinking, fishing, for animals we will hunt and eat, for agriculture and water harvesting, ceremony that requires bathing and direct contact through drinking, that is pure for our traditional pottery making, use of natural pigments in artistry, and safe for our plant spirits that we also harvest for food, tea and medicine.

Women's bodies are more vulnerable to toxicity, and it is through the waters of our mothers that we come into this world. We nourish our children by breast milk that can also be a source of concentrated
toxicity when mothers are overexposed to contamination in cumulative and multiple exposures to toxicity over time.

It is part of our reproductive rights to have strict environmental safety regulations to protect what we must need in order to raise our children in healthy, clean environments and so that they are born as healthy as possible right from the start. In order to raise and birth healthy babies, our waters must have the highest standard of uncompromising protection from now and into the future.

Tewa Women United is in support of adopting Amigos Bravos' proposal to strengthen the aluminum standard. The equation used to determine the current standard is based on faulty data and research, and because of the reasons $I$ already mentioned, please don't let the mining industry's previous weakening of our water quality standards continue. We must protect those most vulnerable to contamination.

I also ask that this Commission reject the temporary standards proposal that would allow polluters to apply for weaker standards in the waters into which they enact their environmental violence. In the very least, please ensure that temporary standards don't apply to discharges.

I'm asking for protection of our small ponds and wetlands which are the foundation for the beginning of our watershed and all life. They must remain free from pollution and remain as strongly protected as the rest of our waters. Please reject the proposal to weaken standards of protection for small ponds and wetlands.

We are also in support of increased protection for ephemeral and intermittent streams that flow through Los Alamos National Laboratories. While they may not flow year-round, they are very active during storm and monsoon seasons, and they're active below ground. These streams lead into our Rio Grande which is used for drinking water for Santa Fe and Albuquerque communities. Please ensure that no further harm comes to our waters as a result of the lab's ongoing production and environmental violence. Violence to our Mother Earth could result in violence to the bodies of women, girls and their unborn. When this inner circle of life givers are protected, we protect us all.

Thank you for your support and strengthening our water quality and for all your hard work.
(Speaking not in English.)
Thank you very much.
MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

Is there any further public comment?
Seeing none, I want to thank everybody who has provided public comment and remind you of how important this is as a part of our public process. So thank you for coming.

At this moment, $I$ think we're going to conclude today's hearing and reconvene tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. for hopefully a short day.

Thank you.
(Proceedings adjourned at 5:47 p.m.)
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| $475: 3,477: 19,508: 5$ | $656: 18,656: 25,$ | 591:16, 682:13, | $498: 17$ | allowed [11] - 464:1, |
| $606: 10,611: 21$ | 657:2, 657:9, 687:24 691:10, 691:12, | 735:4, 737:2, 740:6 745:2, 746:21, | $549: 8,757: 16$ | $548: 21,608: 24$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 636: 6,638: 13 \\ & 642: 22.643: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $691: 16$ | $747: 18,749: 5,$ | ahead [8] - 443:2, $475: 13,476: 2,482: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 611:3, 612:11, } \\ & 635: 23, ~ 651: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| $648: 19,650: 7,654: 3$ |  | 750:16, 753:2, 754:9 | 493:9, 554:14, | 702:6, 739:9 |
| 655:13, 659:7, | $447: 13,466: 12$ | Affordable [1] - | $644: 15,733: 22$ | allowing [6] - 555:8, |
| $689: 12,704: 17$ <br> addressed [12] | 489:16, 568:5, | $459: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aid [1] - 449:15 } \\ & \text { air [1] }-741: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 736: 12,743: 4 \\ & 743: 14,744: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $474: 4,480: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 582: 11,586: 24 \\ & 687: 3,690: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { affordable [1] - } \\ & \text { 498:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { al }[7]-606: 25$ | $744: 22$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 577: 24,587: 6,640: 7 \\ & 641: 22,643: 5 \end{aligned}$ | adopted [13] - 455:6 | afforded [1] - 688:17 | 660:17, 688:14, 698:24, 700:4 | allows [5] - 468:14, 490:25, 561:7, |
|  | $45$ | af1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 698: } \\ & \text { 717: } \end{aligned}$ | $602: 10,617:$ |
| 720:25, $723: 4$ | $493: 24,522: 5,538: 5$ | $50$ | $\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH}) 4[1]-700:$ | alluded [3]-589:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { addresses [1] - } \\ & \text { 704:19 } \\ & \text { addressing [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 565:7, 603:5, 665:10, } \\ & \text { 688:7, } 721: 2 \\ & \text { adopting }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 444: 12,444: 17, \\ & 563: 24,590: 11, \\ & 591: 24,598: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Alamos [11] - 436:2, } \\ & \text { 436:5, 436:6, 440:16, } \\ & 440: 24,475: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 595:15, } 617: 16 \\ & \text { almost }[6]-476: 21, \\ & 549: 14,575: 9,577: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
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| ```644:12, 720:20 alone [1] - 476:24 alongside [2] - 686:22, 751:5 alter [2]-500:12, 579:17 alterations [1] - 645:21 altered [2] - 615:11, 617:20 alternative [2] - 470:17, 567:16 altogether [2] - 679:15, 725:17 ALUMINATE [1] - 700:7 aluminate [3] - 691:5, 700:7, 700:9 Aluminum [3] - 625:3, 722:19, 722:22 aluminum [269]- 540:10, 540:20, 541:3, 541:22, 542:8, 543:6, 545:9, 545:12, 545:19, 546:1, 546:4, 546:5, 547:3, 547:13, 547:16, 548:21, 549:3, 549:5, 549:10, 549:17, 550:2, 550:3, 551:25, 552:2, 552:4, 552:7, 552:8, 552:11, 552:14, 552:15, 552:17, 552:19, 552:24, 553:6, 553:10, 553:13, 553:15, 553:19, 553:21, 555:25, 590:21, 590:22, 593:15, 593:21, 594:16, 595:1, 595:3, 596:11, 596:15, 597:3, 597:7, 597:17, 597:18, 598:1, 598:4, 598:7, 599:1, 599:7, 599:10, 600:21, 601:13, 601:14, 601:15, 601:19, 602:3, 602:5, 602:8, 602:11, 602:13, 602:20, 602:22, 602:24, 603:1, 603:14, 604:8, 605:7, 606:12, 606:14, 607:8, 608:22, 608:23, 610:18, 610:22, 610:24, 610:25, 611:15, 611:16, 612:5, 612:21, 613:21, 613:23, 614:3,``` | 614:12, 615:1, 615:7, 615:20, 616:1, 616:4, 616:12, 616:15, 616:16, 616:21, 617:3, 617:4, 617:23, 617:25, 618:4, 618:7, 619:1, 619:3, 619:6, 619:8, 620:4, 620:10, 620:17, 621:17, 622:1, 622:10, 622:19, 623:3, 623:21, 624:5, 624:11, 625:5, 625:21, 626:13, 626:14, 626:23, 631:9, 638:22, 639:11, 658:6, 658:17, 659:8, 659:13, 662:1, 662:5, 662:9, 662:10, 662:16, 663:2, 663:7, 663:15, 663:17, 665:4, 665:19, 668:2, 668:3, 668:7, 668:19, 669:24, 670:1, 670:7, 672:2, 672:18, 673:12, 673:16, 673:17, 673:18, 673:19, 673:23, 674:3, 674:10, 674:16, 675:17, 675:20, 677:2, 677:13, 677:15, 678:1, 678:2, 678:5, 680:20, 681:1, 684:7, 684:8, 684:12, 684:21, 684:24, 684:25, 685:1, 685:13, 685:23, 686:12, 689:9, 689:10, 689:13, 689:17, 689:20, 692:4, 692:8, 693:12, 696:7, 696:9, 696:17, 696:21, 697:16, 698:5, 699:12, 699:21, 699:25, 700:5, 701:1, 702:11, 704:5, 704:10, 704:17, 704:22, 705:3, 705:10, 705:17, 705:25, 707:3, 707:4, 708:1, 708:5, 710:2, 711:5, 711:7, 711:11, 711:16, 711:22, 713:22, 713:24, 714:5, 714:10, 714:21, 715:18, 715:21, 715:22, 716:17, 716:20, | 717:17, 717:25, <br> 718:7, 720:10, <br> 720:18, 722:11, <br> 722:20, 722:22, <br> 724:20, 724:21, <br> 724:24, 725:1, 725:7, <br> 727:7, 729:18, 730:9, <br> 730:15, 730:18, <br> 731:7, 731:9, 731:12, <br> 732:5, 732:9, 732:24, <br> 739:1, 739:20, <br> 742:24, 745:22, <br> 747:6, 751:22, <br> 751:23, 758:13 <br> aluminum's [2] - <br> 601:24, 622:5 <br> aluminum-based [1] <br> - 722:20 <br> aluminum- <br> containing [1] - <br> 553:15 <br> Alzheimer's [1] 549:5 <br> ambient [3] - 541:24, <br> 683:18, 689:9 <br> ameliorates [4] - <br> 692:12, 692:13, <br> 700:15, 700:16 <br> amenable [1] - <br> 570:15 <br> amend [1] - 467:8 <br> amended [3] - 499:6, <br> 499:13, 586:18 <br> amendment [1] - <br> 585:5 <br> amendments [3] - <br> 453:9, 453:16, 539:3 <br> AMENDMENTS [1] - <br> 433:5 <br> America [3]-541:13, <br> 702:7, 722:25 <br> American [4] - <br> 723:16, 723:22, <br> 751:8, 752:18 <br> Americans [1] - <br> 756:10 <br> Americas [1] 434:12 <br> Amigos [71] - 435:7, 440:14, 441:3, 441:5, <br> 441:10, 443:15, <br> 478:22, 480:3, <br> 514:13, 514:22, <br> 540:18, 589:25, <br> 590:14, 590:22, <br> 590:24, 592:6, 592:7, <br> 592:20, 593:13, <br> 593:18, 593:20, <br> 594:20, 595:17, <br> 597:24, 598:8, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 750: 2,752: 13, \\ & 752: 14,752: 18, \\ & 753: 15,753: 17, \\ & 757: 16 \\ & \text { anion [1] - 700:7 } \\ & \text { annoyed }[1]-646: 21 \\ & \text { annually }[1]-459: 3 \\ & \text { answer [25] - 488:20, } \\ & 496: 19,499: 1, \\ & 515: 20,516: 12, \\ & 517: 21,521: 14, \\ & 528: 20,536: 17, \\ & 542: 24,577: 14, \\ & 606: 23,612: 7,659: 2, \\ & 668: 22,674: 11, \\ & 676: 24,707: 6, \\ & 707: 11,720: 13, \\ & 721: 5,725: 5,725: 11, \\ & 726: 1,730: 2 \\ & \text { answered }[1]- \\ & 663: 13 \\ & \text { answering }[3]- \\ & 451: 9,561: 3,661: 23 \\ & \text { Antarctica }[1]- \\ & 599: 21 \\ & \text { anticipate }[3]- \\ & 520: 22,587: 10, \\ & 706: 13 \\ & \text { antidegradation }[6]- \\ & 499: 9,529: 3,529: 4, \\ & 529: 5,529: 11,639: 20 \\ & \text { anyway }[5]-600: 8, \\ & 607: 8,608: 8,625: 14, \\ & 706: 13 \\ & \text { apologies }[3]- \\ & 475: 20,482: 7,679: 23 \\ & \text { apologize }[4]- \\ & 482: 4,502: 25,627: 4, \\ & 733: 10 \\ & \text { appalled }[1]-555: 2 \\ & \text { appeal }[3]-665: 11, \\ & 665: 22,665: 24 \\ & \text { Appeals }[1]-665: 12 \\ & \text { appearance }[3]- \\ & 466: 21,475: 9,475: 19 \\ & \text { appearing }[1]- \\ & 477: 23 \\ & \text { Appendix }[1]- \\ & 440: 18 \\ & \text { applicability }[1]- \\ & 448: 1 \\ & \text { applicable }[13]- \\ & 445: 1,445: 4,463: 14, \\ & 487: 1,488: 18, \\ & 490: 23,515: 7, \\ & 526: 20,528: 18, \\ & 581: 22,582: 10, \\ & 586: 24,587: 1 \\ & \text { applicant }[1]- \\ & 520: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 636:12, 637:24, } \\ & \text { 647:11. 647:14 } \end{aligned}$ | brains [1] - 553:7 <br> brand [1] - 583:23 | bringing [2] - 521:8, 648:10 | C | $\begin{gathered} \text { care }[10]-459: 17, \\ 459: 18,735: 24, \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 648:20, 661:17, } \\ & 750: 24 \\ & \text { blessing [2] - } 59 \end{aligned}$ | Brantley [1] - 559:21 <br> Bravos [55] - 435:7, | broad [6] - 486:13, 505:19, 611:6, 611:7, 651:21, 723:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C-1 [2]-440:10, } \\ & \text { 472:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 740: 24,749: 15, \\ & 750: 5,751: 4,754: 19, \\ & 756: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 742:7 } \\ & \text { blind [2] }-706: 6 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 441: 10,443: 15, \\ & 478: 22,480: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { broadened }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 447:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C-2 [3] - 635:4, } \\ \text { 635:17, 657:3 } \end{gathered}$ | Care ${ }_{[1]}$ - 459:22 <br> career [2]-592:14 |
| $\begin{gathered} 706: 8 \\ \text { BLM } \end{gathered}$ | 514:22, 540:19, 589:25, 590:15, | broader [1] - 722:1 | $\begin{aligned} & C-3[1]-494: 3 \\ & \text { C-4 [2] }-440: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 683:7 } \\ & \text { careful [3]-460: } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 579:16, 675:18 } \\ & \text { BLM-based [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 590: 24,592: 6,592: 7, \\ & 592: 20,593: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 518:7 } \\ & \text { brook [1] - 604:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 472:11 } \\ & \text { C-A-L-V-E-R-T }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 579:19, 742:6 } \\ & \text { carried [1] - 726:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 675:18 | 593:20, 594:20, | brought [11]-461:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 750:21 } \\ & \text { C-H-A-V-E-Z } 2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | carries [1] - 653:3 |
| block [1] - 464:21 <br> blown [1] - 451:21 <br> board [4]-443:6, | 597:24, 598:8, 602:4, 623:2, 626:15, 627:8, 629:11, 630:3, 634:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 495:14, 519:20, } \\ & 520: 17,527: 14, \\ & 576: 3,644: 21,656: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 745:8, } 749: 11 \\ & \text { calcium [13]-607:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { carry }[2]-639: 5, \\ & \text { 639:6 } \\ & \text { Carson }[1]-752: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 540: 18,593: 3,670: 16 \\ \text { boat }[3]-471: 17, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 635:24, 639:6, } \\ & 640: 16,640: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 658:15, 665:21, } \\ & 668: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 614:7, 614:11, } \\ & \text { 614:16, 614:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Carys [2]-597:8, } \\ & 657: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 535:10, 535:15 } \\ \text { boating [6] - } 471 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 642: 24,644: 4, \\ & 645: 22,648: 6, \end{aligned}$ | Browner [1] - 496:6 <br> build [1] - 706:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 614:25, 615:4, } \\ & \text { 615:11, 615:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { case }[37]-447: 12, \\ & 449: 18,465: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 506:15, 506:24, | 649:19, 650:23, | Building [2] - | 615:14, 692:13, | 487:15, 490:25, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 507:2, 507:12, 559:23 } \\ \text { bodies [14]-446:14 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 651:8, 658:6, 664:17, } \\ & \text { 664:24, 665:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 433:18, 434:19 } \\ \text { bulk [1] - } 673: 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 700:16, 701:1 } \\ & \text { calcium's [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 495: 16,496: 6, \\ & 510: 24,568: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 487:1, 536:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 665: 11,665: 15 \\ & 670: 5.688: 25 . \end{aligned}$ | bump [1] - 739:6 | $\begin{gathered} 700: 24 \\ \text { calcula } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 570: 20,570: 21, \\ & 570: 22,571: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| 537:11, 537:23, | 691:21, 703:7, 708:6, | 466:20, 498: | 449:19, 610:17 | 73:15, 586:5, 586:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 563: 10,565: 1, \\ & 565: 12,659: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 711: 6,742: 25, \\ & 745: 23,745: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $538: 12,538: 18$ | 706:5, 706:7, 707:8 calculations [6] - | 587:17, 589:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 750:4, 757:22, 759:18 } \\ & \text { body [20] - 448:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 751:24 } \\ & \text { Bravos' }{ }^{[15]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | burdens [1] - 498:4 burdensome [3]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 546:25, 606:10, } \\ & \text { 608:25, 609:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 630: 12,633: 11, \\ & 649: 19,679: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 449:20, 471:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 590: 22,593: 18, \\ & 595: 17.598: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $455: 12,497: 1,499: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 609:18, } 706: 23 \\ & \text { Caliente [1] - 750:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $679: 15,681: 24,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 492:23, 506:15, } \\ & 510: 6,512: 22,517: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 595:17, 598:25, } \\ & \text { 601:9, 619:14, } \end{aligned}$ | Bureau [7] - 440:21, | Caliente [1] - 750:25 <br> California [1] - 722:6 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 681:25, 690:11, } \\ 701: 5,702: 21, \end{array}$ |
| 518:4, 528:17, | 635:15, 656:10, | 543:25, 581:14, | Calvert [1] - 750:21 | 705:12, 707:1 |
| 530:22, 534:25, | 666:20, 688:6, 690:3, 699:20, 699:22 | 628:11 | CALVERT [4] - | 730:11, 730:22 |
| $553: 11,567: 1,$ | $708: 16,758: 13$ | Bureau's [11] - | $\begin{aligned} & 439: 11,150: 15, \\ & 750: 21,752: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $490: 25,587: 17$ |
| 567:20, 568:11, | Brazil [1] - 551:8 <br> break [10] - 475:15 | 445:9, 445:17, 446:7, | camping [1] - $748: 9$ <br> candidate ${ }_{[2]}$ - | cases [3] - 530:7, |
| Bonime [1] - 548:8 BONIME [12] - | $\begin{aligned} & 476: 2,512: 3,539: 16, \\ & 556: 10,600: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $452: 13,469: 1,580: 15$ <br> Business [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 543: 15,662: 2 \\ & \text { candidates }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | catalyst [1] - 595:17 <br> catch [1]-713:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 437: 18,477: 16, \\ & 484: 11,548: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 655: 21,725: 5,734: 8 \\ \text { breast }[1]-757: 25 \end{gathered}$ | 459:13 | 540:24 | categories [4] - |
| 548:12, 548:16, | Brewer [2] - 747:23, | $562: 15,562: 2$ | cannot [10] - 457: | 543:3, 564:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 548: 19,549: 24, \\ & 550: 1,575: 24,576: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 748:2 } \\ & \text { BREWER }[3] \text { - 439:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $574: 24,585: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 555: 24,634: 9,637: 9 \\ & 741: 1,741: 2,742: 4, \end{aligned}$ | category [18] 448.25, 450.9, |
| ```550:1, 575:24, 576:4, 576:6 bonus [1] - 682:3 bordering [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 747:17, 747:23 } \\ & \text { bridges }[1]-744: 9 \\ & \text { brief }[5]-540: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BUTCH }{ }_{[1]}-434: 3 \\ & \text { button }[2]-484: 21, \\ & 484: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 741: 1,741: 2,742: 4, \\ & 743: 19,746: 14 \\ & \text { Canton }[2]-684: 18, \\ & 686: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 448:25, 450:9, } \\ & \text { 459:23, 461:2, 506:6, } \\ & \text { 506:10, 506:17, } \\ & \text { 523:23, 524:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 456:12 } \\ & \text { born }[2]-744: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 555: 6,654: 10,683: 3 \\ & 748: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 485:7, 485:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { canyon [2]-577:3, } \\ & 577: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 562: 18,562: 22, \\ & 562: 23,563: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| 758:7 | briefing [2] - 653:9, | $510: 23,511: 22$ | capable [2] - 466:25, | 564:24, 566:20 |
| Boston [1] - 683:9 | 655:13 | 514:18, 519:9, 557:5, | $469: 14$ | $574: 16,575: 2,577: 23$ |
| 509:20, 509:22, | $455: 15,592: 3$ | $\text { 591:20, } 598: 1$ | $595: 11,682: 23$ | ationic [1] - 696:13 |
| 534:17, 544:2, 583:3, | 605:14, 691:17, 721:1 | 606:9, 626:3, 657:16, | capital [1] - 685:14 | attails [1] - 471:14 |
| 597:20, 606:18, | iefs [1] - 649:14 | 664:13, 669:15, | Capitol [1] - 433:18 | attle [1] - 574:8 |
| 695:2, 716:23 | bring [7] - 521:9, | 680:4, 682:17, 688:1, | carbon [8]-599:10, | aught [1] - 652:10 |
| Box [2]-435:15, | 558:16, 589:24, | 691:17, 704:2, 719:2, | 621:22, 658:23, | $\text { aused }[1]-461: 17$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 436: 5 \\ & \text { boy }[1]-548: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 645:14, 681:23, } \\ & 709: 22,742: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 729:10, 731:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 675:19, 684:3, } \\ & \text { 693:14, 713:3, 713:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { causes [2]-594:15, } \\ & 696: 11 \end{aligned}$ |

KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS



| 547:4, 547:10, | 536:16, 536:17, | 445:8, 445:10, 535:5, | 611:13, 614:23, | 618:19, 618:23, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 549:15, 550:5, | 538:11, 539:9, 557:6, | 545:23, 569:7, 662:8, | 708:21, 709:10, | 618:24, 619:18, |
| 556:17, 564:4, | 557:8, 557:10, | 662:9, 692:5, 697:17 | 709:17, 732:13, | 629:12, 634:14, |
| 564:10, 570:9, | 557:13, 557:16 | compares [1] - 446:8 | 732:15, 732:17, | 634:23, 652:24, |
| 572:16, 573:5, | 558:19, 559:3, | comparing [1] - | 732:23, 733:6 | 659:7, 680:16, |
| 575:16, 579:2, | 559:10, 560:6, 560:7, | 602:9 | concentrations [16] - | 680:20, 680:21, |
| 582:20, 584:23, | 560:17, 561:4, | comparison [3] - | 515:5, 515:18, 546:5, | 680:24, 681:1, 681:2, |
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| 481:6, 485:22, 639:24 | doctoral ${ }_{[1]}$ - 683:16 document [17] - | 732:8 double [1] - 467:19 down [20]-474:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 710: 6,710: 19 \\ & 716: 15,716: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 667: 14,678 \\ & 688: 21.701 \end{aligned}$ |
| $[1]-549$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { down }[20]-474: 25 \text {, } \\ & 482: 18,512: 3 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | 718:5, 719:4, 721:7, | 71 |
| ayed [1] - 664:6 | 502:15, 502:18, 521:18, 534:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 482: 18,512: 3, \\ & 533: 19,555: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 722:17, } 727: 4,729: 25 \\ & \text { draft }[11]-490: 12, \\ & 490: 13,490: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 755: 2,759: 11 \\ & \text { duty }[1]-757: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| [3] - | $635: 5,638: 15$ | 569:1, 569:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 490:13, 490:17, } \\ & \text { 494:3, 495:9, 495:17, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 542:8, 547:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 648: 18,648: 21, \\ & 654: 2,654: 3 \end{aligned}$ <br> documentation [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & 646: 11,660: 13 \\ & 710: 11,725: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 495: 19,497: 13 \\ & 499: 25,500: 1,653: 21 \end{aligned}$ | early [4] - 576:24, 577:8, 577:21, 578:17 |
| 621.22, 658.23, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 728:18, 728:22, } \\ & 741: 17,743: 20,750: 6 \end{aligned}$ | drafting [1] - 666:13 <br> draw [1] - 571:16 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 621:22, 658:23, } \\ & \text { 673:12, 673:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $445: 24,469: 25$ | downgrade [14] - | drawer [1] - 583:22 | earmarked [1] - |
| 迷 | $547: 10,636: 20$ | 451:20, 457:7, | wing [1] - 507: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 533:25 } \\ & \text { earth }[1]-755: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 674:18, 674:19, | 644:20, 693:5 documented [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & 491: 22,491: 2 \\ & 492: 6,500: 13 \end{aligned}$ | dried ${ }_{[1]}$ - 577:10 <br> dries [2] - 577:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { earth }[1]-755: 6 \\ & \text { Earth }[1]-759: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 675:7, 675:19, $680: 8$ 680:25, $681: 2,681: 6$ |  | 492:6, 500:13, | 577:2 | Earth [1] - 759:18 <br> earth's [1]-552:18 |
| 681:10, 681:15, | $526: 2,559: 18,$ | 500:16, 511:4, | drill [1] - 726:1 | easier [1] - 636:13 <br> easy [6] - 444:16, |
| 684:3, 693:14, 694:3, | $696: 2,701: 22$ documents [8]- | 562:12, 569:23, $581: 5,584: 11$ | $752: 13,753: 15$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 713: 3,713: 13, \\ & 724: 20,724: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $539: 18,553: 1,628: 9,$ | downgraded [2] | drinking [17] - | $\begin{array}{\|l} 468: 21,556: 1,613: 5 \\ 676: 25 \end{array}$ |
| 724:25, 725:7, 725:9, | 628:12, 647:3, 647:8,$648: 25,668: 21$ | 457:1, 517:8 downgradient [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 498:16, 548:24, } \\ & 550: 4,552: 6,53: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { eat }[4]-550: 3 \text {, } \\ & 741: 17,750: 2,757: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 725: 14,726: 5, \\ & 726: 11,726: 12, \end{aligned}$ |  | 576:20downgrading [4] - | 736:15, 743:7, | Economic [1] - |
| 726:18, 726:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dolan [2]-475:24, } \\ & \text { 476:1 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 749:15, 749:17, <br> 749:19, 750:9, 752:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 459:14 } \\ & \text { economic [5] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 727:13, 730:18 | DOLAN [3] - 436:3, | $584: 6,595: 3$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 498:14, 517:4, } \\ & \text { 517:11, 742:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| dissolved-based [1] | Dominguez [2] - | 584:6, 595:3 downstream [8] | 757:15, 757:18, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & -547: 18 \\ & \text { distilled }_{[1]}-646: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 568:2, 586:4 DOMINGUEZ [36] - | $\begin{aligned} & 736: 14,742: 11, \\ & 751: 11,751: 12, \\ & 752: 2,756: 4,756: 6, \end{aligned}$ | Drive [1] - 434:18 |  |
| distinct [7] -448:3, | $434: 3,443: 1,519: 6$, $526.8,535 \cdot 21.539 \cdot 7$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dry }[2]-571: 23, \\ & 576: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 742:21 } \\ & \text { ecosystem } \end{aligned}$ |
| 479:22, 612:21, <br> 613:10, 614:19, <br> 636:16, 647:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 526: 8,535: 21,539: 7, \\ & 556: 20,557: 6, \end{aligned}$ | downstreams [2] - $742: 13,743: 6$ | 576:23 <br> dryer [1] - 463:15 <br> dual [2] - 686:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 746: 2 \\ & \text { ecosystems }[1]- \\ & 753: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 636:16, 647:14 distinction [9] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 557:12, 559:1, 560:7, } \\ & \text { 561:17, 567:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{Dr}[73]-504$ | 737:12 |  |
| $569: 12,584: 3,651: 4,$ |  | 595:20, 596:2, 597:8 | 490:8, 553:12, 614:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ecotoxicologist }[1] \text { - } \\ & 682: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 653:23, 654:1, 681:9 } \\ \text { distinctions [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 669:10, 669:19 } \\ & \text { 672:6, 675:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 597:11, 598:12, } \\ & 598: 13,598: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 651:1, } 657: 25,682: 9 \\ & \text { duly }[22]-444: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { edge }[1]-741: 5^{\text {edges }[1]-471: 13} \end{aligned}$ |
| 680:25 | 676:18, 677:7, | 60 | 540:2, 545:2, 548:13, | educate [1] - 746:8 |
| distinctly [1] 608:19 | 677:21, 677:25, 678:4, 678:14, 679:3 | $607: 13,607: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 551: 2,554: 18,557: 2, \\ & 591: 16,682: 13, \end{aligned}$ | educated [1] - 746:9 <br> education [1] - |
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| - 441:9 | 690:15 | everywhere [2] - | 598:16, 657:15, | $557: 24,558: 2,600: 1,$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ephemeral [45] - | especially [3] - | 524:22, 563:16 | 664:12, 669:14, | 691:4, 715:14, |
| 453:5, 453:14, | 448:23, 571:12, | Evidence [1] - 637:2 | 680:3, 682:16, 704:1, | 733:15, 742:21 |
| 454:15, 455:10, | 736:13 | evidence [56] - | 719:1, 729: | executive [2] |
| 455:21, 457:21, | essence [7] - 445:13, | 467:15, 467:17, | examination [27] - | 592:6, 735:21 |
| 458:1, 458:12, | 493:20, 493:24, | 479:8, 479:9, 479:11, | 474:16, 476:8, | Exhibit [68] - 440:4, |
| 460:14, 460:19, | 496:16, 500:15 | 483:14, 483:18, | 476:11, 476:15 | 440:8, 440:11, |
| 461:10, 462:6, | 505:3, 530:19 | 483:19, 484:2, 484:4, | 478:18, 483:2, 483:7, | 440:15, 440:18, |
| 463:12, 486:6, | essential [1] - | 494:3, 511:13, 513:3, | 483:20, 514:13, | 440:23, 441:4, 441:5, |
| 493:12, 493:17, | 552:21 | 513:9, 513:11, | 519:5, 575:21, | 441:7, 441:9, 441:10, |
| 498:24, 512:10, | essentially [11] - | 513:15, 513:24, | 575:25, 576:2, 580:5, | 441:12, 441:19, |
| $523: 15,523: 18$ | $477: 6,529: 20,624: 1$ | 522:21, 525:19, | $580: 16,591: 8,627: 3,$ | 441:21, 441:23, |
| 523:22, 524:2, 524:8, $536: 15,537: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 635:21, 646:4, } \\ & \text { 649:16. 653:1, 657:2. } \end{aligned}$ | 549:9, 558:15, <br> 558:17 558.20 | 630:22, 644:1, <br> 645:15, 656:1 | 442:4, 442:6, 472:10, |
| 549:19, 549:20, | 667:15, 668:13, | $559: 6,559: 8,560: 4$ | $679: 10,702: 25,$ | $487: 6,494: 3,50$ |
| $550: 2,555: 5,561: 25$ 562:18, 562:23. | 674:17 | $598: 2,603: 23,604: 7,$ | 703:1, 703:7, 731:15, | 504:21, 595:21, |
| 562:18, 562:23, $563: 6,566: 20,571:$ | establish [3] - | 604:11, 615:24, | 731:18 examine | 596:2, 597:1, 619:15, 619:17, 620:8, |
| 571:18, 575:2, | 672:24 | 627:10, 628:5, | 470:11, 474:24, | 620:15, 630:15, |
| 576:16, 576:18, | establish | 633:10, 633:16, | 547:10, 576:7, 580:5, | 630:19, 631:5, 632:7, |
| 577:11, 577:17, | 448:12, 513:6, 553:9, | 635:20, 635:25, | 651:24, 728:7, 733:21 | 632:12, 633:7, 635:9, |
| $585: 18,759: 9$ | $554: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 637: 18,638: 17 \\ & 638: 18,641: 3 \end{aligned}$ | examined [5] | $635: 16,635: 17$ |
| equally [3]-542:24, | $530: 25$ | 646:25, 647:2, 648:5, | 591:17, 682:14 | $637: 14,638: 4$ |
| 705:7, 709:15 | establishment [1] - | 648:7, 649:7, 687:14, 687:25, 691:10, | Examiner [1] - | 638:11, 638:12, <br> 638:14, 638:20, |
| 542:12, 546:13, | estimate [1] - 566:22 | 691:16, 692:24, | example [19] - 449:9, | 639:13, 647:13, |
| 546:19, 604:19, | estimated [1] - | $697: 20,713: 21$ | $506: 9,507: 6,517: 13$ | 647:15, 647:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 605: 24,606: 3 \\ & 607: 20,607: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 497:19 | evidentiary [7] - <br> 641:2, 641:5, 641 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 517:16, 517:17, } \\ & 559: 21,573: 3,603: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 648:3, 648:6, 648:1 } \\ & 649: 10,656: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 608:17, 609:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { estimates }[3] \text { - } \\ & 497: 4,553: 14,553: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 641:23, 642:3, | $605: 1,605: 4,609: 23$ | 657:1, 657:3, 657:5, |
| 617:21, 622:9, 674:5, 674:6, 674:9, 692:25 | et [11] - 448:8, | $\begin{array}{r} 642: 21,652: 10 \\ \text { evidently [1] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 617:1, 617:8, 637:1, } \\ & 647: 12,668: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 657:11, 670:13, } \\ & 680: 10,687: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| 695:1, 704:20, 706:3, | 456:18, $606: 25$ | $457: 21$ | $696: 13,718: 3$ | $691: 16,714: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 706: 25,711: 3 \\ & 729: 12,729: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 660:17, 688:14, | evolve [1] - 689:18 | examples [2] 506.24, 507:12 | exhibit [21] - 440:6, 502:16, 502:21 |
| $758: 14$ | 698:24, 700:4, | ex [1] - 726:14 |  | 503:1, 503:13, |
| equations [18] | Europe [3] - 685:13, | exact [3] - 573:20, | 624:12, 731:7, 732:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 503: 16,503: 20 \\ & 503: 23,595: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 605:9, 605:17 | 686:3, 686:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 722:8, 727:20 } \\ & \text { exactly [11] }-607: 16, \end{aligned}$ | exceedance [1] - 588:11 | $618: 20,621: 1,630$ |
| 605:21, 606:6, 611:5, | $68$ | 665:21, 698:9, | exceeds [2]-554:3, | 633:25, 635:3, |
| 612:9, 612:15, | 722:22, 723:10 | 699:21, 707:12 | 732:25 | 647:20, 656:18, |
| 612:17, 693:20, $694: 9.694: 11$ | evaluate [4] - | $710: 4,719: 25$ | $\text { except }[3]-455: 19,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 672:2, 672:10, 679:1, } \\ & 691: 14,701: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 694:9, 694:11, <br> 711•21, 712•3 | 666:22, 683:24, | 720:20, 721:11, | 537:19, 711:13 | 691:14, 701:18 <br> exhibits [31] - |
| $714: 11,727: 21$ | 693:11, 698:22 | 724:7, 727:19 | exception [2] | $462: 10,469: 24,$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { equivalent [4] - } \\ 510: 22,520: 3 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | evaluated [1] - 610:5 evaluating [4] - | exam [2]-529:16, <br> 664:16 | 679:18, 711:8 <br> exceptionally [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 472:9, 476:9, 481:19, } \\ & 503: 6,627: 7,627: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| $520: 13,532: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 550: 6,605: 5,621: 20, \\ & 717: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $437: 4,437: 6,437: 7$ | 545:23 exchange [4] - | 627:16, 627:19, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Erik [6] - 443:14 } \\ \text { 514:21, 590:13, } \end{gathered}$ | evaluation [3] - | $437: 9,437: 10$ | 557:21, 628:17, 697:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 627:20, 627:22, } \\ & 628: 7,632: 10,634 \end{aligned}$ |
| 653:15, 653:16, | 553:9, | $438: 4,438: 6,438: 8$ | 637:18 | 634:23, 635:2, 635:9, |
| 664:24 | $685: 16$ | 438:9, 438:10, | exclusion [4] | $635: 24,636: 12$ |
| ERIK [1] - 435:8 | Evelyn [2] - 740:11, | $438: 11,438: 14$ | 637:19, 695:19, | 644:7, 646:13, |
| eriksg@ | $740: 16$ | $438: 15,438: 17$ | $695: 25,713: 13$ | 646:17, 647:21, <br> 656:6, 656:13 |
| westernlaw.org [1] 435:11 | EVELYN [5] - | 438:18 | excuse [17] - 446:10, | 656:16, 656:23, |
| 435:11 erosio | $438: 23,740: 4,740: 5,$ | EXAMINATION [17] - | 478:11, 480:22, | 686:20, 687:14, |
|  | 740:11, 740:12 | 444:7, 485:6, 514:17, | 494:9, 497:7, 498:20, | $691: 13$ |
| error [1] - 461:20 <br> errors [2] - 687:8, | eventually [2] - <br> $543 \cdot 13,714 \cdot 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 519: 8,557: 4,576: 14, \\ & 580: 13,591: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 500:1, 508:11, |  |
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| $492: 11,492: 14$ | 471:18, 506:11, | flood [2] - 550:23, | force [1] - 570:9 | fourfold [1] - 691:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 495:9, 495:18, | 571:23, 599:21, | 577:18 | forced [1] - 649:20 | fourth [2] - 698:25, |
| 496:24, 497:14, | 607:7, 626:4, 696:13, | flow [4] - 444:16, | foregoing [2] - | 700:14 |
| 497:15, 499:6, 500:1, | 696:16, 700:4, 710:1, | 577:21, 759:9, 759:11 | 761:7, 761:8 | fraction [4]-613:22, |
| 500:2, 500:7, 500:24, | 739:5, 742:20, | flower [1] - 740:18 | foremost [1] | 673:23, 674:2, 748:11 |
| 501:9, 505:8, 507:10, | 742:22, 748:22, | flows [1] - 577:2 | 706:19 | frame [5] - 465:18, |
| 510:2, 513:6, 513:20, | 749:23, 749:24, | fluidity [1] - 739:6 | foresee [1] - 538:9 | 487:24, 495:2, |
| 528:3, 534:14, 618:9, | 750:2, 751:19, | flush [2] - 460:3, | Forest [2] - 543:24, | 495:15, 515:19 |
| 643:18, 643:23, | 751:20, 753:14 | 482:9 | 752:12 | framework [1] - |
| 645:1, 645:9, 652:15, | Fish [10]-448:7, | foam [1] - 555:19 | forever [1] - 753:13 | 723:10 |
| 654:7, 720:17, 727:3 | 524:25, 541:7, | foamed [2] - 555:18 | forget [1] - 746:4 | Francis [1] - 434:18 |
| finalized [1] - 489:21 | 541:10, 542:15, | focal [2]-479:21, | forgive [3]-517:25, | Francisco [1] - |
| finally [6] - 452:12, | 596:14, 638:7, | 573:16 | 708:2, 709:21 | 599:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 696: 5,700: 1,700: 14, \\ & 743: 1,751: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 670:20, 701:17, 720:8 <br> fishable [3] - 466:23, | focus [9]-527:8, | forgiving [1] - 531:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Frank [2] - 550:23, } \\ & 748 \cdot 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| financial [3] - 455:8, | $564: 21,575: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 527: 9,527: 16, \\ & 592: 12,636: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { form [3]-521:5, } \\ & 694: 3,700: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 748:2 } \\ & \text { frank [1] - 747:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 496:23, 517:11 financially | fishable/ <br> swimmable [13] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 636:10, 636:11, } \\ & 683: 15 \end{aligned}$ | formalistic [1] - | FRANK [3]-439:7, |
| $761: 16$ $\text { fine [2] - } 6$ | 454:24, 456:5, <br> 456:23, 470:4 | focused [13] - | formally [1] - 627:15 | frankly [4] - 459:6, |
| 726:3 | $470: 10,470: 12$ | $453: 16,457: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { format }[2]-476: 21 \text {, } \\ & \text { 591:2 } \end{aligned}$ | 461:7, 646:21, 649:24 <br> fraught [1] - 455:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { finish [2] - 679:15, } \\ & 718: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 561: 23,563: 2 \\ & 563: 16,563: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $457: 15,457: 16$ | former [3] - 463:8, | free [4]-539:17, |
| finished [1] - 721:9 | $564: 5,580: 25,589: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 457: 21,487: 22, \\ & 488: 1,489: 10,569: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 486:19, 602:8 } \\ & \text { formerly [1] - 751:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 651:4, 735:14, 759:3 } \\ & \text { Freeport [11] - 435:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Fire [1] - 550 | fished [2] - 471:10 | 569:6 | forming [2] - 533:5, | $443: 18,474: 22$ |
|  |  | focuses [1] - 713:12 focusing [2]- | 533:6 | 475:9, 475:18, |
| firm [2] - 551:20, | $507: 20,524: 11,565: 6$ | $600: 20,622: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forms [6]-614:3, } \\ & 673: 20,673: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 475: 21,518: 23 \\ & 634: 3,634: 10,669: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 686:17 } \\ & \text { firms [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fishery }[3]-469: 16, \\ & 563: 4,574: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { folks [3] - 482:22, } \\ & 652: 20,653: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $674: 9,696: 21,696: 23$ | 718:12 <br> Freeport-McMoRan |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 567:4 } \\ & \text { first [61] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fishing }[18]-457: 5, \\ & 467: 1,471: 25, \end{aligned}$ | follow [8] - 451:17, | 700:8 | [1] - 435:2 |
| 448:16, 454:21, | 498:19, 524:23 | 584:2, 598:13 | 547 | 480:3 |
| 455:4, 475:3, 475:13, | 537:25, 538:21, | 677:10, 678:17 | formulation [1] - | freshwater [8] - |
| 475:18, 485:23, | 559:24, 563:11, | follow-up [5] - | 546:25 | $541: 12,541: 16$ |
| 488:4, 488:22, 490:6, | 564:15, 741:2, 741:4, | $567: 14,572: 7,584: 2$ | forth [13] - 457:19, | 541:21, 542:7, |
| 490:10, 492:22, | 741:12, 741:14, | 677:10, 678:17 | 461:5, 461:6, 467:22, | 596:22, 618:25 |
| 498:1, 530:23, 540:2, | 743:24, 743:25, | followed [1] - 526:9 | 499:11, 510:3, | 619:4, 701:16 |
| 543:15, 545:2, | 749:25, 757:15 | following [3] - 498:9, | $563: 11,574: 8,$ | freshwaters [1] - |
| 545:21, 548:13 | fit [1] - 577:23 | $560: 10,693: 5$ | 600:24, 601:5, 630:3, | 689:13 |
| 549:10, 551:2, | five [10]-463:17, | follows [22] - 444:6, | $704: 20,716: 4$ | friends [1] - 748:8 |
| 554:18, 584:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 475: 15,476: 2 \\ & 490: 22, \\ & 491 \cdot 1 \\ & 491: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $481: 3,540: 3,545: 3$ | forward [10] - | front [9] - 475:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 584: 14,586: 21, \\ & 591: 16.610: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 490:22, 491:1, 491:2, <br> 543:10, 566:20, | $548: 14,551: 3$ | $461: 24,544: 17$ | 484:14, 487:8, |
| 591:16, 610:8, <br> 611:20, 625:4, | $655: 21,734: 7$ | 554:19, 557:3, | 550:19, 554:15, | 495:20, 520:15, |
| 630:4, 631:17, | five-minute [4] | $\begin{aligned} & 591: 18,682: 15, \\ & 735: 5,737: 3,74 \end{aligned}$ | 565:20, 589:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 582: 2,651: 22 \\ & 734: 24,746: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 636:11, 649:3, | 475:15, 476:2, | $745: 3,746: 22$ | $726: 23,728: 10$ | full [16] - 451:21, |
| 669:17, 682:13, | $655: 21,734: 7$ | 747:19, 749:6, | fossils [1] - 744:10 | $506: 15,520: 8,527: 4$ |
| 683:7, 684:20, 685:1, | flash [1] - 577:18 | 750:17, 753:3, | fought [2] - 463:5, | 534:25, 540:5, |
| 691:1, 692:19, | flawed [1] - 594:4 | $754: 10,755: 12$ |  | 554:21, 621:25, |
| 694:11, 696:11, | aws [1] - 607:1 | 756:17 | foundation [1] | 648:11, 698:6, |
| 696:22, 701:17, | flexibility [4] - | food [6] - 550:3, | 759:2 | 699:18, 733:10, |
| 706:19, 732:19, | 451:11, 493:5, | $552: 7,553: 15,741: 4$ | founder [1] - 735:20 | 747:21, 749:8, |
| 734:21, 735:4, 737:2, $740: 6,745: 2,746: 21,$ | 742:17, 751:16 | $742: 22,757: 21$ | Four [1] - 440:24 | $750: 19,753: 5$ |
| 747:18, 749:5, | flock [1] - 696:21 | Food [1] - 553:3 | four [7]-461:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { full-blown [1] - } \\ & \text { 451:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 750:16, 753:2, 754:9, | Flood [1] - 550:20 | footnote [9]495:18, 495:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 552: 25,566: 23, \\ & 594: 10 \text { 630.2 } 724 \cdot 9 \end{aligned}$ | full-time [1] - 520:8 |
| 755:11, 756:16 | FLOOD [5] - 437:20, | $505: 25,506: 1,506: 2,$ | 741:21 | $\text { fully }[7]-533: 10$ |
| fiscal [1] - 496:22 <br> fish [21] - 471:10, | 550:20, 550:23, | $506: 5,534: 16,535: 4$ | four-year [2] - 461:4, | $561: 5,600: 23,601: 5$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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| 693:11 functio | $\text { general }[7] \text { - 449:18, }$ $462: 3,518: 3,531: 21,$ | 562:3 given [ | $\begin{aligned} & 663: 10,664: 4, \\ & 672: 11,679: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 484: 10,485: 18, \\ & 548: 18,549: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 731: 13 \\ & \text { fundamental } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 638: 2,719: 20,754: 4 \\ \text { generally }[7]-637: 6, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 473: 3,477: 22, \\ & 481: 22,487: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 24,680: 4,680: 5, \\ & 30: 15,680: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 49:25, 575:22 |
| 709:2 | 637:11, 660:12, | 534:2 | 680:24, 681:7 |  |
| ndamentally | 706:12, 716:3, 716:5, | 553:21, 594:1 | 681:17, 681:2 | 578:25, 579:3, 600 |
| 597:23, 609:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 719:13 } \\ & \text { generated }[5] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 613:10, 620:7, } \\ & \text { 620:13, 633:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 682:9, 703:9, 703:17, } \\ & 704: 2,718: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 600:5, 634:5, 634:8 greetings [1] - 748:1 grew [2]-741:12, |
| 626:3, 681:17, 704:4 |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 542:11, 545:22, <br> 599:12, 624:12, 685:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 651:23, 668:17, } \\ & 703: 17,705: 5,707: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Goodrich [17] - } \\ 437: 8,438: 5,438: 7, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 85:25 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 743: 19 \\ & \text { grind }[1]-649: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| funding [2]-595:13, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 707:19, 708:14, } \\ & 717: 3,727: 4,734: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 437:8, 438:5, 438:7, } \\ & 438: 12,438: 16, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 723: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 685:21 } \\ & \text { generation }[2] \end{aligned}$ |  | 443:15, 480:20 | grind [1] - 649:24 <br> gross [3] - 497:4, |
| fungi ${ }_{[1]}$ - 600:16 furthermore [9] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 741:24, } 754: 20 \\ & \text { generations }[7] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 734: 18,761: 12 \\ & \text { giver }[1]-737: 21 \\ & \text { givers }[1]-759: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 480: 21,514: 21, \\ & 590: 2,590: 13,596: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 611:1, 611:8 ground [1] - 759:12 groundedness [1] - |
| 486:17, 492: | 736:2 |  | 627:9, 631:2 |  |
| 493:8, | 744:16, 746:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { glad [2]-527:13, } \\ & 730: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 643:15, 653:16, 682:6 <br> Goodrich- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 739:6 } \\ & \text { grounds [4] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 504:20, 513:19 | $\begin{gathered} 753: 12,754: 3,757: 10 \\ \text { generic }[1]-518: 10 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| 629:17 | Gensemer [21] | 460:16 <br> globally [1] - 588:17 <br> goal [10] - 454:1, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Schlenker }_{[1]}-480: 20 \\ \text { goose }[1]-646: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 627:19, 632:8, 634:1, |
| future [11]-511:24, | 441:24, 442:5 |  | goose [1] - 646:11 <br> gosh [1] - 488:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 641:2 } \\ & \text { groundwaters }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 538:3, 549:2, 561:7, | 605:22, 607:1 |  | governing [1] -593:11 | groundwaters [1] - 522:19 |
| 746:12, 748:16, | 607:18, 608:2 | goal [10]-454:1, $456: 22,457: 1$ |  | group [12] - 448:6,448:11, $448: 16$, |
| 752:15, 753:12, | 608:20, 609:8, 661:3, | 48 | 593:11 |  |
| 754:3, 757:9, 758:11 | 676:6, 682:20, | 507:23, 537:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 459: 16,460: 2, \\ & 524: 18,551: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 448: 11,448: 16, \\ & 448: 17,448: 22, \\ & 462: 19,514: 6,514: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 686:25, 688:1, 690:7, | 538:24, 574:17 | 524:18, 551:16 government's [1] - |  |
|  | 04:3, 719:4, 722:17, | [14] - 45 | 460:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 462:19, 514:6, 514:8, } \\ & 570: 23,573: 4, \\ & 587: 16,638: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| GALLAG | 729:25 <br> GENSEMER | $\begin{aligned} & 454: 24,456: \\ & 456: 23,457: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { grain }[2]-713: 20 \\ & 713: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 587:16, 638:24 groups [11]-447:18, |
| 435: | 438:13, 682:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 456: 23,45 /: 6 \\ & 469: 11,533: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { grandchildren [1] - } \\ & 750: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 448: 4,448: 11, \\ & 448: 13,541: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| game [2] - 510:13, | 719:5, 719:8, 719:12, | 537:25, 570:3 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 448: 13,541: 13, \\ & 550: 9,572: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| 559:24 | 719:21, 719:24, | 574:25, 589:9 | 750:7 <br> Grande [9]-548:25, | 587:15 |
| me [4] | 720:11, 720:19, | 589:18, 589:19 | 549:1, 739:15, | 587:19 |
| 524:25, 638:7, 670:19 | 721:4, 721:19, 722:2, | 688:1 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { grow }[1]-459: 19 \\ \text { growing }[4]-555: 10, \\ 741: 3,741: 7,751: 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| der [1] - 646:12 | 722:12, 723:1, | - 592 : | $\begin{aligned} & 740: 21,741: 1,744: 2, \\ & 751: 5,752: 6,759: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| gardening [1] - | 723:18, 724:2, 724:6, | GOODRICH [71] | 751:5, 752:6, 759:13 grandmother [4]- |  |
| 576:25 | 725:4, 726:7, 727:9, | 435:8, 443:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 741: 25,744: 17, \\ & 744: 18,744: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $741: 3,741: 7,751: 4$ |
| dens [1] - 743:17 | 727:25, 730:1, 730:6 | 473:21, 478:2 |  | growth [4] - 471:13, |
| gas [1]-697:2 <br> gastropods [6] - | Gensemer's [12] 595:20,596.2 | 480:21, 480:23, | grant [1] - 463:10 <br> granted [1] - 530:17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 613:8, } 613: 13,613: 17 \\ \text { guess [23]-452:3, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 542:21, 543:1, 621:8, | $606: 24,608: 2,609$ | $590: 5,590: 7,590: 1$ | granted [1] - 530:17 <br> grasp [1]-520:2 | $473: 17,526: 4,558: 1$ |
| 621:11, 716:8, 716:12 | 609:10, 618:20, | 591:4, 591:12, | $\text { rasp [1] - } ૮ ૮$ | $563: 22,564: 12$ |
| s [1] - 743:6 | 620:7, 620:15, 673:1, | 591:20, 598:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 466:5 } \\ & \text { grateful }[1]-550: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 565:14, 578:11, |
| gathering [3] - | 680:11, 687:13 | 601:8, 605:13, 606:9, |  |  |
| 521:6, 560:19, 679:1 | gentlemen [1] - | 626:3, 626:11, | gray [2] - 507:17, | 606:23, 607:11, |
| gauge [1] - 474:17 | 484:5 | 626:14, 626:17 | 539:4 |  |
| gee [1]-569:21 | genus [2] - 620:1 | 626:22, 627:1 |  | 658:13, 664:3, 671:9, |
| GEI [20]-441:24, | 620:4 | 627:14, 627:23 | 447:21, 484:10, | 674:4, 678:7, 691:9, <br> 720:13, 727:3, 740:19 |
| 442:5, 596:6, 604:4, | Germaine [1] - | 631:10, 631:1 | 630:7, 630:8, 675:10, |  |
| 604:6, 604:13, 605:5, | 475:2 | 631:16, 631:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 741: 25,744: 18 \\ & \text { greater [8] - 490:19, } \end{aligned}$ | guests [1] - 753:24 |
| 606:13, 609:15, | GERMAINE | 635:4, 635:15, 636:2, |  | guidance [14] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 610:1, 610:4, 612:15, } \\ & \text { 667:11, 667:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 435:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 636:10, 636:15, } \\ & 638: 3,638: 11,642: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 493: 5,565: 18, \\ & 613: 13,624: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 452:19, 461:21, } \\ & \text { 501:23, 501:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $682: 22,682: 25,$ | chappelle@g | 644:14, 645:7, | $704: 17,704: 23,705: 4$ |  |
| 684:19, 705:17, | com [1] - 435:6 | 645:10, 647:6 | greatest [1] - 543:23 | 502:15, 503:4, 503:9, 630:14, 658:6, 658:7, |
| 714:5, 726:9 | gill [5] - 691:6, 691: | 649:12, 650:5 | green [1] - 555:16 | 659:6, 688:12, |
| GEI's [2] - 605:7, | 696:13, 696:15, 697:1 | 650:12, 651:14 | Greenwald [1] | $701: 24,724: 3$guidelines [20] |
| 60 | [1] -541:25 | 653:17, 654:6, 654:9, | $43$ |  |
| General [3] - 434:18, | [1] - 759:19 | $655: 16,656: 8,$ |  | 603:21, 607:9, |
| 466:2, 466:4 | gist [2]-561:20, | 657:11, 663:5, | 477:13, 477:20, | 683:20, 686:4, |
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| 652:21, 654:11, | JON [3] - 437:14, | 434:17 | 540:11, 621:7, | 564:19, 574:6, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 708:20, } 722: 1 \\ & \text { issued [1] - 445:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 540:1, } 540: 7 \\ & \text { journal }[1]-661: 8 \end{aligned}$ | kathryn.becker@ state.nm.us [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 670:17, } 671: 10 \\ \text { KLINGEL [6] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 574:12, 574:17, } \\ & \text { 676:20, 677:3, 743:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| issues [28]-453:17, | uan [49]-435:13, | 434:20 | 437:14, 540:1, 540:7, | 744:7, 749:22 |
| 455:25, 475:4, | 440:3, 443:10, | HY [3] - 438:21, | 544:9, 544:12, 544:14 | land [21] - 524:1 |
| 479:17, 483:22, | 443:24, 444:18 | 737:1, 737:8 | Klingel's [2] - 621:9, | 524:20, 524:2 |
| 512:4, 519:20, 562:5, | 444:21, 445:9, | Kathy [2]-737:7 | 678:21 | 525:1, 525:2, 525:6 |
| 590:24, 592:21, | 445:10, 445:13 | 737:10 | wing [2] | 536:9, 536:19 |
| 626:21, 627:3, 636:6, | 445:20, 446:4, | nly [1] - 689 | 637:19, 652:1 | 536:20, 536:23, |
| 636:13, 636:16, | 446:21, 447:2 | ep [13]-463:25, | knowledge [10] | 537:9, 538:8, 538:20, |
| 638:13, 639:8, 639:9, | 447:19, 452:16 | 471:1, 491:2 | 495:14, 504:20, | 538:22, 538:23, |
| 639:11, 640:25, | 452:20, 453:6, | 533:21, 556:3, 556:4, | 615:7, 617:13 | 573:11, 574:10 |
| 642:6, 647:3, 652:9 | 453:18, 461:13 | 609:25, 628:4, 671:3, | 630:21, 681:16 | 574:22, 579:13 |
| 653:5, 656:2, 677:17, | 472:10, 474:14 | 734:8, 748:10, | 712:4, 715:19 | 587:18 |
| $\begin{gathered} 714: 24,719: 18 \\ \text { IT }_{[1]}-433: 15 \end{gathered}$ | 478:23, 479:14 | 749:23, 756:1 | 715:20, 719:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Land }{ }_{[1]}-543: 25 \\ & \text { lands }[1]-524: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 481:5, 481:15, | keeping [5] - 534:1, | known [8]-552:19, |  |
| IT [1] - 433:15 <br> item [1]-521:18 | 482:12, 483:1, | 611:7, 611:8, 626:25, | 552:22, 553:21, | language [44]- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { itemize }[1]-656: 6 \\ & \text { iterative }[1]-643: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 485:14, 487:6 | 738:6 | 578:8, 636:23, 637:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 444: 25,445: 3, \\ & 446: 11,447: 11, \\ & 451: 5,451: 6,452: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 487:21, 487:25 | Keller [1]-551:20 | 637:11, 751:9 |  |
| iterative [1] - 643:20 itself [13]-457:3, | 488:9, 488:13, 489:5, | NNEDY ${ }_{[1]}$ | knows [1] - 579:21 |  |
| 517:10, 628:21,$628: 24,631: 4,631: 5$, | 489:13, 527:5, 573:4, | 435:3 | kudos [1] - 667:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 452: 21,455: 11, \\ & 467: 20,470: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 573:5, 634:17, | key [6] - 609:16 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 628: 24,631: 4,631: 5 \\ & 631: 6,640: 9,641: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 634:19, 635:16, } \\ & \text { 635:17, 640:23, } \\ & \text { 653:12, 657:3, } \\ & 663: 23,750: 25,751: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 609:19, 621:25, | L | 486:17, 486:23, 488:24. 491:16. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 644:19, 645:16, } \\ & 722: 2,739: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  | 748:16 <br> kids [1] - 741: | L-O-R-E-T-T-O [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 488:24, 491:16, } \\ & 495: 4,497: 8,498: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| J | $\begin{array}{r} \text { judgment }[2]- \\ 695: 21,730: 13 \end{array}$ | kill [4] - 555:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 755:17 } \\ & \text { lab's [1] - 759: } \end{aligned}$ | $499: 10,501: 11,$ <br> 501:12, 504:2, 505:5, |
|  | judicial [4]-636:24, | ogram [1] - 553:11 | label [1] - 532:17 | 505:13, 506:2 |
|  | 636:25, $637: 3,651: 1$ judicially $[1]-637: 5$ | Kimball [8] - 610:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Laboratories }[1] \text { - } \\ & 759: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 507:9, 516:18, } \\ & 526: 13,526: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 434:8 } \\ & \text { James [3] - 462:11, } \end{aligned}$ | judicially [1] - 637:5 <br> July [2] - 441:18, | 611:20, 612:3, | Laboratory [4] | 526:13, 526:15, $526: 18,527: 6,528$ |
|  | 441:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 657:22, 658:8, } \\ & 730: 22,731: 9,733: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 436:4, 436:5, 475:25, | 528:12, 531:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 544:21, 729:8 } \\ & \text { JAMES [2] - 437:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { jump [2] - 577:7, } \\ & 741: 5 \end{aligned}$ | kind [52] - 449:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 736: 13 \\ & \text { laboratory }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 534: 13,580: 24, \\ & 604: 10,611: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| JAMES [2] - 437:16, 545:1 | jumped ${ }_{[1]}$ - 493 jurisdiction [5] - | $452: 5,452: 8,454: 5$ $457: 23,458: 25,$ | 611:14, 683:24 | $640: 9,653: 22,726: 19$ |
| 545:1 <br> JANE [1] - 434:4 |  | $459: 3,460: 5,462: 22,$ | 705:20, 705:22, | LANS [1] - 686:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { January }[1]-595: 22 \\ & \text { JECFA }[3]-553: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 465: 15,465: 22, \\ & 522: 15,571: 17,637: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 463:5, 469:10, | 706:14, 707:8, 727:20 laboratory-based [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { large }[3]-448: 25, \\ & 539: 3,545: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| JECFA [3] - 553:3, 553:9, 553:14 Jemez [2] - 752:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { jurisdictional }[1] \text { - } \\ & 522: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 471:24, 475:5, 479:8, 479:12, 479:17, | $\begin{aligned} & -707: 8 \\ & \quad \text { lack [10] - 481:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 539:3, 545:23 } \\ & \text { largely }[1]-448: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 757:12 | 522:16 | 495:4, 497:4, 510:12, | 597:12, 605:19, | larger [7] - 489:1, |
| jeopardy [1] - 561:12 jmccaleb@ | Justice [1] - 757: justification [1] - | $530: 8,537: 6,537: 11,$ | 615:24, 657:25, | 673:24, 718:2, 718:3 |
|  | justification [1] - 560:13 | $559: 15,560: 3,$ | 681:19, 707:3, | largest [1] - 594:15 |
| taylormccaleb.com[1]-435:17 | justify [2] - 558:17, | 562:15, 563:8, 567:8, | 707:19, 707:22, | LARRY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 434:3 |
|  | 597:15 | 572:2, 573:11, | 714:25 | last [27] - 480:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-435: 17} \\ & \text { job }[1]-746: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | $579: 11,585: 7,$ | ladies [1] - 484:5 | 489:11, 509:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { job [1] - 746:8 } \\ & \text { John [1] - 443:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $525: 19$ | 600:19, 622:7, 631:7, | laid [2] - 702:12, | 514:4, 529:10, |
| JOHN [3] - 434:5, |  | 652:9, 652:10, | 708:12 | 550:22, 551:19, |
| 434:6, 434:17 | K | 652:11, 652:19 | Lake [2] - 471:9 | 585:16, 587:25, |
| john.verheul@ <br> state.nm.us [1] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & 652: 25,653: 6,658: 9 \\ & 675: 5,683: 22,702: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 471:22 <br> lake [14] - 450:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 593:9, 594:17, } \\ & 594: 23,595: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 434:21Joint $[1]-553: 2$ | K-L-I-N-G-E-L [1] - | $702: 14,721: 25$ | 456:24, 471:11, | 629:15, 645:20, |
|  | K-L-I-N-G-E-L ${ }^{\text {540 }}$ - | 725:10, 750:2 | 471:12, 471:23, | 651:13, 652:25, |
| Joint ${ }_{[1]}$ - 553:2 <br> JOLENE [1] - 435:14 | KAREN [2] - 437:18, | inds [11] - 463:19, | 471:24, 471:25 | 667:14, 676:12, |
| Jolene [1] - 443:10 | 548:12 | 499:15, 565:1, 637:4, | 571:23, 574:8, | 676:14, 685:1, |
| Jon [6] - 540:7,540:11, $670: 16$, | Karen [1] - 548:8 <br> Kathryn [2] - 443:12, | 685:19, 686:5, | 574:21, 575:1, 575:5, | 685:21, 686:9, |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 695:22, 706:3, } \\ & \text { 719:21. 727:20 } 732: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 588:12 | 688:21, 689:7,698:19, $725: 22$ |
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| Section [36]-446:2, S | $733: 22,760: 2$ | 620:3, 621:5, 623:1 $624: 6,715: 17$ | short-term [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 637:16, 647:18, } \\ & 707: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 450: 6,453: 4,454: 15 \\ & 455: 2,455: 11 \end{aligned}$ | seeks [1] - 485:15 | sensitivity [2] - | 613:3, 697:5 shortcut [1] - 561:11 | simpler [2] - 492:5, |
|  | seem [4] - 497 | 715:21, 720:10 | shorthand [1] - | 713:8 |
| 455:20, 458:15, | $510: 16,625: 25$ $646: 24$ | sentence [10] <br> 450:7, 466:7 | 761:10 | simplistic [1] - |
| 463:22, 470:22, |  | 4 | shoulder [1] - 508:18 | 622:14 |
| 492:18, 493:12, |  |  | shoulders [1] - | simply [15] - 479:4, |
| 494:17, 495:11, |  | $583: 12,588: 2,588$ | 466:20 | $481$ |
| 500:10, 523:23, | $448: 15,460: 14$ | sentences [1] - |  | $546: 9,546: 16$ |
| 526:18, 531:17, | $460: 20,470: 13$ | $456: 10$ | 461:10, 469:3, 500:8, $564: 4,566 \cdot 10,575 \cdot 4$ | 636:23, 639:7, |
| 531:18, 531:22, |  | separate [1] - 639:19 | 564:4, 566:10, 575:4, 580:25, 585:25, | 643:25, 644:16, |
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| 650:18, 656:16, | 752:1, 752:8, 752:11, | 733:15, 748:3 | 596:15, 596:17, | specifies [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 731: 9,731: 13 \\ & \text { single }[11]-507: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 759:1, } 759: 6 \\ \text { societies }[1] \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sort }[25]-451: 10, \\ & 451: 24.460: 18 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 596:23, 596:24, } \\ & \text { 596:25. 597:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 516: 14 \\ & \text { specify }[2]-531 \end{aligned}$ |
| 639:21, 649:20, | 600:1 | 466:21, 480:1 | 598:3, 601:20, 605:3, | 532:10 |
| 659:16, 663:8, 680:6, | ociety [2] - 600:12, | :11, 559:19 | 605:20, 606:15 | ative ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| 697:20, 697:22, | 600 | 559:24, 567:3 | 606:22, 608:1 | 558 |
| 698:2, 744:17, 754:23 | soft [1] - 699:9 | 9, 603:1 | 616:25, 617:7 | [2] - 682:4, |
| sister [2]-741:25, <br> 744:10 <br> sit [5] - 591:8, 630:22, 728:17, <br> 728:22, 746:10 <br> site [20]-447:7, <br> 452:2, 463:12, <br> 467:18, 487:1, <br> 503:25, 520:3, 520:6, <br> 520:9, 528:6, 559:13, <br> 559:22, 670:18, <br> 670:19, 670:21, <br> 679:2, 694:19, <br> 694:20, 694:25 <br> site-specific [10] - <br> 447:7, 452:2, 463:12, <br> 487:1, 520:3, 520:6, <br> 520:9, 528:6, 694:19, <br> 694:20 <br> sitting [1] - 463:17 <br> situated [1] - 456:12 <br> situation [4] - 460:4, <br> 577:19, 677:19, <br> 699:23 <br> situations [4] - <br> 460:8, 529:9, 530:8, <br> 530:13 <br> $\boldsymbol{s i x}$ [10] - 455:6, <br> 458:7, 463:17, <br> 542:13, 692:1, 694:6, <br> 725:12, 726:17, <br> 726:21, 731:23 <br> SJWC [5] - 440:4, <br> 440:6, 440:8, 440:11, <br> 484:3 <br> skipped [1] - 482:1 <br> slightly [1] - 605:18 <br> slope [15] - 546:13, <br> 607:20, 607:21, <br> 608:8, 608:12, <br> 608:20, 608:25, <br> 609:9, 729:12, <br> 729:17, 729:20, <br> 729:21, 729:23, <br> 731:3, 731:19 <br> slopes [1] - 609:1 <br> sloughs [1] - 456:15 <br> slower [1] - 600:5 <br> small [17] - 471:12, <br> 673:23, 674:1, 687:8, <br> 690:15, 736:11, <br> 736:12, 743:3, <br> 745:25, 748:24, | oil [2] - 448:7 | 605:2, 605:18, 611:4, | 618:16, 618:2 | 682 |
|  | $572: 21$ | 611:10, 611:17 $615: 15,617: 6$, | 619:5, 619:17 619:21, 619:2 | spell [15]-540:6, |
|  | sole [1] - 757:3 <br> solely [2] - 479: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 615:15, 617:6, } \\ & 621: 1,621: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 619:23, 620:1, 621:5, | 550:22, 554:21, |
|  | 622:12 | $630: 13,650: 9$ | $622: 15,623: 6$ | $745: 5,746: 24$ |
|  | $732: 14,732: 17$ | orts [1]-637: | $\text { 624:17, } 626$ | 750:19, 753:5 |
|  | 732:18 | ound [11] - 467:15, | 636:18, 637:10 | 754:12, 755:14 |
|  | ds [1] - 732:22 | 467:24, 560:3, | 637:17, 637:20, | 756:19 |
|  | solubility [5] - 546:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 570: 23,598: 1 \\ & 603: 23,604: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 647:16, 670:20, } \\ & \text { 670:22, 671:21, } \end{aligned}$ | spelled [1] - 548:9 |
|  | 732:25 | 604:11, 623:9 | 677:15, 694:23 | 562:16, 575:3, 585 |
|  |  | 692:24, 718:8 | 695:7, 698:2, 702:5 | ending [1] - 461:9 |
|  | 614:3, 673:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sounds [6] - 451:24, } \\ & 451: 25,558: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 702: 7,707: 18, \\ & 715: 16,715: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { spent }[8]-551: 8 \text {, }$ |
|  |  | 577:22, 652:9, 724:25 | 722:23, 722:25 | 566:15, 566:17 |
|  | 732:15, | source [7] - 515:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 723: 3,723: 4,723: 9, \\ & 723: 17,723: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 566:22, 599:8, 600:20 |
|  | solution [13] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 568:13, 568:15, } \\ & 569: 15,757: 3,757: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 723:17, 723:22, 729:19 | spirit [1] - 452:8 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 652:14, 696:21, } \\ & \text { 699:23, 706:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 569:15, 757:3, 757:25 <br> sources [3] - 498:16, | specific [22] - 447:7, | spirits [1] - 757:20 <br> spiritual [2] - 739:7, |
|  | 712:10, 713:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 573:11, 637:8 } \\ & \text { South }[2]-464: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 451:4, 452:2, 463:12, } \\ & 473: 22,487: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 757:14 |
|  | 729:14, 729:15 | 465:7 | 488:23, 494:13 | sponge [1] - 752:15 <br> spot ${ }^{11]}$ - 578.7 |
|  | $730: 13,731: 10,733: 6$ | south [1] - 465:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 517: 23,520: 3,520: 6, \\ & 520: 9,528: 6,530: 21, \end{aligned}$ | spreadsheet [1] - |
|  | solutions [2] - <br> 546.10, $713 \cdot 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Southwest [1] - } \\ & 70 \supset \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$ | $545: 11,574: 6$ | 441:9 |
|  | $\text { ve }{ }_{[1]}-569: 1$ | sovereign [1] | 651:18, 651:24, | spring [3]-576:23, <br> 577:21 |
|  | sometime [3] | 737:13 | 694:19, 694:20 | springs [1] - 576:23 |
|  | 465:12, 561:7, 723:25 | span [1] - 461:4 | 715:12, 718:3 specifically [40] | ss [1] - 761:2 |
|  | etimes [4] | speaking [7] |  | St ${ }_{11}$ - 434:18 |
|  | 576:25, 577:1, | 492:18, 550:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 492:19, 499:16, } \\ & \text { 499:23, 501:9, } \end{aligned}$ | STACEY [3] |
|  | 667:18, 688:14 | 666:15, 734:20 | 499:23, 501:9, | 439:17, 755:10, |
|  | mewhat [5] | 738:16, 750:13 |  | 755:17 |
|  | 568:25, 632:7, $643 \cdot 24,675 \cdot 25,696.5$ | $759$ | $534: 18,590: 2$ | Stacey [2] - 755:16 |
|  | somewhere [1] - | 735:12, 740:13, | $596: 15,596: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 755:20 } \\ & \text { staff }[2]-551: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 460:2 | 756:23 | 597:12, 597:1 | 628:11 |
|  | soon [3]-555:15 | spearheaded [1] | 602:23, 606:1 | stage [2] - 735:1, |
|  | 723:20, 738:16 | 465:4 | 620:18, 626:2 | 735:2 |
|  | sorry [31] - 477:13 | pecial [1] - 463: | $646: 20,665: 20$ | stand [4]-443:8, |
|  | 478:11, 482:7, | specialized [1] - | 673:4, 683:16, 686:6, | 477:1, 572:4, 731:24 |
|  | 503:19, 505:9, | specializes [1] | 688:12, 691:20, | standard [155] - <br> 444:24, 445:1, 445:4 |
|  | $508: 16,528: 2$ | $542: 20$ | 698:10, 700:3, 700:6, | 444:24, 445:1, 445:4, $445: 22,446: 17$ |
|  | 8:19, 549:8 | Species [4]-440:18, | 702:6, 704:14, 706:6, 708:12, 710:3, 718:2, | 446:23, 447:1, |
|  | $549: 13,559: 2,$ | 540:25, 543:12 | 708:12, 710:3, 718:2, | $447: 20,447: 25$ |
|  | 583:24, 608:5, 627:4, | 543:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 719:15, } \\ & 752: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 448:5, 449:5, 449: |
|  | 631:22, 634:9, 635:2, | species [69] |  | 449:24, 450:8, |
|  | 653:16, 656:15, | $540: 21,540: 22$ | specified [9] - 450:8, | 451:22, 452:7, |
|  | 680:13, 710:2, | $540: 23,541: 24,$ | $494: 16,496: 3,506: 6,$ | 452:15, 452:17, |
|  | 711:10, 715:14, | $543: 1,543: 3,543: 7$ | 506:8, 531:17, | 455:18, 458:3, 460:5, |
|  | $719: 8,722: 13$, $728: 19,731: 17$ | 543:18, 543:20, | 531:20, 582:13, | 486:18, 487:13, |
|  | 728:19, 731:17, | 543:22, 543:23, | 582:17 | 487:21, 487:23, |



| 578:6, 579:5, 585:18, | 604:16, 604:20, | 501:20, 505:6, | 457:1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 588:12, 669:25, | 604:22, 604:24, | 507:19, 507:24, | succinctly [1] - | 454:23, 462:21, |
| 671:20 | 605:1, 605:20 | 534:2, 534:20 | 634:2 | 474:25, 482:20, |
| streams [19] - | 606:14, 606:25, | 584:12, 589:17 | sudden [2] - 510:13, | 489:14, 502:4, 502:8, |
| 456:13, 456:14, | 607:12, 607:16, | subject [5] - 483:6, | 607:15 | 502:10, 509:13, |
| 458:12, 462:6, | 609:16, 609:24, | 529:13, 574:14, | suffers [2] - 699:21, | 511:7, 512:25, |
| 463:13, 523:18 | 610:2, 610:4, 610:7, | 684:9, 693:2 | 717:6 | 513:12, 513:16 |
| 523:22, 549:21 | 611:6, 612:2, 612:10, | subjected [1] - 651:1 | ficient [8] - | 519:22, 520:1, |
| 557:19, 563:2, | 612:11, 612:18, | bmission [3] | 460:19, 502:4, 502:7, | 525:14, 534:22 |
| 563:10, 567:8, | 613:7, 615:5, 615:6, | 472:21, 645:12, | 502:10, 513:11, | 552:10, 568:9, 583:6, |
| 571:18, 577:25, | 616:14, 620:2, | 645:13 | 589:6, 604:7, 706:24 | $588: 15,589: 6,$ |
| 592:24, 754:25, | 620:22, 621:2, 622:3, | submissions [1] - | sufficiently [3] - | $597: 13,598: 24,$ |
| 759:9, 759:13 | 658:12, 660:16, | 651:10 | 620:10, 620:18, | 601:10, 633:14, |
| Streams [1] - 440:24 <br> street [1] - 600:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 683:24, 685:12, } \\ & \text { 685:22, 686:2, 686:5, } \end{aligned}$ | submit [8] - 641:1, <br> 641:8, 641:14 | 642:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 654:23, 668:6, } \\ & \text { 683:22, 685:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| strengthen [1] - | 692:13, 695:20, | 641:15, 644:18, | 696:25 | 685:13, 688:6, 736:4, |
| $758: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 695: 25,697: 24 \\ & 698: 12,698: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $645: 1,654: 20,656: 12$ | suggest [10] - | $\begin{aligned} & 737: 19,740: 23, \\ & 751: 2,754: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| strengthening [1] - | $698: 22,699: 4,700: 2,$ | submittals [2] - | 466:16, 468:21, | $755: 25,757: 2$ |
| 759:21 <br> stressed | 700:16, 702:2, 702:4, | 644:5, 650:16 | 469:20, 470:6, 483:5, | $758: 12,759: 8,759: 21$ |
| strict [1] - 758:5 | 702:9, 702:15, | 593:13, 606:1, 633:8, | 646:25, 700:11, 713:9 | supported [7] - |
| stricter [1] - 754:2 | 706:24, 707:3, 713:6, | 633:9, 633:14, | suggested [2] - | 447:20, 467:15, |
| strictly [1] - 705:21 | 715:7, 715:12, 716:7, | 639:23, 640:8, | 500:17, 619:7 | 511:10, 523:11, |
| stringent [11] - | 716:11, 717:16, | 640:22, 641:7 | suggesting [3] | 593:14, 598:10, |
| 448:23, 449:2, | 717:21, 717:24 | 641:20, 647:21 | 457:25, 458:7, 645:17 | 622:23 |
| 463:25, 464:5 | 718:1, 723:15, | 654:13, 656:11, | suggestion [2] | supporting [5] - |
| 511:18, 529:24, | $723: 17,723: 21$, $724: 3,730: 8,730: 9$, | 667:14, 680:12, 726:8 | 528:14, 699:20 | 466:25, 469:15, |
| 530:21, 531:2, 586:2, | 724:3, 730:8, 730:9, | submitting [3] - | suggestions [2] | 513:14, 533:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 589:20, 662:15 } \\ & \text { striped [1] - } 604: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 730: 22,730: 23 \\ & \text { study }[34]-458: 11, \\ & 462: 19,533: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 636:4, 650:20, } 655: 1 \\ \text { subparagraph [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $454: 9,454: 13$ <br> suggests [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & 692: 24 \\ & \text { supportive [1] - } \\ & 558: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { strong }[5]-462: 14 \\ & 464: 9,604: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 536:23, 541:20, | 527:15 <br> subsection [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 487:25, 616:5, 617:4, } \\ & 644: 22,700: 8 \end{aligned}$ | supports [5] - 447:3, |
| 630:17, 750:14 | 573:12, 596:6, 604:3, | 526:18 | suit [2] - 464:21 | 464:1, 487:11, |
| stronger [4] - | 604:6, 605:5, 607:3 | Subsections [1] - | 694:24 | 498:18, 589:1 |
| 515:10, 515:11, | 607:4, 607:5, 607:13, | $587: 1$ | Suite [2] - 434:13, | supposed [3] - |
| $515: 13,515: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 611:2, 611:21, 612:3, } \\ & \text { 613:15, 667:11, } \end{aligned}$ | subsequent [1] - | $435: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 507: 14,675: 22, \\ & 723: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| strongly [2] - 700:8, | 613:15, 667:11, 675:24, 694:18 | $487: 18$ | sum [3] - 716:23, | 723:24 |
| 759:4 | 695:6, 697:20, | substance [5] - | $720: 11,748: 10$ | supposedly [1] - 604:18 |
| structured |  | 566:6, 633:4, 690:16, | summarize [10] - |  |
| 501:22, 640:20 | 717:14, 718:6, | 732:15 | $453: 8,466: 8,467: 7$ $593: 18,599: 5,688: 2,$ | Sur [1] - 435:9 <br> surely [1] - 571:22 |
| structures [3] 601:16, 742•16 | $721: 25,722: 21$ | substantial [8] - <br> 582:24, 598:2, 609:4 | 593:18, 599:5, 688:2, | SURFACE ${ }_{[1]}$ - 433:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 601:16, 742:16, } \\ & 751: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 723:8, 731:2, 733:10, | $624: 16,624: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 691:17, 692:15, } \\ & \text { 692:19, 725:10 } \end{aligned}$ | surface [27] - 453:12, |
| Stubblefield [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 733:13 } \\ & \text { studying [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | 647:23, 667:11, <br> 685.22 | summarized [1] - | $455: 1,455: 4,455: 9$ <br> 456:11, 467:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 660: 17,661: 2, \\ & 698: 24,699: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 722:19, 722:20, | 685:2 | 552:25 | 522:19, 523:1, |
| 717:10, $723: 5$ | 722:24 | 549:11, 602:14, | $497: 11$ | $526: 22,546: 2$ |
| stuck [2] - 466:14, | turgeon [1] - | $602: 16,603: 24$ | sum | 548:22, 549:18 |
| 511:23 | 599:16 | 608:22, 623:5, | 487:10, 543:5, 701:3 | 586:25, 599:1, |
| student [1] - 610:12 | sub [5] - 448:14, $450 \cdot 9,506 \cdot 6,506 \cdot 10$, | 667:10, 674:21, | summer [4] - 577:8, | 600:10, 601:14, |
| studied [4]-524:1, | $506: 17$ | 707:18 | $577: 9,578: 17,748: 8$ | 608:24, 618:1, |
| $\begin{gathered} 603: 1,662: 5,727: 14 \\ \text { studies [87] - 458:19 } \end{gathered}$ | sub-basin [1] - | $633: 7,633: 10,636: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { summertimes [1] - } \\ & 755: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 622:24, 691:6, 691:7, |
| $463: 16,542: 5,546: 7$ | 448:14 | $638: 15,649: 7$ | sunflower [1] - | 697:1, 754:22 |
| $546: 16,552: 23$ | sub-category [4] 450:9, 506:6, 506:10 | substantively [5] - | $740: 17$ | surprise [3] - 481:4, |
| $552: 24,553: 4,553: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 450: 9,506: 6,506: 10 \\ & 506: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $478: 22,479: 16$ | supplemental [2] - | 481:11, 628:7 |
| 553:23, 554:1, | subcategories [2] - | 630:1, 630:18, 633:2 | 643:13, 671:16 | surprised [1] - 664:5 surrebuttal [1] - |
| 596:11, 597:13, | $501: 16.507: 21$ | subtle [1] - 533:17 | Supplemental [2] - | surrebuttal [1] - |
| 597:15, 603:6, 603:8, | 501.16, 507.21 | success [1] - 613:9 | 597:1, 619:14 | 693:4 |
| 603:17, 604:13, | subcategory [8] - | successful [1] - |  | surrogate [1] - 723:9 |
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| 620:14, 621:15, | Thayer [1] - 564:11 | 594:7, 599:8, 607:15, | together [5] - | toxic [4]-601:15, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 621:16, 624:20, | THE [25]-433:2, | 607:19, 610:20 | 466:17, 573:7, | 617:4, 732:23, 739:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 626:18, 627:16, } \\ & 630: 12,630: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 433: 5,519: 9,540: 5, \\ & 550: 22,554: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 636: 6,711: 25, \\ & 741: 20,757: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 629:18, 658:11, } \\ & 735: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { toxicity [103] - } \\ 545: 12,546: 7, \end{gathered}$ |
| 632:10, 632:13, | 557:5, 591:14, | three-quarters [1] - | tolerable [2] | 553:21, 596:12, |
| 633:12, 634:21, | 655:19, 657:10, | 588:1 | 553:10, 553:16 | 596:15, 597:17 |
| $640: 8,640: 22,641:$ 641:10, 641:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 669:15, 719:2, 729:7, } \\ & 735: 7,737: 5,740: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { threshold [4] - } \\ & \text { 560:3, 709:9, } 709: 11, \end{aligned}$ | tolerate [1] - 624 tomatoes [2] - | 597:18, 599:1 |
| 646:18, 646:22, | 745:5, 746:24, | 739: | 712:23 | 601:20, 601:24, |
| 649:19, 650:22, | 747:21, 749:8, | hreshold-based [1] | tomorrow [3] - | 602:20, 602:22, |
| 651:11, 651:16, | 750:19, 753:5, | - 709:9 | 681:24, 754:24, 760:7 | 602:24, 603:14, |
| 652:16, 654:23, | 754:12, 755:14, | throughout [4] | Tongate [6] - 526:9, | 612:22, 613:1, 613:3, |
| 654:24, 655:6, | 756:19 | 450:11, 498:12, | 535:21, 536:17, | 613:10, 614:12, |
| 656:11, 656:12, | theirs [1] - 750:4 | 676:7, 684:2 | 538:12, 557:6, 574:4 | 615:1, 615:20, 616:1, |
| 656:13, 656:14, | themes [1] - 691:22 | throwing [1] - 611:6 | TONGATE [7] - | 616:4, 616:12, |
| 656:18, 657:4, | themselves [3] - | thrust ${ }_{[1]}$ - 570:3 | 434:3, 535:22, | 616:15, 616:16 |
| 657:21, 662:9, | 448:5, 531:12, 562:17 | thumbing ${ }_{[1]}-533: 1$ | 535:24, 536:6, 538:8, | 616:21, 619:3, 619:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 662:14, 662:15, } \\ & 663: 6,665: 5,665: 6, \end{aligned}$ | therefore [15] - $480 \cdot 7486.25$ | tied [2] - 562:24, | $538: 16,539: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 619:8, 620:23, 621:1, } \\ & \text { 621:10, 622:1, 622:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 666: 25,667: 9, \\ & 667: 10,668: 1,668: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 488:17, 512:21, | Tim [1] - 475:24 | took [1] - 709:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 622:10, 623:5, } \\ & \text { 623:17, 623:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 668:12, 670:13, | 512:24, 552:10, 574:13, 616:16, | time-limited [2] 573:18, 588:10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { tool }[7]-446: 19, \\ \text { 489:15. 493:4. 52 } \end{gathered}$ | $625: 6,639: 11,659: 8$ |
| 672:12, 675:15, | 616:21, 623:2, 690:2, | $573$ | $573: 24,705: 3$ | 662:1, 662:5, 675:20, |
| 678:21, 678:22, | 699:22, 700:11, | 655:15, 676:7 | tools [1] - 498:10 | $680: 21,681: 8,684: 1$ <br> 684:5, 685:22, 686:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 678:24, 678:25, } \\ & \text { 680:11, 680:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 707:16, 745:20 thermodynamics [3] | $\begin{gathered} \text { timeliness [15] } \\ \text { 629:23, 629:25, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { top }[9]-601: 22, \\ 617: 2,625: 18, \end{gathered}$ | 684:5, 685:22, 686:2, 689:13, 692:4, 692:8, |
| 686:16, 686:25, | - 546:22, 732:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 229:23, 629:25, } \\ & 632: 21,633: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 617:2, 625:18 | 692:12, 692:14, |
| 687:3, 687:4, 687:7, | 732:20 | $636: 7,638: 13,639: 2,$ | 716:23, 722:1 | 695:25, 696:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 687:10, 687:14, } \\ & \text { 688:2, 689:5, 689:24, } \end{aligned}$ | thesis [1] - 610:11 | 642:2, 646:10, 647:9, | 757:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 696:24, 697:4, 697:9, } \\ & 697: 16,698: 5,698: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| 690:8, 690:10, | 510:15, 566:13, | 647:10, 648:19, | topic [5] - 444:12, | 698:17, 699:12, |
| $690: 11,690: 14$, $690 \cdot 17,690: 23$, | 628:12, 721:9, 721:10 | 654:11 | 493:11, 499:21 | $700: 9,700: 16$, $700: 17,700 \cdot 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 690:17, 690:23, } \\ & \text { 691:3, 691:4, 691:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { thinking }[7]-460: 10,$ | timewise [1] - 539:8 | topically [1] - 486:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 700:17, 700:20, } \\ & 700: 23,701: 1,704: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| 691:19, 691:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 489: 23,490: 2, \\ & 521: 15,615: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { timing }[2]-646: 14 \\ & 652: 3 \end{aligned}$ | topics [1] - 593:2 <br> total [42]-543:7, | 704:17, 704:22, |
| 692:18, 692:22, | $650: 3,738: 2$ | TIMOTHY [1] - 436: | total [42]-543:7 | 705:3, 705:10 |
| 693:3, 693:4, 693:10, | third 19 - 459:15 | $\text { tiny }[1]-555: 12$ | $56$ | 705:20, 705:22 |
| 693:16, 693:17, | 499:21, 509:5, | $\text { title }[1]-503: 8$ | $672: 18,673: 8 \text {, }$ | 706:4, 706:11, 707:4, |
| 693:18, 693:19, | 509:10, 509:22, | titled [2] - 441:7, | $673: 16,674: 2,674: 7,$ | 713:22, 714:24, |
| 694:5, 694:6, 695:3, <br> 697:11, 698:4, 701:5 | 546:20, 552:18, | 455:17 | 674:15, 674:21, | 715:18, 715:23, |
| 701:6, 701:9, 701:19, | 699:11, 703:22 | [2] - 449:20 | 675:7, 680:8, 680:9, | 716:7, 716:17, 716:20, 717:17. |
| 709:19, 710:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { third-most }[1] \text { - } \\ & 552: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 595:2 | $680: 25,681: 1,681: 2 \text {, }$ | 732:7, 737:18, |
| 711:18, 712:11, | Thomas [1]-606:25 | TO [1] - 433:5 | 681:3, 681:6, 681:9, | 737:24, 741:6, 741:7, |
| 714:4, 714:16, | thoroughly [2] - | $\begin{array}{r} \text { today [35] - } 467: 6,6 \\ 472: 19,473: 1,479 \end{array}$ | $699: 15,716: 24,$ | 741:16, 747:10, |
| 714:19, 716:9, | $688: 20,696: 1$ | 479:15, 496:15, | $\text { 720:12, } 724: 21,$ | 757:23, 758:1, 758:2 |
| 716:14, 717:6, 717:9, | thoughts [3] - 574:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 4 / 9: 15,496: 15 \\ & 501: 18,522: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $725: 3,725: 9,725: 23$ | toxicologically ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| $717: 20,722: 18$, $725 \cdot 2,728 \cdot 8,728 \cdot 25$, | 585:19, 643:11 | $540: 9,540: 19$ | 726:6, 726:13, | 732:10 |
| 731:22, 731:24, | thousands [3] - | 573:20, 589:4 | 726:15, 726:19 | toxicologist [4] - |
| $738: 13,761: 8,$ | 458:9, 731:5, 738:4 | $590: 17,592: 2$ | 727:11, 727:15 | 597:8, 677:20, 683:11 <br> Toxicology ${ }^{[2]}$ - |
| 761:10, 761:11 | threatened [3]- | 595:17, 621:6 | $730: 9,730: 17$ | $600: 12,600: 13$ |
| tests [6] - 553:6, | $540: 24,543: 19$ $743: 22$ | 628:15, 654:21, | 732:24, 733:1 <br> Total [1]-62 | toxicology [14] - |
| 613:3, 706:4, 706:11, | threatening [1] - | 655:6, 657:21, 662:9, 662:14, 679:21, | totally [1] - 652:2 | 551:6, 551:23, 552:2, |
| 723:2, 727:20 | 575:13 | 684:2, 716:9, 733:13, | toward [2] - 515:25, | 552:23, 552:24, |
| Tewa [3]-740:16, | three [20]-472:13, | $734: 3,736: 3,740: 22$ | 577:3 | 599:14, 611:17, |
| 757:6, 758:12 | 490:8, 542:13, | $745: 15,746: 16,$ | towards [5] - 543:16, | 676:2, 683:1, 683:14, |
| ${ }_{619} \operatorname{text}^{\text {[2] }}$-589:15, | 543:25, 545:17, | 751:2, 754:17, | 631:8, 647:4, 747:11, | 683:17, 683:21, |
| thankful [1] - 739:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 547: 14,551: 13, \\ & 582: 10,584: 9,588: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 754:23, } 755: 24 \\ & \text { today's [1] }-760: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 747:12 } \\ & \text { tox }[1]-601: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 689:17, 709:9 <br> toxins [2]-555:24, |
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| vitae [1] - 440:5 | 465:21, 466:6, | 597:19, 599:1, 600:9, | 453:18, 453:25, | 523:16, 523:23, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| voice [2] - 744:15, | 467:10, 468:13, | 600:11, 601:23 | 454:23, 456 | 524:8, 524:9, |
| 744:23 | 469:8, 471:17 | 603:21, 603:22 | 456:20, 461:13 | 524:12, 524:21, |
| iced [1] - 701:21 | 471:18, 478:12 | 614:19, 614:22 | 465:22, 469:1 | 529:13 |
| Volume [1] - 433:23 | 487:1, 490:19, | 621:17, 624:5 | 472:10, 474:14, | $531: 18,536: 21$ |
| vulnerable | 492:23, 493:13 | 658:22, 659:23 | 478:23, 479: | 536:22, 537:5, |
| 738:8, 757:22, 758:19 | 497:18, 498:11, | 662:19, 673:20, | 479:14, 481:5, 483:1, | 537:13, 537:17, |
|  | 498:13, 498:16 | 683:18, 683:25 | 485:14, 487:6, | 537:21, 537:24, |
|  | 498:17, 498:18, | 689:9, 689:10, | 487:21, 488:9 | 538:20, 548:22, |
| WADE [1] - 434:8 wading [5]-506:14, | 506:16, 506:18, | 693:13, 695:9 | 489:13, 492:24 | 549:19, 549:20, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 506: 25,507: 2,507: 3 \\ & 507: 15,509: 2,510: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 695:16, 697:18 | 494:17, 495:10, | 550:2, 552:5, 552:7 |
|  |  | 699:7, 700:23 | 496:3, 500:3, 500:9, | 552:8, 560:23 |
| 506:24, 507:1, | 510:24, 512:22, | 700:25, 713:18 | 501:22, 502:11, | 561:23, 562:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 507:12, } 535: 11 \\ & \text { wait [2] - 481:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $513: 10,515: 5,$ | $723: 10,736: 4,736: 5$ | $503: 10,504: 1,504: 5$ | $562: 14,563: 16,$ |
| 631:20 | 515:11, 515:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \\ & 72 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { waiting }[1]-627: 9 \\ & \text { walk }[1]-555: 19 \\ & \text { walked }[2]-580: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 517:10, 517:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 736: 15,737: 19 \\ & 737: 20.737: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $505: 20,506: 12$ | $564: 16,564: 21,$ |
|  | 517:15, 517:20, | 737:22, 738:1, 738:5, | 518:6, 518:7, 522:18, | 571:8, 571:12, |
|  | 518:4, 518:12 | 738:6, 738:10 | 522:24, 527:6, 539:2, | 571:15, 574:13 |
| $744: 12$ | 518:16, 521:10, | 738:11, 738:18 | 560:21, 573:5 | 574:15, 575:10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 521: 11,521: 13 \\ & 522: 17,522: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 738:20, 738:21 | 582:14, 582:17 | 578:4, 592:9, 592:2 |
|  |  | 738:22, 739:5 | 588:25, 589:2, 589:9, | 593:12, 596:25 |
| WAN [3] - 438:21,$\begin{aligned} & \text { 737:1, 737:8 } \\ & \text { Wan [2] - } 737: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 522: 17,522: 18, \\ & 524: 11,525: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 739:13, 739:16 | 592:23, 593:2, 593:4, | 601:14, 602:8, |
|  | $528: 3,528: 17,$ | 739:17, 739:24 | 593:5, 593:8, 605:9, | 602:11, 608:2 |
|  |  | 740:18, 740:23 | 634:19, 635:17, | 616:23, 618:1, 620:5, |
|  | 529:17, 530:10, | 740:24, 741:4 | 640:23, 657:3 | 620:21, 622:24, |
| $447: 10,458: 23$,$461: 7,479: 11$, | 530:19, 530:22, <br> 530:25, 531:3, | $741: 23,743: 2,743: 3,$ | 666:14, 684:14 <br> 684:22, 688:8 | 639:18, 642:13, <br> 688:23, 698:10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 530: 25,531: 3 \\ & 534: 14,534: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 743:20, 745:18, <br> $745: 25,746: 4,746: 6$ | 684:22, 688:8, 688:18, 688:19, | 688:23, 698:10, <br> 699:9, 705:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 489: 16,511: 20, \\ & 569: 2,637: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 534: 14,534: 25, \\ & 535: 9,535: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 745: 25,746: 4,746: 6, \\ & 746: 12,747: 4,747: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 688:18, 688:19 693:8, 694:9, 6 | $705: 16,706: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 569: 2,637: 21, \\ & 679: 17,734: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 535:17, 536:11, | $747: 11,748: 5,748$ | $721: 20,736: 3$ | $707: 5,707: 19,718$ |
| War [1]-599:23 | $536: 19,537: 1,537: 3,$ | 748:12, 748:15, | 740:14, 742:14 | 719:7, 719:11, |
|  | $537: 10,537: 11$ | 748:18, 748:24 | 743:13, 745:12, | 719:13, 719:20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { warm }[6]-456: 3, \\ 524: 11,537: 3,563: 3, \end{gathered}$ | 541:3, 541:14, | 749:15, 749:17 | 751:13, 752:9, 756:8, | 720:2, 721:25, 722: |
| 524:11, 537:3, 563:3, $565: 6,574: 18$ |  | 749:19, 749:21, | $757: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 727: 12,727: 16, \\ & 797.18 \quad 721 \cdot 70 \end{aligned}$ |
| warrant [1] - 481:12 warranted [1] - | $542: 17,544: 3,$ | 751:4, 752:1, 752:3, | waterfall [1] - 577:5 | $743: 5,743: 7,743: 1$ |
| 543:11 | 545:15, 546:1, 546:2, | 752:4, 752:15, | waterfowl [1] - | 743:17, 743:23 |
| wash [1]-456:23 <br> washes [1] - 564:19 | 548:24, 549:1, 549:4, | 753:12, 753:15 | $471: 11$ | 754:23, 757:3, |
|  | 549:7, 550:4, 550:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 753: 17,753: 18 \\ & 753: 23,754: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | watering [4] - | 757:23, 758:9, <br> $750 \cdot 22,759 \cdot 5,759 \cdot 16$ |
| Washington [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 552: 6,553: 19,555: 4 \\ & 555: 5,555: 8,555: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $754: 18,754: 19$ | 454:17, 456:2, 537:2, $576: 25$ | Waters [6] - 455: |
| 463:17, 551:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 555: 5,555: 8,555: 10, \\ & 556: 2,556: 5,557: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $755: 1,755: 6,755: 25,$ | waters [136] | $455: 22,557: 13$ |
| waste [1] - 449:21 | $559: 13,559: 14$ | $756: 1,756: 2,756: 10,$ | 448:24, 453:5, | 559:3, 560:8, 560:18 |
|  | $559: 20,562: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 756: 11,757: 10, \\ & 757.11 \text { 757.11 } \end{aligned}$ | $453: 12,453: 14$ | WATERS [8] - 433:7, |
| 445:6, 446:8, 446:14, | 562:22, 563:4, | $757: 16,758: 18$ | 454:15, 455:4, 455:9, | 434:6, 509:24, |
| 446:19, 446:20 | 564:7, 565:1, 565:6, | $759: 14,759: 22$ | 455:19, 455:21, <br> 456:7, 456:9, 456:1 | $559: 4,560: 9,561: 15$ |
| 447:2, 447:16, | 565:12, 567:1, | WATER [1] - 433:2 | 457:6, 457:12, | watershed [14] - |
| 448:14, 448:15, | 567:20, 568:11, | Water [104] - 433:17, | 457:13, 457:16 | 447:17, 448:10, |
| 448:20, 449:13, | 572:21, 574:8, | $434: 2,435: 13,440: 3,$ | 457:17, 457:21, | $448: 11,572: 20,$ |
| 449:20, 450:8, | $574: 18,574: 25$ | 440:23, 441:17, | $458: 1,458: 5,459: 4,$ | 573:3, 573:10, |
|  | 577:16, 577:23, | 443:11, 444:19, | $463: 24,464: 14,$ | 573:23, 573:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 451:2, 452:7, 452:22, } \\ & 453: 13,453: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 579:18, 582:10, | $445: 11,445: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 465: 15,468: 3, \\ & 470: 10,486: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 587:12, 587:15, 587:19, 587:20, |
|  | $585: 2,585: 5,585: 11,$ | $445: 20,446: 4,$ | 493:12, 493:17, | $757: 12,759: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 454: 20,454: 22, \\ & 455: 1,456: 3,456: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 585:12, 585:20, | 446:22, 447:3, | 498:24, 502:3, 502:6, | watershed-based [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 456: 17,456: 19 \\ & 464: 2,464: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 586:25, 588:9, 592:12, 592:17, 592:20, 592:25, | 447:19, 448:1, | 512:9, 522:4, 522:23, | $-587: 19$ |
| 464.2, 464.19, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 452: 16,452: 19 \\ & 452: 20,453: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 523:2, 523:4, 523:6, | watersheds [1] - |
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