

MINUTES
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD
JANUARY 21, 2026
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

Official EQB Approved
On June 9, 2026

Notice of Public Meeting – The Environmental Quality Board (Board) convened for a Regular Meeting at 9:30 a.m., at the Department of Environmental Quality, 707 N. Robinson, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. This meeting was held in accordance with 25 O.S. Section 311, with notice of the meeting given to the Secretary of State on December 3, 2025. The agenda was mailed to interested parties on January 12, 2026 and was posted at the DEQ on January 20, 2026. Dr. Shannon Ferrell, Chair, called the meeting to order. Also, he went over safety and housekeeping rules. Ms. Fields called roll and a quorum was confirmed.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Richard Auer
Jimmy Kinder
Alexandria Kindrick
Brandi Lowry
Steve Mason
Tim Munson
Mike Paque
Kim Peterson
Pete Schultze
Sheldon Tatum
Shannon Ferrell

DEQ STAFF PRESENT

Rob Singletary, Executive Director
Madison Miller, Deputy Executive Director
Jonathan Allen, General Counsel
Ryan McIntosh, Legislative Liaison
Gary Henry, Deputy General Counsel
Mark Hildebrand, Chief of Staff
Karen Steele, Water Quality Division
George Russell, Water Quality Division
Kathy Aebischer, Administrative Services Division
Kelly Dixon, Land Protection Division
Kendal Stegmann, Air Quality Division
Beverly Botchlet-Smith, Air Quality Division
Vance Pennington, Environmental Complaints & Local Services
Travis Mensik, Environmental Complaints & Local Services
Dustin Davidson, State Environmental Laboratory Services
Stacey Tucker, Administrative Services Division
Kole Kennedy, Land Protection Division
Skylar McElhaney, Office of Continuous Improvement
Kambridge Stephens, Environmental Complaints & Local Services
Nick Armour, Water Quality Management Advisory Council
Patrick Rosch, Water Quality Management Advisory Council
Susan Mensik, State Environmental Laboratory Services
Greg Carr, Water Quality Management Advisory Council
Ryan Kirk, Land Protection Division
Travis Couch, Environmental Attorney
Afiya Wilkins, Environmental Attorney
John Brown, Environmental Attorney
Nicholas Huber, Environmental Complaints & Local Services
April Eberle, Environmental Attorney
Jayme Jones, State Environmental Laboratory Services
Chris Robinson, Environmental Attorney
Kylan Huffman, Environmental Attorney
Patrick Riley, Land Protection Division
Lauren Predieri, Land Protection Division
Brian Clagg, Water Quality Division
Taryn Hurley, State Environmental Laboratory Services
Melanie Foster, Air Quality Division
Malcolm Zachariah, Air Quality Division
Mark Stasyszen, Water Quality Division
Rachel Hildebrand, Legal Secretary
Quiana Fields, Office of the Executive Director/Board & Council Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT

Katlin Esteph
Ken Hirshey

OTHERS PRESENT

Jennifer Lewis, Office of the Attorney General
Bud Ground, Environmental Federation of Oklahoma
Kinnamon Clark, Hazardous Waste Management Advisory Council
Laura Lodes, Air Quality Advisory Council
Brian Duzan, Water Quality Management Advisory Council
Jenny Longley, Court Reporter

Approval of Minutes – Dr. Ferrell called for a motion to approve the November 6, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes. Mr. Tatum moved to approve and Mr. Munson made the second.

See transcript pages 4-5

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Abstain
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Abstain

Election of Officers – Dr. Ferrell called for nominations for Chair. Mr. Kinder nominated Dr. Ferrell to remain as Chair and Mr. Auer made the second. Hearing no other nominations, Dr. Ferrell stated all in favor of the motion that nominations cease and then called for a roll call vote.

transcript pages 5-8

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes

Then, Dr. Ferrell called for a roll call vote on the nomination of Dr. Ferrell as Chair for the Board.

transcript pages 8-9

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes

Dr. Ferrell called for nominations of Vice-Chair. Mr. Munson nominated Ms. Kindrick to remain as Vice-Chair and Mr. Paque made the second. Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Tatum made a motion to cease nominations and elect by acclamation. Mr. Peterson made the second.

transcript pages 9-11

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes

**Rulemaking – OAC 252:100 – Air Pollution Control
Subchapter 2 – Incorporation by Reference [AMENDED]
Appendix Q – Incorporation by Reference [AMENDED]**

Dr. Ferrell called upon Ms. Laura Lodes, Chair of the Air Quality Advisory Council (AQAC), to present the air rules. Ms. Lodes stated that the Department is proposing to update language in Subchapter 2, Incorporation by Reference, to reflect the latest date of

incorporation of EPA regulations. The Department is also proposing to update the content in OAC 252:100, Appendix Q, Incorporation by Reference, to incorporate the latest changes to EPA regulations. The gist of these rule proposals and the underlying reason for the rulemaking is to incorporate the latest changes or additions to 40 C.F.R. Part 60, New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), (NESHAP) and other EPA regulations referenced in Chapter 100. Hearing no questions or comments by the Board or the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Kinder moved to approve and Mr. Auer made the second.

transcript pages 11-14

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes

**Rulemaking – OAC 252:100 – Air Pollution Control
Subchapter 11 – Alternative Emissions Reduction Plans and Authorizations
[REVOKED]**

Subchapter 33 – Control of Emission of Nitrogen Oxides [REVOKED]

Ms. Lodes stated that the Department is proposing to revoke Subchapter 11, Alternative Emissions Reduction Plans and Authorizations and Subchapter 33, Control of Emission of Nitrogen Oxides as they have been identified as outdated and ineffective. On February 3, 2020, Governor Stitt signed Executive Order 2020-03, which directed all state agencies to review “agency’s administrative rules to identify costly, ineffective, duplicative and outdated regulations.” During DEQ’s comprehensive rule review, Subchapter 11 and Subchapter 33 were both identified as being potentially obsolete and ineffective. The gist of this rule proposal and the underlying reason for the rulemaking is to implement the Executive Order by “streamlining state government” through revocation of unnecessary rules. Following questions from the Board and none by the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Tatum moved to approve and Mr. Schultze made the second.

transcript pages 14-19

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes

**Rulemaking – OAC 252:100 – Air Pollution Control
Subchapter 49 – Oklahoma Emission Reduction Technology Rebate Program
[AMENDED]**

Ms. Lodes stated that the Department is proposing to amend Subchapter 49, Oklahoma Emission Reduction Technology Rebate Program, in OAC 252:100, to implement recent changes to applicable provisions of the Oklahoma Emission Reduction Technology Incentive Act, 68 O.S. § 55006, et seq. DEQ and the Oklahoma Tax Commission jointly administer the “Oklahoma Emission Reduction Technology Rebate Program” to provide an incentive for “Emission Reduction Projects” – implementation of new and innovative technologies to reduce air pollutant emissions from oil and gas facilities. The gist of this rule proposal and the underlying reason for the rulemaking is to implement the Department’s continuing responsibilities under the Oklahoma Emission Reduction Technology Incentive Act as revised during the 2025 Oklahoma Legislative Session.

Following a question by the Board and none by the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Munson moved to approve and Mr. Paque made the second.

transcript pages 19-23

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes

Ms. Kindrick entered the meeting during agenda Item #9.

Rulemaking - OAC 252:205 - Hazardous Waste Management – Dr. Ferrell called upon Mr. Kinnamon Clark, Chair of the Hazardous Waste Management Advisory Council (HWMAC), to present the rule. Mr. Clark stated that the Department is proposing to update its rules related to the date of incorporation by reference for the Code of Federal Regulations from the year that ended June 30, 2024. The regulation changes include the following:

Incorporated are regulation amendments addressing manifest and electronic manifest (e-Manifest) requirements for shipments of hazardous waste, including those specific to hazardous waste imports and export; requirements pertaining to the international movement document for imports and exports of hazardous waste; the manifest data correction process, and the Discrepancy, Exception and Unmanifested Waste Reports. Additionally, this rule modification makes technical corrections to address typographical errors in the e-manifest regulations.

Also, incorporated are a rule change establishing 40 CFR Part 266 Subpart Q which describes alternative standards for the recovery and recycling of lower flammability hydrofluorocarbons and hydrocarbon substitutes as well as making conforming changes to corresponding parts of the hazardous waste regulations.

The final rule change incorporated serves to finalize five revisions to the August 9, 2023 direct final rule that made technical corrections to the 2016 Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements Rule, the 2019 Hazardous Waste Pharmaceutical Rule and the 2018 Vacatur of the Definition of Solid Waste Rule. These five revisions were among eight amendments that were withdrawn due to the receipt of adverse comments. Hearing no questions or comments by the Board or the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Kinder moved to approve and Mr. Schultze made the second.

transcript pages 23-26

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Rulemaking – OAC 252:301 – Laboratory Accreditation – Dr. Ferrell called upon Mr. Brian Duzan, Chair of the Water Quality Management Advisory Council (WQMAC) to present the water and lab rules. Mr. Duzan stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to update the rules to modify the title, clarify program definitions, correct references and standardize language between other DEQ Lab Accreditation Program (LAP) rules.

Additional proposed updates are to simplify the program renewal and application processes and fee calculations, remove the late application fee and revise the annual accreditation period and timelines for submitting renewal applications and invoice payment. Other proposed changes are to update incorporations by reference for EPA methodologies and to make other amendments for conformity and added flexibility with method requirements under the EPA Primary Drinking Water regulations, National Standards for Solid Waste Methods and EPA Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants. The Department is also proposing rule amendments clarifying accreditation groups and types, proficiency testing and laboratory assessments. Following questions by the Board and none by the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Auer moved to approve and Mr. Tatum made the second.

transcript pages 27-34

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Rulemaking – OAC 252:302 – Field Laboratory Accreditation – Mr. Duzan stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to update the rules to modify the title, clarify program definitions, correct references and standardize language between other DEQ Lab Accreditation Program (LAP) rules. Additional proposed updates are to simplify the program renewal and application processes and fee calculations and revise the annual accreditation period and timelines for submitting renewal applications and invoice payment. Other proposed changes are to update incorporations by reference for EPA methodologies and make amendments allowing more flexibility with method requirements under the national program for EPA Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants. The Department is also proposing rule amendments to clarify proficiency testing requirements. Hearing no questions by the Board or the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Kinder moved to approve and Ms. Kindrick made the second.

transcript pages 34-37

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Rulemaking – OAC 252:307 – TNI Laboratory Accreditation – Mr. Duzan stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to update the rules to modify the title, clarify program definitions, correct references and standardize language between other DEQ Lab Accreditation Program (LAP) rules. Additional proposed updates are to simplify the program renewal and application processes and fee calculations, remove the late application fee and revise the annual accreditation period and timelines for submitting renewal applications and invoice payment. Other proposed changes are to update incorporations by reference for EPA methodologies and to make other amendments for conformity and added flexibility with method requirements under the EPA Primary Drinking Water regulations, National Standards for Solid Waste Methods and EPA Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants. The Department is also proposing rule amendments to clarify proficiency testing requirements. Hearing no questions or

comments by the Board or the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Schultze moved to approve and Mr. Auer made the second.

transcript pages 37-40

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Rulemaking – OAC 252:606 – Oklahoma Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (OPDES) Standards – Mr. Duzan stated that the DEQ is proposing to update the federal rules incorporated by reference from July 8, 2024, to January 17, 2025. The regulatory changes are minor in nature, primarily consisting of grammar and style changes.

DEQ is proposing updating the section on fees. Currently, Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustments are made on July 1st every year for individual discharge permits and individual permit fees for industrial users. The proposed update is to apply the CPI to stormwater and other general discharge permit fees.

DEQ is proposing adding and modifying definitions to Subchapter 1. INTRODUCTION, as well as adding language to SUBCHAPTER 6. POING SOURCE DISCHARGES for determination of reasonable potential for selenium and changing language to disallow monitoring frequency reductions for a parameter when the receiving water is impaired for that parameter. Following no questions or comments by the Board but one by the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Tatum moved to approve and Mr. Auer made the second.

transcript pages 40-47

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Rulemaking – OAC 252:626 – Public Water Supply Construction Standards – Mr. Duzan stated that the DEQ is proposing to update the rule to allow electronic submittal of plans and specifications and engineering reports; update references to International Fire Code (IFC) and American Water Works Association (AWWA); and to correct typographical errors and update other incorrect references.

Proposed updates to SUBCHAPTER 9. TREATMENT include providing a specific reference to the sedimentation portion of the clarification section; removing “the maximum detention time of the rapid mix basin, at design flow is 30 seconds” and replacing with “provide good mixing of the raw water with the chemicals applied and prevent deposition of solids in the mixing zone;” and adding language noting a rapid mix detention time of not more than 30 seconds.

Another proposed update removes the work “Slow” from the title of Appendix E. Following a question by the Board and none by the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Schultze moved to approve and Mr. Kinder made the second.

transcript pages 47-51

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Rulemaking OAC 252:627 – Operation and Maintenance of Water Reuse Systems – Mr. Duzan stated that the DEQ is proposing to update the rule to include CPI language allowing for the annual adjustment of fees based on the CPI. This will ensure consistently amongst the rules that require annual fees. Hearing no questions or comments by the Board or the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Mr. Peterson moved to approve and Mr. Tatum made the second.

transcript pages 51-53

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Rulemaking – OAC 252:656 – Water Pollution Control Facility Construction Standards – Mr. Duzan stated that the DEQ is proposing to update the rule to allow electronic submittal of plans and specifications and engineering reports and to update references to Metcalf & Eddy.

Proposed updated to SUBCHAPTER 13. PRELIMINARY TREATMENT STANDARDS adds a citation requiring Flow Equalization Basins (FEBs) be constructed with the same location requirements as lagoons to provide for groundwater protection.

A proposed update to SUBCHAPTER 16. BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT STANDARDS specifies that 4-inch piping is a minimum requirement for return sludge piping. Hearing no questions or comments by the Board or the public, Dr. Ferrell called for a motion. Ms. Kindrick moved to approve and Mr. Schultze made the second.

transcript pages 53-56

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Executive Director’s Report – Mr. Rob Singletary, Executive Director of the DEQ, discussed agency accomplishments and activities since the last Board meeting, as well as information pertaining to budgetary and/or legislative matters.

See transcript pages 57-80

Federal Updates Report – Ms. Madison Miller, Deputy Executive Director of the DEQ, gave a report that may include information pertaining to federal rulemaking, Congressional enactments, pending litigation involving the United States government and EPA, or other matters on the national scale that may be of interest to the Board. This report is for informational purposes only, and no action by the Board is required.

transcript pages 80-94

Budget Update and Financial Overview (FY 2026) – Dr. Ferrell called upon Ms. Kathy Aebischer, Director of Administrative Services Division. Ms. Aebischer gave a presentation, which included an update and overview of DEQ’s current budget for Fiscal Year 2026. No action by the Board is required.

See transcript pages 94-96

New Business – None

Next Meeting – The next Regular Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 9, 2026 at 9:30 a.m., at the Department of Environmental Quality, 707 N. Robinson, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Adjournment – Dr. Ferrell called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Munson moved to adjourn and Mr. Auer made the second. Meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

transcript pages 97-99

Rich Auer	Yes	Mike Paque	Yes
Jimmy Kinder	Yes	Kim Peterson	Yes
Alexie Kindrick	Yes	Pete Schultze	Yes
Brandi Lowry	Yes	Sheldon Tatum	Yes
Steve Mason	Yes	Shannon Ferrell	Yes
Tim Munson	Yes		

Public Forum – No public forum issues were raised.

The transcript and sign-in sheet become an official part of these Minutes.

Page 1

1 REGULAR MEETING, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
 2 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD
 3 BEGINNING AT 9:30 AM ON JANUARY 21, 2026
 4 IN OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA
 5
 6
 7 MEMBERS PRESENT:
 8 Richard Auer
 9 Shannon Ferrell
 10 James Kinder
 11 Alexandria Kindrick
 12 Steve Mason
 13 Brandi Lowry
 14 Peter Schultze
 15 Tim Munson
 16 Sheldon Tatum
 17 Mike Paque
 18 Kim Peterson
 19
 20 MEMBERS ABSENT:
 21 Kenneth Hirshey, Jr.
 22 Katlin Esteph
 23
 24
 25 REPORTED BY: Jenny Longley, CSR

Page 2

1 PROCEEDINGS
 2 DR. FERRELL: Ladies and Gentlemen, the
 3 January 21, 2026 regular meeting of the
 4 Environmental Quality Board has been called
 5 according to the Open Meeting Act, Section 311 of
 6 Title 25 of the Oklahoma Statutes. Notice was filed
 7 with the Secretary of State on December 3, 2025.
 8 Agendas were mailed to the interested parties on
 9 January 12, 2026 and were posted at the DEQ on
 10 January 20, 2026. Only matters appearing on the
 11 posted agenda may be considered.
 12 If this meeting is continued or
 13 reconvened, we must announce today the date, time
 14 and place of the continued meeting and the agenda
 15 for such continuation will remain the same as
 16 today's agenda.
 17 I want to welcome everybody here on a
 18 chilly January morning, and if your New Year's
 19 resolution was to engage in administrative
 20 rulemaking, congratulations, you are well on your
 21 way by being here today because we've got a full
 22 agenda.
 23 In terms of announcements, if there
 24 is any sort of an emergency, exits are located over
 25 here towards the west side of the building here and

Page 3

1 towards the back. For your comfort and convenience,
 2 restrooms are located around by the elevators and
 3 then down the hallway a little bit that direction.
 4 There is no anticipation of any
 5 severe weather today, so we should be safe on that
 6 front, but if so, DEQ personnel will direct you down
 7 to the basement. It's Oklahoma, you never know.
 8 With that, Ms. Fields would you
 9 please call our roll?
 10 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 11 MR. AUER: Here.
 12 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Esteph is absent.
 13 Mr. Hirshey is absent.
 14 Mr. Kinder?
 15 MR. KINDER: Here.
 16 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick is absent.
 17 Ms. Lowry?
 18 MS. LOWRY: Here.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 20 MR. MASON: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 22 MR. MUNSON: Here.
 23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 24 MR. PAQUE: Yes, here.
 25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?

Page 4

1 MR. PETERSON: Here.
 2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 3 MR. SCHULTZE: Here.
 4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 5 MR. TATUM: Present.
 6 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 7 DR. FERRELL: Here.
 8 MS. FIELDS: We have a quorum.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Excellent, thank you.
 10 Moving on to agenda item number 4 is
 11 our approval of minutes from our November 6, 2025
 12 regular meeting. Those were part of the board
 13 packet and I believe available to the public, as
 14 well.
 15 If you'd like to take a chance to
 16 review those fully or if you have already, the Chair
 17 would entertain a motion with respect to those
 18 minutes.
 19 MR. TATUM: Move to approve.
 20 DR. FERRELL: Motion to approve. Is there
 21 a second?
 22 MR. MUNSON: Second.
 23 DR. FERRELL: Second. Any discussion on
 24 the motion?
 25 Seeing none, Ms. Fields would you

Page 5

1 please call the vote?
 2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 3 MR. AUER: Yes.
 4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 5 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 6 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 7 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 8 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 9 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 10 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 11 MR. MASON: Yes.
 12 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 13 MR. PAQUE: I'll abstain only because I
 14 wasn't here, unless I'm needed for a quorum vote.
 15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 16 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 18 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 20 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 22 DR. FERRELL: Abstain.
 23 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 24 DR. FERRELL: Excellent, thank you.
 25 Moving on then to agenda item number

Page 6

1 5, the Election of Officers. The officers of the
 2 board consist of a Chair and Vice Chair that
 3 basically carry out the role of organizing meetings
 4 and conducting other affairs of the board.
 5 We'll start with the office of Chair.
 6 Are there any nominations for the office of Chair?
 7 MR. KINDER: Jimmy Kinder, I'd like to
 8 nominate Shannon Ferrell.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Shannon Ferrell accepts.
 10 Are there any other nominations? Any
 11 other nominations? Any other nominations?
 12 Is there a motion that the
 13 nominations cease?
 14 MR. KINDER: I'll so move.
 15 DR. FERRELL: Motion. Is there a second?
 16 MR. AUER: Second.
 17 DR. FERRELL: Any discussion on the
 18 motion? All those in favor of the motion that
 19 nominations cease, please signify by saying aye.
 20 ALL: Aye.
 21 MS. LEWIS: You're required to vote.
 22 DR. FERRELL: Oh, but nominations to
 23 cease, though. Motion to close nominations, then
 24 proceed to vote.
 25 MS. LEWIS: We usually do a roll call vote

Page 7

1 for each vote and then it's submitted. I think the
 2 ability to say aye, which is under the Open Meetings
 3 Act, might be better if we --
 4 DR. FERRELL: What I believe is on the
 5 floor is the motion to close nominations, which we
 6 take a vote on that?
 7 MS. LEWIS: Yes. Roll call vote.
 8 DR. FERRELL: Right. And then vote on the
 9 matter?
 10 MS. LEWIS: Yes.
 11 DR. FERRELL: Yes. All right.
 12 So, with that second, then, roll vote
 13 to close the nominations.
 14 Ms. Fields, could you please take the
 15 vote?
 16 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 17 MR. AUER: Yes.
 18 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 19 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 20 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 21 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 23 MR. MASON: Yes.
 24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 25 MR. MUNSON: Yes.

Page 8

1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 2 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 4 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 6 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 8 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 10 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 12 DR. FERRELL: With that, the motion now is
 13 to vote on the nomination of this guy as Chair for
 14 the board.
 15 Ms. Fields, would you please call the
 16 vote?
 17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 18 MR. AUER: Yes.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 20 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 22 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 24 MR. MASON: Yes.
 25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?

Page 9

1 MR. MUNSON: Yes.

2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?

3 MR. PAQUE: Yes.

4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?

5 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

6 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?

7 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.

8 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?

9 MR. TATUM: Yes.

10 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?

11 DR. FERRELL: Yes.

12 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.

13 DR. FERRELL: I want to thank everyone for

14 that. I've really enjoyed my time as Chair over the

15 past year, it's been fantastic to engage with our

16 staff here at the agency and with our legislators

17 and the public, as well, so I thank you for the

18 opportunity to do that one more time.

19 With that, we now need to elect a

20 Vice Chair for the board. Our current Vice Chair

21 isn't here and thus unable to defend herself, so I

22 would strongly encourage someone to make a

23 nomination with that information in mind.

24 MR. MUNSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to

25 nominate Alexandria Kindrick.

Page 10

1 DR. FERRELL: Motion. Is there a second?

2 MR. PAQUE: Second.

3 DR. FERRELL: All right. Any other

4 nominations? Any other nominations? Any other

5 nominations?

6 MR. TATUM: Mr. Chairman, I move that

7 nominations cease and we elect by acclamation.

8 DR. FERRELL: Excellent motion. So moved.

9 Is there a second?

10 MR. PETERSON: Second.

11 DR. FERRELL: Second. Any other

12 discussion?

13 With that, then, Ms. Fields would you

14 please call the roll for the vote?

15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?

16 MR. AUER: Yes.

17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?

18 MR. KINDER: Yes.

19 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?

20 MS. LOWRY: Yes.

21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?

22 MR. MASON: Yes.

23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?

24 MR. MUNSON: Yes.

25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?

Page 11

1 MR. PAQUE: Yes.

2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?

3 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?

5 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.

6 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?

7 MR. TATUM: Yes.

8 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?

9 DR. FERRELL: Yes.

10 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.

11 DR. FERRELL: And in full and fair

12 disclosure to the public, yes, she's not here to

13 defend herself, but we had also asked Lexie earlier

14 if she would be willing to serve in that role and

15 she did say yes, so -- but that's what you get for

16 missing meetings, folks, so show up every time.

17 All right. That brings us to agenda

18 item number 6, which is the start of our rulemaking

19 docket for today, with potential revisions to

20 Chapter 252, Subchapter 100 with respect to Air

21 Pollution Control, and the rule will be presented

22 today by Ms. Laura Lodes, who's the Chair of our Air

23 Quality Advisory Council.

24 Ms. Lodes, the floor is yours.

25 MS. LODES: Mr. Chairman, Environmental

Page 12

1 Quality Board, I appreciate this opportunity. Our

2 first item on the agenda today is Chapter 100, Air

3 Pollution Control; Subchapter 2; Appendix Q.

4 The Department is proposing to update

5 the language in Subchapter 2, Incorporation by

6 Reference, to reflect the new date of incorporation

7 for Appendix Q, updated as of June 30, 2025. This

8 proposal is part of the annual update of Title 40,

9 Code of Federal Regulations, Incorporations by

10 Reference in Chapter 100.

11 The purpose of the update to OAC

12 252:100, Appendix Q, Incorporation by Reference, is

13 to incorporate the latest changes to EPA

14 regulations. Included are changes or modifications

15 to 40 CFR Part 60, New Source Performance Standards,

16 and Part 63, National Emission Standards for

17 Hazardous Air Pollutants, as well as other

18 referenced subparts.

19 Notice of the proposed rule changes

20 was originally published in the Oklahoma Register on

21 September 15, 2025 and a revised notice to reflect

22 bringing the proposed rule changes to this EQB

23 meeting was published on October 15th of 2025. The

24 Department received no comments prior to or during

25 the October 16, 2025 Air Quality Advisory Council

Page 13

1 meeting. The Council unanimously approved the
 2 proposal at its October meeting.
 3 As Chair of the Air Quality Advisory
 4 Council, I recommend that the Board approve the
 5 proposed Chapter 100-2 and Appendix Q revisions as
 6 permanent.
 7 DR. FERRELL: Thank you, Ms. Lodes.
 8 Any questions of Ms. Lodes from the
 9 board? Any questions from the public?
 10 All right. Seeing none, the Chair
 11 would entertain a motion to approve the rule as
 12 stated.
 13 MR. KINDER: Move to approve, Jimmy
 14 Kinder.
 15 MR. AUER: Auer, second.
 16 DR. FERRELL: Second? Any discussion on
 17 the motion? Any discussion? Any discussion?
 18 Seeing none, we'll proceed to vote.
 19 Ms. Fields?
 20 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 21 MR. AUER: Yes.
 22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 23 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 24 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 25 MS. LOWRY: Yes.

Page 14

1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 2 MR. MASON: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 4 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 6 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 8 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 10 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 12 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 13 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 14 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 15 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 16 DR. FERRELL: Very good.
 17 That brings us to item number 7,
 18 which is additional amendments to 252, Subchapter
 19 100 regarding Air Pollution Control.
 20 Ms. Lodes, you have the floor.
 21 MS. LODES: The next item we have today is
 22 Subchapter 11 for Alternative Emissions Reduction
 23 Plans and Authorizations, and Subchapter 33, Control
 24 of Emission of Nitrogen Oxides.
 25 The Department is proposing to revoke

Page 15

1 Subchapter 11, Alternative Emissions Reduction Plans
 2 and Authorizations, and Subchapter 33, Control of
 3 Emission of Nitrogen Oxides, as they were identified
 4 as outdated and ineffective. On February 3, 2020,
 5 Governor Stitt signed Executive Order 2020-03, which
 6 directed all state agencies to review "agency's
 7 administrative rules to identify costly,
 8 ineffective, duplicative, and outdated regulations".
 9 During ODEQ's comprehensive rule review, Subchapter
 10 11 and Subchapter 33 were both identified as being
 11 potentially obsolete and ineffective.
 12 Subchapter 11 was initially added to
 13 provide facilities flexibility in emission reduction
 14 by allowing offsets between emission points within
 15 the facility. Subchapter 11 has only been used for
 16 one facility but this use was never submitted and
 17 approved by EPA, making it ineffective. The
 18 revocation of this rule would remove this option of
 19 internal trading and require facilities to adhere to
 20 actual emission point limits as required under their
 21 permit and expected by EPA for all individual
 22 permits.
 23 Subchapter 33 was created to "control
 24 the emission of nitrogen oxides from stationary
 25 sources to prevent the Oklahoma air quality

Page 16

1 standards from being exceeded". This rule was first
 2 drafted in October of 1971, a time when there were
 3 very few federal NOx requirements and Oklahoma was
 4 in need of an applicable rule after the creation of
 5 the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Since
 6 that time, numerous federal New Source Performance
 7 Standards, NSPS, addressing NOx emissions have been
 8 promulgated, largely negating the need for
 9 Subchapter 33 NOx limits. The revocation of
 10 Subchapter 33 would remove additional, stringent
 11 requirements that were imposed by the state rule.
 12 Notice of the proposed rule changes
 13 was originally published in the Oklahoma Register on
 14 September 15th of 2025 and a revised notice to
 15 reflect bringing the proposed rule changes to this
 16 EQB meeting was published on October 15, 2025. The
 17 Department received one verbal comment during the
 18 October 16, 2025 Air Quality Advisory Council
 19 meeting, inquiring as to how the Department notified
 20 potentially affected facilities. The question did
 21 not require a change to the rule language. The
 22 Department's response can be found in your EQB
 23 packets. The Council unanimously approved the
 24 proposal at its October meeting. We are
 25 recommending that this rule be passed as final

Page 17

1 today.

2 DR. FERRELL: Thank you.

3 Any questions of Ms. Lodes from the

4 board? Any questions?

5 MS. LOWRY: I have a question.

6 MS. LODES: Yes?

7 MS. LOWRY: So I saw on the minutes for

8 October that there was a discussion that 10

9 facilities are still complying with Subchapter 33

10 and that there had been compliance concerns with

11 whether they were meeting those 33 limits or not,

12 but no expectation that there would be any permit

13 changes. Would you not expect the ones that had had

14 issues complying with Subchapter 33 to get new

15 permitting conditions?

16 MS. LODES: So of the facilities subject,

17 virtually all of them are Title V or PSD major

18 sources, so they -- if we were to try to go in and

19 do a permit change, that would be considered

20 backsliding and they would not be able to relax that

21 limit because they're going to have gone through a

22 BACT review.

23 MS. LOWRY: Okay. So whenever they do

24 come in for their renewal, then it would be

25 addressed at that time --

Page 18

1 MS. LODES: Right, that --

2 MS. LOWRY: -- then would probably receive

3 the same limits?

4 MS. LODES: They will receive the same

5 limits, in all likelihood they would. But that rule

6 will come out of the regulatory applicability

7 section, but everybody is -- I think they've found

8 that everybody was subject to one of the other

9 applicable federal standards, wherever it was D, Da,

10 Db.

11 MS. LOWRY: One of the other NSPS?

12 MS. LODES: Yeah, one of the Es, one of

13 the Gs, one of the Is, Js, KKKs. So there wasn't

14 really anything that, at this point, would allow

15 them to truly backslide.

16 MS. LOWRY: Okay. Thank you.

17 MS. LODES: Yeah. Any other questions?

18 DR. FERRELL: Any other questions? Any

19 questions from the public?

20 Seeing none, the Chair would

21 entertain a motion to approve the rule as stated.

22 MR. TATUM: So move.

23 DR. FERRELL: Motion?

24 MR. SCHULTZE: Second.

25 DR. FERRELL: Second? Any discussion?

Page 19

1 Any discussion? Any discussion?

2 Seeing none, Ms. Fields would you

3 please call a vote?

4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?

5 MR. AUER: Yes.

6 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?

7 MR. KINDER: Yes.

8 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?

9 MS. LOWRY: Yes.

10 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?

11 MR. MASON: Yes.

12 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?

13 MR. MUNSON: Yes.

14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?

15 MR. PAQUE: Yes.

16 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?

17 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

18 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?

19 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.

20 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?

21 MR. TATUM: Yes.

22 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?

23 DR. FERRELL: Yes.

24 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.

25 DR. FERRELL: Agenda item 8 is further

Page 20

1 rulemaking with respect to the Subchapter 100, and

2 specifically Subchapter 49 on Emission Technology

3 Reductions.

4 MS. LODES: Thank you.

5 The Department is proposing to amend

6 Subchapter 49, Oklahoma Emission Reduction

7 Technology Rebate Program in OAC 252:100, to

8 implement recent changes to applicable provisions of

9 the Oklahoma Emission Reduction Technology Incentive

10 Act, 68 O.S. 55006. DEQ and the Oklahoma Tax

11 Commission jointly administer the "Oklahoma Emission

12 Reduction Technology Rebate Program" to provide an

13 incentive for "Emission Reduction Projects" -

14 implementation of new and innovative technologies to

15 reduce air pollutant emissions from oil and gas

16 facilities. The gist of this rule proposal and the

17 underlying reason for the rulemaking is to implement

18 the Department's responsibilities under the recently

19 revised Oklahoma Emission Reduction Technology

20 Incentive Act.

21 Notice of the proposed rule changes

22 was originally published in the Oklahoma Register on

23 September 15, 2025 and a revised notice to reflect

24 bringing the proposed rule changes to this EQB

25 meeting was published on October 15, 2025. The

Page 21

1 Department received no comments prior to or during
 2 the October 16, 2025 Air Quality Advisory Council
 3 meeting. The Council unanimously approved the
 4 proposal at its October meeting.
 5 As Chair of the Air Quality Advisory
 6 Council, I recommend that the board approve the
 7 proposed changes to Chapter 100, Subchapter 49 as
 8 permanent rules.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Any questions for Ms. Lodes
 10 from the board?
 11 MR. MASON: I have a question. I support
 12 the rebate. Tell me about the rebate. How many
 13 dollars, what is the rebate?
 14 MS. LODES: It's for emission reductions
 15 when the companies will come in and justify how much
 16 they have spent to reduce emissions on various
 17 things. The companies I know of have looked at
 18 things like where they've gone into the no-bleed
 19 controllers or other reductions.
 20 Kendal, how much have y'all approved
 21 or seen through?
 22 MS. STEGMANN: I couldn't give you an
 23 exact number, but I can find out and get it to you.
 24 MR. MASON: Could she just guess?
 25 MS. STEGMANN: I would say it would be

Page 22

1 probably close to \$1 million.
 2 MR. MASON: Thank you.
 3 DR. FERRELL: Any other questions? Any
 4 questions from the public?
 5 Seeing none, the Chair would
 6 entertain a motion to approve the regulation as
 7 stated.
 8 MR. MUNSON: Munson moves for approval.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Motion. Second?
 10 MR. PAQUE: Second.
 11 DR. FERRELL: Second. Any discussion?
 12 Any discussion? Any discussion?
 13 Ms. Fields, would you please call the
 14 roll?
 15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 16 MR. AUER: Yes.
 17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 18 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 20 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 22 MR. MASON: Yes.
 23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 24 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?

Page 23

1 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 3 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 5 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 6 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 7 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 8 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 9 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 10 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 11 DR. FERRELL: All right. Thank you,
 12 Ms. Lodes, we appreciate you.
 13 Next up is item number 9, which is
 14 modifications to Subchapter 205 with respect to
 15 Hazardous Waste Management, and we have Kinnamon
 16 Clark to present the regulation.
 17 You have the floor.
 18 MR. CLARK: Thank you.
 19 The Department of Environmental
 20 Quality is proposing to amend OAC 252:205. The gist
 21 of this rulemaking is to make DEQ's hazardous waste
 22 rules consistent with the federal regulations by
 23 incorporating by reference the regulations found in
 24 40 CFR Parts 124 and Parts 260 through 279, revised
 25 as of July 1, 2025.

Page 24

1 There are three separate rule changes
 2 that are included in this incorporation by
 3 reference. The first amended regulation addresses
 4 manifest and electronic manifest - e-Manifest -
 5 requirements for shipments of hazardous waste,
 6 including those specific to hazardous waste imports
 7 and export; requirements pertaining to the
 8 international movement document for imports and
 9 exports of hazardous waste; the manifest data
 10 correction process; and the Discrepancy, Exception,
 11 and Unmanifested Waste Reports.
 12 Additionally, this rule modification
 13 makes technical corrections to address typographical
 14 errors in the e-manifest regulations.
 15 The second rule change establishes 40
 16 CFR Part 266 Subpart Q, which describes alternative
 17 standards for the recovery and recycling of lower
 18 flammability hydrofluorocarbons and hydrocarbon
 19 substitutes during the service, repair, and disposal
 20 of appliances, as well as making conforming changes
 21 to corresponding parts of the hazardous waste
 22 regulations.
 23 The third change finalizes five
 24 revisions to the August 9, 2023 direct final rule
 25 that made technical corrections to the 2016

Page 25

1 Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements Rule, the
 2 2019 Hazardous Waste Pharmaceutical Rule, and the
 3 2018 Vacatur of the Definition of Solid Waste Rule.
 4 These five revisions were among eight amendments
 5 that were withdrawn due to the receipt of adverse
 6 comments.
 7 The Hazardous Waste Management
 8 Advisory Council met on October 23, 2025, and voted
 9 to approve the proposed changes. The Council
 10 recommends that the board approve these revisions to
 11 OAC 252:205.
 12 Thank you.
 13 DR. FERRELL: Any questions from the board
 14 for Mr. Clark? Any questions?
 15 Any questions from the public?
 16 Seeing none, the Chair would entertain a motion to
 17 accept the regulations as proposed.
 18 MR. KINDER: Kinder, so move.
 19 DR. FERRELL: Motion. Second?
 20 MR. SCHULTZE: Second.
 21 DR. FERRELL: I have a motion and a
 22 second. Any discussion on the motion? Any
 23 discussion? Any discussion?
 24 Seeing none, Ms. Fields, please call
 25 the roll.

Page 26

1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 2 MR. AUER: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 4 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick has entered the
 6 meeting.
 7 Ms. Kindrick?
 8 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 10 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 12 MR. MASON: Yes.
 13 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 14 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 16 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 18 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 20 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 22 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 23 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 24 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 25 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.

Page 27

1 DR. FERRELL: Excellent. Thank you,
 2 Mr. Clark.
 3 Agenda item number 10 is with respect
 4 to Laboratory Accreditations and modifications to
 5 Subchapter 301. To present the information about
 6 this and several other regulations is Mr. Brian
 7 Duzan.
 8 MR. DUZAN: Thank you, sir. I do have to
 9 use my reading glasses. I could have printed it in
 10 bigger font, but I thought you guys might be worried
 11 if I showed up here with a rough draft of War and
 12 Peace, so...
 13 [Laughter]
 14 MR. DUZAN: I'm Brian Duzan, Chairman of
 15 the Water Quality Management Advisory Council.
 16 Today, the Council has seven chapters of rules to
 17 recommend to the board.
 18 The first one's OAC 252:301,
 19 Laboratory Accreditation. Please note that Chapters
 20 301, 302, and 307 being presented today have
 21 previously been approved by this board during the
 22 June 11, 2024 session. After legislative and
 23 gubernatorial approval of changes to Chapters 301,
 24 302, and 307 during the 2025 legislative session, an
 25 unintended oversight by DEQ to timely publish a

Page 28

1 Permanent Rule Document in the Oklahoma Register as
 2 required by the Administrative Rules on Rulemaking
 3 and the Administrative Procedures Act resulted in a
 4 failure to promulgate the rule changes. As such,
 5 the rulemaking process must be repeated and DEQ
 6 staff are proposing the same changes as previously
 7 approved.
 8 In the original performance of this
 9 rulemaking, DEQ staff held two informal public
 10 meetings: one was conducted March 26, 2024, here at
 11 the DEQ with 17 attendees, and the second was
 12 conducted on March 28, 2024 at the Tulsa Mohawk
 13 Water Treatment Plant with 16 attendees. Recently,
 14 DEQ staff discussed the proposed rulemaking at the
 15 December 2, 2025 WQMAC meeting where these rules
 16 were unanimously recommended to the board by the
 17 Council.
 18 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ staff
 19 proposes changes within Subchapters 1, 3, 5, 7, and
 20 9 of this rule. DEQ staff proposes modifying the
 21 chapter name to "State of Oklahoma Laboratory
 22 Accreditation" to be more descriptive of the
 23 program. Under Subchapter 1, DEQ staff proposes to
 24 reduce the number of groups of accreditation from
 25 three to two: "Drinking Water" and "General

Page 29

1 Environmental". No new fees are proposed but
 2 changes to simplify the calculation of application
 3 and renewal fees are proposed. Finally, DEQ staff
 4 proposes a change of the stated accreditation period
 5 from September to August to a calendar-year cycle,
 6 January to December, which is proposed for all
 7 laboratory accreditation rules. Under Subchapter 3,
 8 staff proposes updating the stated date for
 9 submitting renewal application materials and
 10 proficiency testing reports to September 15th from
 11 June 15th and removing requirements for submitting
 12 fees with an application. The new proposed date for
 13 payment is December 15th, which will reduce
 14 inaccurate payments, increase timely processing, and
 15 timely issuing letters of accreditation. Under
 16 Subchapter 5, staff proposes to specify that the
 17 only acceptable assessors for out-of-state
 18 assessments must be nationally accredited from the
 19 TNI governmental body. On-site assessments are also
 20 proposed to be reduced from once every two years to
 21 three years to better align with EPA drinking water
 22 laboratory audits. Under Subchapter 7, staff
 23 proposes to reduce ambiguity for proficiency testing
 24 requirements while not changing specific
 25 requirements. Under Subchapter 9, staff proposes to

Page 30

1 update incorporations by reference for EPA
 2 methodologies for drinking water regulations,
 3 evaluating solid waste, and analysis of pollutant
 4 procedures.
 5 In conclusion, the WQMAC recommends
 6 this rule to the Environmental Quality Board by
 7 unanimous vote. If you have any questions, the
 8 staff or I will be happy to respond.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Thank you, Brian.
 10 Any questions from the board?
 11 MS. LOWRY: I have a question. So with
 12 the removal of the late application fee, it is now
 13 instead they would lose their accreditation and then
 14 they would have to go through the initial
 15 application process again --
 16 MR. DUZAN: Correct.
 17 MS. LOWRY: -- in this case? So is there
 18 an estimate, like, on how often that late fee was
 19 assessed and how long the initial application
 20 process would take for them to get their
 21 accreditation again?
 22 MR. DUZAN: Jonathan, do you want to --
 23 or, Taryn's coming up.
 24 MS. HURLEY: Hello, I'm Taryn Hurley, the
 25 Program Manager for Laboratory Accreditation. If a

Page 31

1 laboratory were to have to come back into the
 2 program, if they have been assessed within the last
 3 two years we would just need to process fees and the
 4 new application. That would take likely about 60
 5 days, at maximum, to process.
 6 If they have not received an
 7 assessment in the last two years, we would need to
 8 go on site to perform another assessment. Due to
 9 staff and needing to perform assessments for all
 10 labs, that could take up to six months to be able to
 11 perform an assessment and process the application.
 12 Something worth noting is with the
 13 previous rules, even with the late fees if they
 14 missed the late fee deadline, this was still the
 15 process, they had to come back in as a condition
 16 regardless, and we have extended the timeframe in
 17 which they can pay. So we've removed the late fee,
 18 but we've given them more time to pay.
 19 MS. LOWRY: So would you have an estimate
 20 on how often that happens?
 21 MS. HURLEY: Sorry, I forgot that part of
 22 my question. That happened -- we have about 150
 23 accredited labs, about 100 of those are in-state.
 24 Those -- the in-state ones are the only ones we have
 25 to do an assessment on. Out of the in-state ones,

Page 32

1 it's about five a year miss payment entirely until
 2 we remind them another time, afterwards.
 3 MS. LOWRY: So just based on the demand at
 4 the lab, do you see any issues with samples being
 5 able to be processed? Because I think this affects
 6 the next two --
 7 MS. HURLEY: It does, yeah.
 8 MS. LOWRY: -- types, as well. So any
 9 kind of issues with demand being able to be met if
 10 they can't do any samples for six months, if
 11 possible?
 12 MS. HURLEY: Yes. There is the risk of a
 13 lapse in accreditation, in which they would have to
 14 be subcontracting those samples out to another lab
 15 that was accredited. We do everything we can to
 16 prevent labs losing their accreditation. We know
 17 the significant impact to laboratories, which is why
 18 we put them on the front of the list where if they
 19 do miss, they go on the top of the schedule. We
 20 only have two full-time assessors, and so that's why
 21 it can take up to six months still.
 22 MS. LOWRY: Thank you.
 23 MS. HURLEY: Of course.
 24 DR. FERRELL: Any other questions from the
 25 board? Any questions?

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 Any questions from the public?</p> <p>2 Seeing none, the Chair would entertain a motion to</p> <p>3 approve the regulation as stated.</p> <p>4 MR. AUER: Auer, motion to approve.</p> <p>5 DR. FERRELL: Moved. Second?</p> <p>6 MR. TATUM: Second.</p> <p>7 DR. FERRELL: We have a second. Any</p> <p>8 discussion on the motion? Any discussion? Any</p> <p>9 discussion?</p> <p>10 Seeing none, Ms. Fields, please call</p> <p>11 the roll.</p> <p>12 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?</p> <p>13 MR. AUER: Yes.</p> <p>14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?</p> <p>15 MR. KINDER: Yes.</p> <p>16 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?</p> <p>17 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.</p> <p>18 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?</p> <p>19 MS. LOWRY: Yes.</p> <p>20 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?</p> <p>21 MR. MASON: Yes.</p> <p>22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?</p> <p>23 MR. MUNSON: Yes.</p> <p>24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?</p> <p>25 MR. PAQUE: Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 proposed. As with Chapter 301, staff proposes</p> <p>2 changing the state accreditation period to a</p> <p>3 calendar-year basis. Under Subchapter 3, staff</p> <p>4 proposes to eliminate the requirement to submit fees</p> <p>5 with the renewal application materials. Staff</p> <p>6 further proposes to update the stated date for</p> <p>7 submitting the renewal application materials and</p> <p>8 proficiency testing reports to September 15th from</p> <p>9 June 15th and adding the December 15th deadline for</p> <p>10 invoice payments. Under Subchapter 5, staff</p> <p>11 proposes clarifying terms such as changing</p> <p>12 references to an on-site "evaluation" to an on-site</p> <p>13 "assessment" as well as a few additional edits to</p> <p>14 make the current text more concise. Under</p> <p>15 Subchapter 7, as with Subchapter 5, staff proposes</p> <p>16 clarifying a few terms as well as a few additional</p> <p>17 edits to make the current text more concise. Under</p> <p>18 Subchapter 9, as with Chapter 301, staff proposes to</p> <p>19 update incorporations by reference for other EPA</p> <p>20 approved methodologies adding flexibility for both</p> <p>21 the accreditation program and impacted labs for</p> <p>22 regulatory changes.</p> <p>23 In conclusion, the WQMAC recommends</p> <p>24 this rule to the Environmental Quality Board by</p> <p>25 unanimous vote. If you have any questions, the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?</p> <p>2 MR. PETERSON: Yes.</p> <p>3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?</p> <p>4 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.</p> <p>5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?</p> <p>6 MR. TATUM: Yes.</p> <p>7 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?</p> <p>8 DR. FERRELL: Yes.</p> <p>9 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>10 DR. FERRELL: All right. That moves us on</p> <p>11 to agenda item 11, which is Field Laboratory</p> <p>12 Accreditation.</p> <p>13 Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>14 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Now we're on to OAC</p> <p>15 252:302, Field Laboratory Accreditation, and all the</p> <p>16 public participation that I mentioned for Chapter</p> <p>17 301 also applies here.</p> <p>18 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ staff</p> <p>19 proposes changes within Subchapters 1, 3, 5, 7, and</p> <p>20 9 of this rule. DEQ staff proposes modifying the</p> <p>21 chapter name to "Industrial Discharge Laboratory</p> <p>22 Accreditation" to be more descriptive of the</p> <p>23 program. Under Subchapter 1, staff proposes to</p> <p>24 remove the fee for submitting late renewal</p> <p>25 applications. No additional or increased fees are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 staff or I will be happy to respond.</p> <p>2 DR. FERRELL: Thank you, sir.</p> <p>3 Any questions from the board?</p> <p>4 Any questions from the public?</p> <p>5 Seeing none, the Chair would entertain a motion to</p> <p>6 approve the regulation as stated.</p> <p>7 MR. KINDER: Kinder, so move.</p> <p>8 DR. FERRELL: A motion. Is there a</p> <p>9 second?</p> <p>10 MS. KINDRICK: Second.</p> <p>11 DR. FERRELL: Second. Any discussion?</p> <p>12 Any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, we'll</p> <p>13 call a vote. Ms. Fields?</p> <p>14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?</p> <p>15 MR. AUER: Yes.</p> <p>16 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?</p> <p>17 MR. KINDER: Yes.</p> <p>18 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?</p> <p>19 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.</p> <p>20 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?</p> <p>21 MS. LOWRY: Yes.</p> <p>22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?</p> <p>23 MR. MASON: Yes.</p> <p>24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?</p> <p>25 MR. MUNSON: Yes.</p>

Page 37

1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 2 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 4 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 6 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 8 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 10 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 12 DR. FERRELL: Agenda item 12 is rulemaking
 13 with respect to TNI Laboratory Accreditation. We'll
 14 turn things back over to Mr. Duzan.
 15 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Now we're on to
 16 252:307, TNI Laboratory Accreditation.
 17 And again, all of the public
 18 participation I mentioned in Chapter 301 also
 19 applies here.
 20 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ staff
 21 proposes changes within Subchapters 1, 3, 5, 7, 9,
 22 and 11 of this rule. DEQ staff proposes modifying
 23 the chapter name to "National TNI Laboratory
 24 Accreditation" to make the DEQ accreditation program
 25 distinguishable from the other accreditation

Page 38

1 programs under Chapters 301 and 302. Under
 2 Subchapter 1, staff proposes to change the state
 3 accreditation period to the calendar year, January
 4 to December. Staff proposes to incorporate other
 5 EPA approved analytical methods for accreditation
 6 increasing program flexibility, to simplify fee
 7 calculations, and to remove fees for past due
 8 applications. Under Subchapter 3, staff proposes to
 9 eliminate the requirement for the submittal of
 10 application fees with renewal application materials.
 11 Staff proposes a stated date change for submitting
 12 renewal application materials and proficiency
 13 testing reports to September 15th from June 15th and
 14 adding a December 15th deadline for invoicing
 15 payment prior to certificate issuance. Under
 16 Subchapters 5 and 7, staff proposes no substantive
 17 changes; the only rule changes proposed in these
 18 subchapters remove the word "the" before the term
 19 "DEQ", shorten repeated terms such as "proficiency
 20 testing" to the acronym "PT", and other similar
 21 textual edits. Under Subchapter 9, staff proposes a
 22 new section to provide guidance to labs when a
 23 "NELAP/TNI recognized" proficiency test sample is
 24 not available for a particular analyte or matrix for
 25 which the laboratory seeks accreditation. Other

Page 39

1 non-substantive proposed changes to this subchapter
 2 will correct typographical and grammatical errors,
 3 including similar changes like those mentioned in
 4 Subchapters 5 and 7.
 5 In conclusion, the WQMAC recommends
 6 this rule to the board by unanimous vote. If you
 7 have any questions, the staff or I will be happy to
 8 respond.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Any questions for Mr. Duzan
 10 from the board?
 11 Any questions from the public?
 12 Seeing none, the Chair would entertain a motion to
 13 approve the regulation as stated.
 14 MR. SCHULTZE: I'll motion to approve.
 15 MR. AUER: I'll second.
 16 DR. FERRELL: Motion and a second. Any
 17 discussion? Any discussion? Any discussion?
 18 Seeing none, Ms. Fields, would you please call a
 19 vote?
 20 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 21 MR. AUER: Yes.
 22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 23 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 24 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?
 25 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.

Page 40

1 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 2 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 4 MR. MASON: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 6 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 8 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 10 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 12 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 13 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 14 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 15 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 16 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 17 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 18 DR. FERRELL: Excellent.
 19 Agenda item 13 is regulatory changes
 20 with respect to the OPDES Standards.
 21 Mr. Duzan?
 22 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Moving on from the lab,
 23 we're now to OAC 252:606, OPDES Standards.
 24 Please note that prior to bringing
 25 these remaining rules before you today, DEQ staff

Page 41

1 held two informal public meetings: one was conducted
 2 on October 2nd here at the DEQ office where we had
 3 approximately 19 attendees, and the second was
 4 conducted on October 8th, in Tulsa at the Centennial
 5 Center in Veterans Park where we had approximately
 6 10 people attend.

7 Additionally, DEQ staff discussed
 8 this proposed rulemaking during the September 23,
 9 2025 Council meeting and at the December 2, 2025
 10 council meeting where these rules were unanimously
 11 approved for recommendation to the EQB.

12 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ staff
 13 proposed changes that include an update of the
 14 federal rules incorporated by reference from July 8,
 15 2024 to January 17, 2025; adding and modifying
 16 definitions to Subchapter 1, titled "Introduction",
 17 definitions added or modified include Beneficial
 18 Use, Regulatory Low Flow, 30Q2, Qu30Q2, and Qe30;
 19 updating sections 606-3-4 regarding fees, currently
 20 Consumer Price Index adjustments are made on
 21 July 1st every year for individual discharge permit
 22 fees and individual permit fees for industrial
 23 users, the proposed update is to apply the CPI to
 24 stormwater and other general discharge permit fees,
 25 this will ensure consistency amongst the rules that

Page 42

1 require annual fees; updating Subchapter 6, titled
 2 "Point Source Discharges" that include the
 3 following: adding language to disallow monitoring
 4 frequency reductions for a parameter when the
 5 receiving water is impaired for that parameter,
 6 replacing the term "7Q2" with "regulatory low flow",
 7 adding language that the Q* ratio is "for all toxic
 8 substances unless otherwise specified in this
 9 section", and making a couple of style and grammar
 10 corrections.

11 For Chapter 606, DEQ received written
 12 public comments from Oklahoma Gas and Electric and
 13 the Environmental Federation of Oklahoma, and oral
 14 comments from a citizen, Kelsey Royce, made at the
 15 December 2, 2025 WQMAC meeting.

16 Ms. Royce shared her concern about
 17 how beneficial use of waterbodies is determined and
 18 whether these determinations adequately reflect the
 19 public's best interest. In particular, she shared
 20 her concerns about the condition of the Arkansas
 21 River in Tulsa, which people use for recreation and
 22 which is in close proximity to refineries. She
 23 expressed concern that harmful chemicals may not be
 24 monitored adequately. Ms. Royce also noted that
 25 groundwater contamination directly impacts surface

Page 43

1 water quality.

2 DEQ's response is the DEQ appreciates
 3 Ms. Royce's comments and concerns and that DEQ's
 4 mission is to protect human health and the
 5 environment. While 252:606 is a portion of a
 6 regulatory framework aimed at protecting human
 7 health and the environment, it is not the best forum
 8 to address Ms. Royce's concerns, particularly those
 9 about the Arkansas River in Tulsa. Such concerns
 10 are better addressed through the issuance and
 11 renewal of industrial discharge permits, during
 12 which DEQ evaluates specific discharges and provides
 13 opportunities for public notice and comment.

14 Regarding the OG&E comments submitted
 15 December 1, 2025, DEQ notes OG&E's concern that
 16 changing regulatory low flows from a seven-day
 17 two-year, or "7Q2", to a 30-day two-year, or "30Q2",
 18 would significantly increase the regulatory low
 19 flow. DEQ's response is that these concerns are
 20 largely moot because DEQ is no longer recommending
 21 changes to Chapters 730 and 740 that would implement
 22 changes to regulatory low flow. Nonetheless, DEQ
 23 chose to leave the definition of 30Q2 so that there
 24 would be no need to reopen Chapter 606 in the
 25 future.

Page 44

1 Regarding the comments from EFO
 2 submitted on December 1, 2025, DEQ notes that EFO
 3 stated that the change in the definition of
 4 'Beneficial Use' sets a high standard with the use
 5 of the term 'best uses' which may be used to limit
 6 industrial discharges and that EFO might further
 7 believe that Beneficial Use should therefore be
 8 defined something like: "Beneficial use is the use
 9 of water resulting in appreciable gain or benefit to
 10 the user consistent with state law".

11 DEQ's response is that the phrase
 12 "beneficial use" is used differently in various
 13 contexts in Oklahoma law. For instance, 82 O.S.
 14 105.2 uses the phrase "beneficial use" to refer to
 15 the quantity of water used, as well as the purpose
 16 and method of its use in economic activities. In
 17 contrast, the proposed definition change in Chapter
 18 606 is associated with the way the phrase is used in
 19 the Clean Water Act and federal regulations, and
 20 relates to protection of water quality for
 21 discharge-receiving waters under Oklahoma's Water
 22 Quality Standards or OWQS. Because a portion of the
 23 OWQS and its implementation is contained within
 24 Chapter 606, this proposed definition for
 25 "beneficial use" is intended to reconcile the

Page 45

1 Chapter 606 and Chapter 730 definitions of the same
 2 phrase.
 3 The comments and DEQ's response to
 4 comments are included in the Executive Summary.
 5 In conclusion, the WQMAC recommended
 6 this rule to the EQB by unanimous vote. If you have
 7 any questions, the staff or I will be happy to
 8 answer.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Any questions for Mr. Duzan
 10 from the board?
 11 Any questions from the public? Oh,
 12 ma'am, is that a question?
 13 MS. PRATHER: Yeah, I have a question for
 14 the board.
 15 DR. FERRELL: Would you mind stating your
 16 name for the record, please, ma'am?
 17 MS. PRATHER: Hi, my name's Cailyn
 18 Prather. My question is for the CPI increase for
 19 the stormwater and other discharge permit fees.
 20 Will that also include the application fee for water
 21 use that currently does not have a fee?
 22 DR. FERRELL: Would anyone like to respond
 23 to that question, either from the agency or from the
 24 council?
 25 MR. SINGLETARY: I don't know that that's

Page 46

1 part of this particular rulemaking, that may be on a
 2 different agenda item.
 3 DR. FERRELL: Any other questions? Seeing
 4 none, is there a motion to approve the regulation as
 5 stated?
 6 MR. TATUM: [Raised hand].
 7 DR. FERRELL: Mr. Tatum has a motion. Is
 8 there a second?
 9 MR. AUER: Second.
 10 DR. FERRELL: Second? Any discussion on
 11 the motion?
 12 Seeing none, we'll proceed to a vote.
 13 Ms. Fields?
 14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 15 MR. AUER: Yes.
 16 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 17 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 18 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?
 19 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.
 20 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 21 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 23 MR. MASON: Yes.
 24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 25 MR. MUNSON: Yes.

Page 47

1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 2 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 4 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 6 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 8 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 10 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 12 DR. FERRELL: Agenda item 14 is changes to
 13 Subchapter 626 with respect to Public Water Supply
 14 Construction Standards.
 15 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Moving on to OAC
 16 252:626, Public Water Supply Construction Standards.
 17 All the public participation that I
 18 talked about for Chapter 606 also applies here.
 19 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ staff
 20 proposed changes that include: allowing electronic
 21 submittal of plans and specifications and
 22 engineering reports; updating references to
 23 International Fire Code and the American Water Works
 24 Association; correcting typographical errors and
 25 updating other incorrect references; providing a

Page 48

1 specific reference to the sedimentation portion of
 2 the clarification section; removing "the maximum
 3 detention time of the rapid mix basin, at design
 4 flow is 30 seconds" and replace with "provide good
 5 mixing of the raw water with the chemicals applied
 6 and prevent deposition of solids in the mixing
 7 zone"; adding language noting a rapid mix detention
 8 time of not more than 30 seconds; removing "Cathodic
 9 protection shall be provided for all steel tanks to
 10 prevent under bottom corrosion"; and for Appendix E,
 11 DEQ proposed to amend the name of the appendix. No
 12 substantive changes to the appendix were made.
 13 For Chapter 626, DEQ received oral
 14 comments from a citizen, Ms. Ann Marie Beer, at the
 15 December 2, 2025 WQMAC meeting.
 16 Ms. Beer expressed concerns about the
 17 lack of requirements for grading and drainage in
 18 Chapter 626. She also asked if Chapter 626 included
 19 requirements for beginning and end dates for
 20 construction and if there are regulations about the
 21 age of water storage tanks.
 22 DEQ's response is that although the
 23 proposed rules in Chapter 626 are outside the scope
 24 of Ms. Beer's comments, DEQ regularly conducts
 25 sanitary surveys of public water systems every three

Page 49

1 years, and these sanitary surveys include an
 2 evaluation of water storage tanks. Additionally,
 3 construction permits expire after one year, which
 4 can be extended if needed. Because DEQ has limited
 5 jurisdiction, there may be other rules and
 6 regulations that control conditions such as grading
 7 and elevation.
 8 The comments and DEQ's response to
 9 comments are included in the Executive Summary.
 10 In conclusion, the WQMAC recommends
 11 this rule to the EQB by unanimous vote. If you have
 12 any questions, the staff or I will be happy to
 13 answer.
 14 DR. FERRELL: Any questions from the
 15 board? I'll ask one just for a point of
 16 clarification just, I think, to underscore the
 17 point, which was with respect to the removal of the
 18 cathodic protection requirements, that was not a
 19 removal of corrosive protection requirements, but
 20 rather a recognition that there are other
 21 technologies available that would fill that role.
 22 Is that correct?
 23 MR. DUZAN: Correct.
 24 DR. FERRELL: Any other questions from the
 25 board?

Page 50

1 Any questions from the public?
 2 Seeing none, the Chair would entertain a motion to
 3 approve the regulation as stated.
 4 MR. SCHULTZE: I'll motion to approve.
 5 DR. FERRELL: Move to approve. Is there a
 6 second?
 7 MR. KINDER: Second.
 8 DR. FERRELL: Any discussion on the
 9 motion? Any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing
 10 none, Ms. Fields, would you please call the roll?
 11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 12 MR. AUER: Yes.
 13 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 14 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 15 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?
 16 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.
 17 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 18 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 20 MR. MASON: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 22 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 24 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?

Page 51

1 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 3 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 5 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 6 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 7 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 8 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 9 DR. FERRELL: Agenda item 15 is with
 10 respect to Operation and Maintenance of Water Reuse
 11 Systems under Subchapter 627.
 12 Mr. Duzan?
 13 MR. DUZAN: Okay. On to OAC 252:627,
 14 Operation and Maintenance of Water Reuse Systems.
 15 Again, all the public participation that I talked
 16 about for Chapter 606 also applies here.
 17 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ staff
 18 proposed changes that include updating the rule to
 19 include the Consumer Price Index language allowing
 20 for the annual adjustment of fees based on the CPI.
 21 This will ensure consistency amongst the rules that
 22 require annual fees.
 23 In conclusion, the WQMAC recommends
 24 this rule to the EQB by unanimous vote. If you have
 25 any questions, the staff or I will be happy to

Page 52

1 answer.
 2 DR. FERRELL: Any questions from the
 3 board?
 4 Any questions from the public?
 5 Seeing none, the Chair would entertain a motion to
 6 approve the regulation as stated.
 7 MR. PETERSON: So move.
 8 DR. FERRELL: Motion. Is there a second?
 9 MR. TATUM: Second.
 10 DR. FERRELL: And a second. Any
 11 discussion on the motion? Any discussion? Any
 12 discussion? Seeing none, Ms. Fields, would you
 13 please call the roll?
 14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 15 MR. AUER: Yes.
 16 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 17 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 18 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?
 19 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.
 20 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 21 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 23 MR. MASON: Yes.
 24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 25 MR. MUNSON: Yes.

Page 53

1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 2 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 4 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 6 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 8 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 10 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 12 DR. FERRELL: I believe that brings us to
 13 item 16 - just wanted to make sure I was keeping
 14 track here - with respect to Water Pollution Control
 15 Facility Construction Standards under Subchapter
 16 656.
 17 Mr. Duzan, we, with a heavy heart,
 18 indicate that this is your last agenda item of the
 19 day.
 20 MR. DUZAN: This is my last agenda item.
 21 And I saw that Ms. Kindrick showed up just before I
 22 started talking, either she wanted to hear me talk
 23 or -- but I doubt that that's the case.
 24 MS. KINDRICK: Yeah, traffic was trying to
 25 keep me away, but it didn't win.

Page 54

1 MR. DUZAN: Okay. 252:656 is Water
 2 Pollution Control Facility Construction Standards.
 3 Again, all the public participation
 4 that I talked about for Chapter 606 applies here.
 5 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ staff
 6 proposed changes that include: allowing electric
 7 submittal of plans and specifications and
 8 engineering reports; updating references to Metcalf
 9 & Eddy; updating wet weather flow equalization basin
 10 construction to require wet weather Flow
 11 Equalization Basins, FEBs, be located with the same
 12 requirements as lagoons to provide for groundwater
 13 protection; and updating return sludge piping
 14 language to specify that 4-inch piping is a minimum
 15 requirement.
 16 For Chapter 656, DEQ received oral
 17 comments from a citizen, Ms. Royce, at the
 18 December 2, 2025 WQMAC meeting.
 19 Ms. Royce asked how many permits a
 20 day DEQ staff reviews and whether the public can be
 21 notified when projects are under review by DEQ.
 22 DEQ's response is that Ms. Royce's questions are
 23 generally outside the scope of the proposed rule.
 24 There is no set number of permits per day that are
 25 reviewed and the duration of review of a given

Page 55

1 permit can vary widely. There are often delays
 2 caused by deficiencies and late submissions. DEQ is
 3 developing a Permitting Dashboard for public access
 4 and notice of permits is published in local
 5 newspapers. The comments and DEQ's response to
 6 comments are in the Executive Summary.
 7 In conclusion, the WQMAC recommended
 8 this rule to the EQB by unanimous vote. If you have
 9 any questions, the staff or I will be happy to
 10 answer.
 11 DR. FERRELL: Any questions from the
 12 board?
 13 Any questions from the public?
 14 Seeing none, the Chair would entertain a motion to
 15 approve the regulation as stated.
 16 MS. KINDRICK: So moved.
 17 DR. FERRELL: Motion. Is there a second?
 18 MR. SCHULTZE: Second.
 19 DR. FERRELL: And a second. Any
 20 discussion on the motion? Any discussion? Any
 21 discussion?
 22 Seeing none, Ms. Fields, would you
 23 please call a vote?
 24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 25 MR. AUER: Yes.

Page 56

1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 2 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 3 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?
 4 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.
 5 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 6 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 8 MR. MASON: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 10 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 12 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 13 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 14 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 16 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?
 18 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 20 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 22 DR. FERRELL: With that, I would like to
 23 congratulate Mr. Duzan on his world record for the
 24 number of pages of regulations that he has presented
 25 over the past two years, including passing our water

Page 57

1 quality standards twice, these regulations as well.
 2 The people from Guinness will be here after the
 3 meeting to take your picture.
 4 [Laughter]
 5 DR. FERRELL: Now, having said that, with
 6 all seriousness, I do want to express on behalf of
 7 the entire board our appreciation for all of our
 8 advisory councils and the members. It is an
 9 incredibly important part of our regulatory process
 10 that really gives us an open dialogue between our
 11 staff and the regulated community to make sure that
 12 we're passing regulations that are fairly balanced
 13 and that accomplish our mission of protecting human
 14 health and the environment, so we really do, very
 15 sincerely, appreciate the efforts of our boards.
 16 So thank you to all those boards that
 17 are present and please express our appreciation to
 18 your members when you see them next.
 19 That brings us to agenda item 17,
 20 which is the Executive Director's Report.
 21 Mr. Singletary?
 22 MR. SINGLETARY: Yes, sir. I don't know
 23 how to follow that.
 24 So it's been since November, I guess,
 25 since our last board meeting and I've got a lot of

Page 58

1 good news to report, a lot of good progress on a
 2 bunch of different fronts.
 3 I'm not going to go into a whole lot
 4 of detail on federal updates. Back by popular
 5 demand, Ms. Madison Miller, our Deputy Executive
 6 Director, is going to follow me on the agenda and
 7 provide a little bit more in-depth update on what's
 8 been going on at the federal level.
 9 But I did want to give you a quick
 10 update on some meetings that I had just about two
 11 weeks ago in D.C. So myself and the other two ECOS
 12 officers - there was a director from Oregon and then
 13 one from Mississippi - we had the opportunity to
 14 meet with David Fotouhi, who's the Deputy
 15 Administrator for the EPA - so the number-two guy at
 16 EPA - as well as a bunch of his staff.
 17 And then we also had separate
 18 meetings with the different directors of the
 19 different offices, so the Office of Water, the
 20 Office of Air and Radiation, and the Office of
 21 Enforcement and Compliance. So it was a great
 22 opportunity to have in-person, you know, small-group
 23 dialogue with those folks.
 24 And I can say the overall theme from
 25 the EPA folks was they really want to put more of

Page 59

1 these programs in the hands of the states and give
 2 the states more flexibility in implementing the
 3 programs within their jurisdiction, which was pretty
 4 refreshing.
 5 I mean, you know, we've had other
 6 administrations that were a lot more restrictive in
 7 how the states were implementing the programs and
 8 seemed, you know, more focused on federal
 9 jurisdiction than empowering the states, so...
 10 And kind of in response to, you know,
 11 their theme, some of the stuff that I shared was,
 12 you know, that's something in Oklahoma, anyway,
 13 we've really been fighting for, the ability to
 14 implement as many of these programs in the state as
 15 possible and really kind of fighting for the states'
 16 rights to implement those and to have that
 17 discretion and that the one thing we needed, though,
 18 was support from EPA.
 19 So we need adequate funding to
 20 implement those programs; on the science side, we
 21 need support from EPA to help set standards and to
 22 help develop solutions to really, you know,
 23 difficult, challenging problems; and then we also
 24 needed that flexibility.
 25 So we've got all our local concerns

Page 60

1 that we're trying to shape our implementation plans
 2 around. So we talked a bit about that, that was
 3 very well received from their standpoint.
 4 On that flexibility note, I did have
 5 the opportunity to share with the Deputy
 6 Administrator and with the head of the Office of Air
 7 and Radiation kind of a challenging permitting
 8 scenario that we have here in Oklahoma that's kind
 9 of popped up in different areas of the state.
 10 Talking to some of our industry
 11 partners, we learned that there's some parts of the
 12 state that are really having trouble permitting new
 13 major source air quality sources so -- because of
 14 PSD and, you know, we are getting close to the ozone
 15 design value and so that kind of limits the kind of
 16 development in those parts of the state.
 17 So we came up with what we think is a
 18 pretty innovative solution to apply some standards
 19 that would essentially apply in the state if we were
 20 in nonattainment so they would actually allow
 21 continued development in those areas and improve air
 22 quality within the state.
 23 So we're talking about potential
 24 offsets and having to control -- even stricter
 25 control technology than would be required under our

Page 61

1 current status of attainment.
 2 So it's kind of a win-win for
 3 everybody, we thought, but it's not directly
 4 provided for in the Clean Air Act or in the rules,
 5 but we don't think it's inconsistent, and states
 6 always have the ability to be stricter than the
 7 federal government in implementing programs.
 8 And you could argue this is stricter,
 9 but it also allows for continued growth and
 10 development which couldn't happen without this
 11 innovative idea that we're kind of pitching.
 12 So I was able to share that with them
 13 and very, very pleased with the response, they're
 14 very open to -- they recognize not just in this
 15 instance, but across the board there's all kind of
 16 regulatory challenges where things don't fit
 17 directly in the way the statutes and the regs are
 18 developed, and they're very open to innovative ideas
 19 that, you know, are promoting economic development,
 20 but simultaneously are protective of human health
 21 and the environment, as well, and this proposal we
 22 have is right in line with that. So very, very
 23 positively received.
 24 Also brought up some dialogue we're
 25 having in the state related to biosolids, that's a

Page 62

1 very difficult issue that the state is facing right
 2 now. And a lot of it -- not a lot, I mean, it's
 3 partly related to the Biden administration. On
 4 their way out, they issued a draft risk assessment
 5 related to the land application of biosolids, and
 6 there's a lot of unanswered questions related to
 7 that draft.
 8 And the current administration is
 9 considering comments that they've received related
 10 to that draft document and they're really looking
 11 hard at the assumptions that were in place. So
 12 they've committed to having some -- either a new
 13 proposed risk assessment release or just kind of
 14 building off that existing one and the comments
 15 received, coming out with just a final thing, a
 16 final document.
 17 So they didn't give us any timeline
 18 on that, but they are actively working on that,
 19 which is something we really need. It's a
 20 challenging situation in the state that we're
 21 facing, so -- and very, very political, so the more
 22 science, the more information that they have, the
 23 better that will be.
 24 Overall, very encouraged by the
 25 discussions. Again, that desire to support the

Page 63

1 states in our efforts to implement these programs
 2 and then just that open dialogue and willingness to
 3 collaborate, just have a discussion on different
 4 ideas that we can to make things better, so they
 5 were very open to that discussion.
 6 While we were there, we also learned
 7 that the federal budget side, that both houses of
 8 Congress have agreed to an EPA budget. I don't -- I
 9 think it's gone to the President, I'm not sure
 10 100 percent, but as of a couple weeks ago, we had
 11 agreement from both sides of Congress.
 12 And the two things that we're
 13 watching really carefully are the categorical grants
 14 and the SRFs, I've talked quite a bit about those.
 15 The categorical grants I think we actually saw a
 16 little bit of increase, and then there's a lot more
 17 money going to the Tribes, as well. So not coming
 18 out of state funds, separate funds coming to the
 19 Tribes, so here in Oklahoma that's more investment
 20 into the state so that's probably a really good
 21 thing.
 22 And then on the SRFs, the funding was
 23 pretty good. I mean, it actually was I think a
 24 slight increase. The only downside was when it
 25 comes to the Drinking Water SRF, about 64 percent of

Page 64

1 it is going to be designated for congressionally
 2 Directed Spending or earmarks, and on the Clean
 3 Water side it was 54 percent, so those are pretty
 4 huge numbers.
 5 That's problematic for us just
 6 because, I mean, that money still comes to Oklahoma,
 7 but it doesn't come out of our priority use plan,
 8 our priority list for systems that we think need the
 9 money the most, but more importantly it doesn't go
 10 back into that revolving fund, and that's the
 11 revolving nature of the SRFs, and we don't get that
 12 administrative set-aside from the SRF that we
 13 typically get, you know, to administer our programs,
 14 as well.
 15 So that's kind of a -- it's great
 16 that the money's coming to the states, but you know,
 17 it would be nice if it was happening in a different
 18 way. But even with that, I think we consider these
 19 general funding levels to be very -- a very positive
 20 development, so we consider that really good news.
 21 Kind of on that same line, I'd like
 22 to acknowledge that we did survive the longest
 23 federal shutdown in history, really had very, very
 24 minimal interruptions to our operations, and I think
 25 that's a testament to Kathy and our program leaders

Page 65

1 and just making sure that we had money drawn down
 2 and ready to go before, you know, the shutdown
 3 actually occurred and then we were very judicious
 4 about spending during that time just in case, but in
 5 the end we ended up in very good shape.
 6 So it's very -- you know, you hear
 7 about looming shutdowns and everything, and to know
 8 that we have just encountered the longest one in
 9 history and have been able to, you know, just
 10 continue our operations pretty much as normal is
 11 very encouraging.
 12 On the state budget side, so over the
 13 last couple weeks we've had our budget subcommittee
 14 meetings, our hearings with our subcommittee in the
 15 House and in the Senate. Our illustrious Chair
 16 actually attended one of those meetings with us and
 17 I'm happy to report that I think both of those
 18 hearings went really well and that we're, you know,
 19 feeling very confident going into the upcoming
 20 session, especially in regard to the budget, but
 21 really in regard to a lot of different things.
 22 So we did request a flat budget this
 23 year, as you all approved. We've had -- we're kind
 24 of over there quite a bit and I'll talk a little bit
 25 about that in a minute, but we've had legislators --

Page 66

1 numerous legislators wanting to give us -- even
 2 though we're not asking for it, wanting to give us
 3 money for different projects, pilot projects related
 4 to PFAS and then they really want to fund some
 5 potential new equipment in the lab for PFAS.
 6 So we have our two machines that
 7 analyze PFAS, but they're dedicated to, like,
 8 drinking water samples, pretty clean samples because
 9 of, you know, how small the parts-per-trillion level
 10 that we're trying to get down to.
 11 If we're going to start looking at
 12 different -- analyzing different samples like
 13 biosolids and things like that, if we did that with
 14 those same machines, it could potentially mess up
 15 their ability to detect those little numbers.
 16 So they're talking about providing
 17 funding for a piece of machinery for us to dedicate
 18 specifically to biosolids and samples of that
 19 nature, so we'll see what happens. There seems to
 20 be a lot of support. There's a lot of activity
 21 going on, it's one of those hot topics.
 22 Garage update. So we just actually
 23 hit the milestone, it's been almost exactly one year
 24 now since we closed the existing garage. We're just
 25 over a third done with the new construction of the

Page 67

1 garage. If you get a chance, go up to 7 and look
 2 out -- you can go into Mark's office, look out that
 3 west window, it's pretty amazing.
 4 I keep talking about every time I go
 5 out there, it's like there's so much activity, there
 6 are so many guys working and just doing different
 7 things, it's all so well coordinated and managed
 8 and, you know, there's cranes flying and guys
 9 pouring concrete and all kinds of stuff going on.
 10 So I think the projected date has
 11 been -- the timeline has been shortened and they're
 12 saying now I think we're about one year away from
 13 the completion of the garage. So before I think it
 14 was April and it's kind of been brought down to
 15 February, January, but they keep moving, and we're
 16 hoping by the end of this year we're going to be in
 17 there.
 18 For two reasons, one because we
 19 really need the parking spaces, but also there's
 20 going to be two brand new elevators in that garage,
 21 as well, so we are going to -- it won't stop at
 22 every floor, but it'll stop obviously at the bottom
 23 floor of the building and then you can access the
 24 building through the 6th floor, as well.
 25 So that kind of takes me to our next

Page 68

1 update, our elevator saga, but we're down to just
 2 two passenger elevators that work, and one of them
 3 works very intermittently and was actually down this
 4 morning, but it's up and running because I took it
 5 down from my office to get to this board meeting.
 6 So we had the folks out here that are -- we pretty
 7 much need to get them an office in the building and
 8 keep it running, but...
 9 So if you recall, back in September I
 10 signed an emergency declaration and that allowed us
 11 to expedite the process, we could -- it exempted us
 12 from certain procurement requirements and allowed us
 13 to move forward with the vendor that we use to keep
 14 the elevators running.
 15 We had our pre-construction permit --
 16 our pre-construction meeting last Friday and they
 17 have ordered the materials that are going to be
 18 necessary, it's going to be about 12 weeks before
 19 those materials get in.
 20 In the meantime, in the next couple
 21 of weeks, they're going to start dismantling parts
 22 of the two elevators that are not working and then
 23 commence construction as soon as those materials
 24 arrive.
 25 The project date on that, the

Page 69

1 completion date for the last elevator is going to be
 2 April of 2027, so in just over a year we're going to
 3 have seven, you know, brand new elevators to
 4 utilize, including the freight elevator, and a brand
 5 new garage, so we're really looking forward to that
 6 date.

7 Other improvements, I've talked to
 8 you about some of the IT platforms that we rely upon
 9 and the big changes that are going on there and the
 10 big investments. Probably the biggest one that's
 11 been a challenge for us, and Mr. Tatum can recognize
 12 that, is our operator certification platform.

13 We've been really kind of held
 14 prisoner to a very antiquated and unreliable
 15 platform for several years. It's significantly
 16 impacted our ability to get some of those licenses
 17 out, which is very problematic because we require
 18 systems that have certified operators to run the
 19 water and wastewater systems.

20 So after a pretty significant
 21 investment with time and money, we've got that new
 22 platform ready to roll. We're doing some internal
 23 testing and pulling some folks from the outside to
 24 kind of do some testing on it in the next week or
 25 two and then it's going to be running by the end of

Page 70

1 the month or the beginning of February.

2 So we're excited to get that up and
 3 running and right in time for the next licensing
 4 cycle, so hopefully it'll go a lot smoother going
 5 forward. Again, we've got numerous other platforms
 6 that we are in the process of designing and
 7 improving, as well.

8 So as those kind of go live, I'm
 9 going to share those successes with you, as well,
 10 but this is one that's probably been -- the one
 11 that's been weighing the heaviest on us for several
 12 years.

13 Last week, we also had our all-agency
 14 meeting, and one of the things that we did at that
 15 meeting is we kicked off our DEQ mentoring program,
 16 the next cycle of that. But then I had the thought
 17 that many of you guys probably aren't familiar with
 18 what that is.

19 So I think we've kind of turned a
 20 corner when it comes to recruitment, the job market
 21 is very favorable for us, but that retention piece
 22 is always a challenge. We can't pay as much, we get
 23 people trained up and they're super valuable, so
 24 what can we do to, you know, entice folks to stay
 25 and kind of help them develop here at the DEQ, and

Page 71

1 one of those ways is that mentoring program.

2 So I asked George - who's our new
 3 Water Quality Director, he's also kind of
 4 spearheading that effort for the agency - just to
 5 give you a two-minute, you know, description of what
 6 that is.

7 The reason I asked him to do it is
 8 because he's so passionate and excited about it. He
 9 had everybody just ready to sign up at that
 10 all-agency meeting.

11 MR. RUSSELL: Thanks, Rob. Good morning,
 12 everybody. Yeah, really -- I am passionate about
 13 it, it's important to me. I think about mentorship
 14 and the mentors that I've had along the way and
 15 just, like, the great value that they added to me.

16 And I think we as an agency have so
 17 many great leaders and people that have a lot to
 18 offer and we can share that with kind of the new
 19 generation of folks, and I know how beneficial that
 20 is.

21 So we started doing this five years
 22 ago, just in the division ECLS, we had 10 people
 23 sign up. It was really small, kind of the pilot
 24 project, and then we've continued to kind of grow
 25 every single year to add new divisions.

Page 72

1 So last year was the first year we
 2 did agency-wide, and we had 101, 102 participants,
 3 so about 20 percent of the agency, which was really
 4 good. It's a volunteer program, you know, we don't
 5 require it from the staff. The managers are
 6 automatically involved in it as mentors, but it's a
 7 lot of fun.

8 And so now we're starting to kick it
 9 off again. We do it in six-month periods so it
 10 doesn't really get stale after a while, you know,
 11 you don't just kind of continue to go along with it.
 12 So this is our fifth iteration, we're hoping to get
 13 more than 100, continue to grow.

14 Like Rob said, some of the kind of
 15 goals -- I remember when we started in ECLS, we'd
 16 lost, like, a lot of managers and leaders. Over a
 17 five-year period, we'd almost had a complete shift,
 18 you know. Rob's new to his role, I'm new to my
 19 role, Madison, Mark, too, they're -- all the
 20 leadership here in DEQ is new to their roles, too,
 21 and we needed that kind of knowledge transfer and to
 22 kind of -- so we don't have to fight the same
 23 battles that maybe our predecessors did, we can kind
 24 of take some of that and learn lessons from it.

25 So we wanted to do that, we talked

Page 73

1 about retention and kind of succession planning,
 2 planning for the future, and then also, like,
 3 sharing ideas from the staff level. We have so many
 4 smart people that know a lot of different things
 5 that -- you know, I graduated college a long time
 6 ago and maybe they're coming in with new ideas, new
 7 technology, new things that we can implement at a
 8 higher level. And so it's not just, like, a mentor
 9 giving information, but it's also a sharing of
 10 information from the mentee to the mentor. So
 11 there's a lot of great things.
 12 So like Rob said, we're in the kind
 13 of recruitment phase right now. We'll send out an
 14 application here in a couple weeks and people can
 15 talk about on that application what they're
 16 interested in, what ideas they have, different
 17 things like that, and then we take those
 18 applications and we pair people up.
 19 So some people want to stay within
 20 their division they're in and then some we do
 21 cross-divisional pairings. So somebody -- I might
 22 pair up with somebody from the Land Protection
 23 Division or something and Water Quality and they're
 24 interested in a certain program or something. So we
 25 get -- it develops some new relationships, we get to

Page 74

1 share some new ideas, there's lots of good things.
 2 We do an orientation phase where we
 3 kind of lay out the expectations, let people know,
 4 like, what are your expectations as a mentee and as
 5 a mentor and talk about those and then run it over a
 6 six-month period.
 7 And the expectation is to meet once a
 8 month. It isn't a huge time sink, meet once a month
 9 and kind of -- I send out some prompts for the
 10 conversation, but it's not required, so it's more of
 11 a starting point, you know, what you want to talk
 12 about, so...
 13 And then at the end, we send out a
 14 survey and say, "Hey, what went well, what didn't go
 15 well?", and then we revamp it and try and kick it
 16 off again every year and do kind of a -- essentially
 17 a six-month program every calendar year or fiscal
 18 year.
 19 And it's been -- the feedback on the
 20 surveys has been really positive, most people seem
 21 to enjoy it. The negative ones have been, like, "I
 22 didn't really get paired up with somebody that I
 23 wanted to or that was beneficial to me", but -- so
 24 we really take those pairings seriously.
 25 But I think it's great, I love it, I

Page 75

1 love the program, I've encouraged everybody that I
 2 run across to join it. And like I said, it's not
 3 just for the mentees, the mentors learn so much, as
 4 well and have a lot of fun doing it, so...
 5 Thank you.
 6 MR. SINGLETARY: Thanks, George. During
 7 his presentation at the all-agency meeting, he had a
 8 bunch of quotes from people who had gone, you know,
 9 through it before and one was "10 out of 10" and,
 10 you know, I don't -- he had me ready to sign up, but
 11 then he told me I was already signed up.
 12 All right. So we're looking forward
 13 to that kicking off and hopefully getting continued
 14 involvement -- participation in that, or increased
 15 participation.
 16 One thing that also happened last
 17 week is we had the kickoff for the Blue River Study,
 18 that's the study where the legislature gave us \$1
 19 million to conduct a study on the Blue River.
 20 And so it's taken a little bit of
 21 time to get that up and running. OU was selected to
 22 do that study and there've been some delays on their
 23 side, but we finally had that meeting.
 24 We met at the confluence of the Blue
 25 and the Little Blue Rivers and just had a big

Page 76

1 kick-off ceremony and really looking forward to
 2 seeing some progress on that project, it's going to
 3 be a very worthwhile project.
 4 So legislative session, that's one of
 5 the last things I wanted to mention. Again, we're
 6 constantly over there. We were over there yesterday
 7 talking about PFAS-related issues, and we're
 8 actually going to go back over this afternoon, talk
 9 about our councils.
 10 Once again, the sunseting of the
 11 councils is coming up, it's kind of an
 12 every-three-year-type deal, so we need to go over
 13 there and explain the value of the councils. There
 14 are some folks saying that the councils just kind of
 15 add to the size of government.
 16 Kind of my spiel when I go over there
 17 is that it actually is a little bit of oversight on
 18 government, having that public participation is just
 19 another level of the public being able to
 20 participate in our processes and different
 21 stakeholders being involved in rulemaking.
 22 And so far, every time it comes up
 23 we've been able to convince them, but they -- you
 24 know, it's coming up again. So we'll be over there
 25 this afternoon and I'm hopeful that it'll end well.

Page 77

1 But anyway, we're over there for -- Ryan's over
 2 there every other day, it seems like, if not more,
 3 the rest of us are over there quite frequently.
 4 On our permitting reform bill that
 5 you guys approved back in our previous board
 6 meeting, Senator Rader has agreed to carry that for
 7 us in the Senate and Representative Boles is
 8 carrying it for us in the House, so -- and we --
 9 seems like we've got a lot of support on that, a lot
 10 of folks that are interested in doing something that
 11 reduces those timelines and we're kind of excited to
 12 see where that one goes.
 13 And we just had a meeting yesterday
 14 with Ryan and a bunch of the leadership at the
 15 agency to talk about some of the other bills that
 16 have been filed that are going to potentially impact
 17 DEQ, and as always there's hundreds of them, so
 18 we're going to watch them pretty closely, but I'll
 19 keep you posted on that.
 20 I just wanted to -- I don't have any
 21 real details on them, but I wanted to start adding a
 22 topic -- or, an agenda item or an item on my updates
 23 about hot topics and just to let you guys know kind
 24 of things we're dealing with.
 25 Two of the biggest regulatory hot

Page 78

1 topics we've got going on right now is that land
 2 application of biosolids that we're trying to work
 3 through and then data centers, that's the other
 4 really big one. So we are one of those emerging
 5 areas in the country for data centers, so there's
 6 quite a bit of activity really in different parts of
 7 the state. So that's the kind of stuff you want to
 8 hear about and just wanted to give you a heads-up on
 9 that.
 10 Last announcement I wanted to make is
 11 when George was selected to be our Water Quality
 12 Division Director, his assistant in the lab then
 13 became the Assistant Lab Director, which opened up
 14 -- not -- or, the Lab Director -- the actual Lab
 15 Director, which opened up the Assistant Director
 16 spot, and just this week our new Assistant Lab
 17 Director was selected, Mr. Jayme Jones. Stand up
 18 Jayme.
 19 [Applause]
 20 MR. SINGLETARY: Jayme's been in the lab
 21 for over two decades, I don't know, how long --
 22 MR. JONES: 33 years.
 23 MR. SINGLETARY: Okay. Three decades, 33
 24 years up in the lab, so a great addition to the
 25 team.

Page 79

1 So that's all I have. Any questions?
 2 I'll be happy to answer them.
 3 DR. FERRELL: Any questions from the
 4 board?
 5 I would just add, from my own
 6 perspective, going back to the some of those issues,
 7 first off I wanted to extend my appreciation and
 8 congratulations to Rob, Kathy, and to all the DEQ
 9 staff. The stewardship that you showed of your
 10 resources in the longest government shutdown in
 11 history is incredibly impressive. Like, I did not
 12 see, as an outside observer, that the agency missed
 13 a beat, and that is an incredible testament to how
 14 well you guys manage what you have to work with, so
 15 thank you so much for that.
 16 And I think my perspective at the
 17 budget hearings, I got to attend the House side
 18 budget hearings, and I'm an attorney so I watch
 19 those things with a careful eye. It was fascinating
 20 to watch the tone and the questions that DEQ
 21 received versus the other agencies.
 22 And my observation from that was the
 23 folks at the legislature trust DEQ's stewardship and
 24 so they felt comfortable saying, "Hey, if that's
 25 what you asked for, we know that you're asking for

Page 80

1 what you need and we know that you'll take good care
 2 of what you get". So I was incredibly encouraged by
 3 that, and again it's a testament to your staff and
 4 to the leadership, so thank you guys for doing that.
 5 Any other comments before we move on
 6 to our next item? Okay. Well, thank you, Rob, for
 7 your report, we sure appreciate that.
 8 Our next item is item 18 in your
 9 agenda, that's our Federal Updates Report from
 10 Ms. Madison Miller, who's Deputy Executive Director
 11 here at DEQ.
 12 Given the amount of flux that we have
 13 seen in the regulatory environment at the federal
 14 level, we've kind of just made the choice that on an
 15 ongoing basis we'd like to see an update of what's
 16 going on at the federal level and how that might
 17 impact the implementation of our programs here in
 18 the state, and we've asked Madison to do that for
 19 us.
 20 So, Madison, the floor is yours.
 21 MS. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
 22 good morning to the board. So today I have eight
 23 rules to talk to you about that have had some status
 24 updates since the last time we talked about federal
 25 rules, and two of them are currently out for public

Page 81

1 comment in proposed form, and that is the 401
 2 Certification Rule and the Perchlorate National
 3 Drinking Water Standard Rule.
 4 And then the rest of them are final,
 5 and that would be the Definition of the Waters of
 6 the US, the Natural Gas Turbine Rule under the Clean
 7 Air Act, the Once In Always In Rule, the Methane
 8 Delay Rule, and PFAS Hazardous Substance Rule, which
 9 was final in 2024, so I really have, like, a
 10 litigation update on that one.
 11 Okay. So starting with the Clean
 12 Water Act, new and noteworthy highlights are 401
 13 Certifications. So by way of background, the Clean
 14 Water Act Section 401 provides that a federal agency
 15 may not issue a license or permit to conduct any
 16 activity that may result in any discharge into
 17 waters of the US, unless the state or an authorized
 18 authority where the discharge would originate
 19 either, one, issues a 401 water quality
 20 certification finding compliance with the applicable
 21 water quality requirements or, two, certification is
 22 waived.
 23 And so what the rule provides, what
 24 the proposal would do, is revise several procedural
 25 and substantive aspects of the Clean Water Act

Page 82

1 Section 401 Water Quality Certification Improvement
 2 Rule of 2023 to address areas of regulatory
 3 uncertainty, and implementation challenges which
 4 would include: contents of a request for
 5 certification, scope of certification, contents of a
 6 certification decision, or a modification process.
 7 And currently, we're evaluating the
 8 specific details of this rule proposal and
 9 determining whether to submit comments, which are
 10 due on February 17th of 2026.
 11 And I just want to add, I was
 12 watching George present earlier and was getting
 13 jealous because he was not using notes whatsoever
 14 because it was all in his head. This stuff, I could
 15 try to commit it all to my head and it would just be
 16 impossible, so I apologize, I'm looking at my notes
 17 significantly.
 18 Okay. So for the second rule under
 19 Clean Water Act, it's the "Updated Definition of
 20 Waters of the US", and that rule was proposed on
 21 November 20th of 2026, but the public comment period
 22 has ended on January 5th of 2026.
 23 And the Clean Water Act definition of
 24 WOTUS determines the dividing line between federal
 25 and state jurisdictions. So these two rules, this

Page 83

1 one and the 401 Certification Rule, are significant
 2 because of their cooperative federal implications.
 3 And so again, a little background.
 4 After the US Supreme Court case of Sackett v. EPA,
 5 the EPA in 2023 revised the definition of WOTUS to
 6 align the definition with the court's decision, and
 7 this updated rule that EPA proposed in 2026 - sorry,
 8 2025, November 20th of 2025 is when this rule was
 9 proposed - takes the definition further, to further
 10 clarify the definition and shore up some things that
 11 the 2023 rule left uncertain.
 12 And the Sackett Supreme Court stated
 13 that the definition of WOTUS is that "waters within
 14 the Clean Water Act encompass only those relatively
 15 permanent, standing or continuously flowing bodies
 16 of water forming geographical features that are
 17 described in ordinary parlance as streams, oceans,
 18 rivers, and lakes", and that a water of the US must
 19 be a "relatively permanent body of water connected
 20 to traditional interstate navigable waters or
 21 wetlands with a continuous surface connection with
 22 that water".
 23 So again, this proposed rule would
 24 better align the definition and all of these
 25 sub-terms within the definition with the Supreme

Page 84

1 Court's decision there, and there are definitions
 2 for "relatively permanent" and "continuous surface
 3 connection", which are two of the biggest
 4 definitions that we're looking at.
 5 And on December 31st of 2025, EPA -
 6 let me see, this is a Final Rule - provided a Final
 7 Rule to extend deadlines under the Effluent
 8 Limitations Guideline and Standards for the Steam
 9 Electric Power Generating Point Source Category, so
 10 this extends deadlines in EPA's Final Rule from
 11 2024.
 12 Under the Safe Drinking Water Act,
 13 EPA proposed on January 6th of 2026 the National
 14 Primary Drinking Water Regulation for Perchlorate,
 15 and the background there is that in 2011, EPA made
 16 an affirmative determination to regulate perchlorate
 17 under SDWA, Safe Drinking Water Act. In 2019, EPA
 18 proposed a rule to set an MCL and MCL goal for
 19 perchlorate at 56 micrograms per liter. And then in
 20 2020, EPA sought to withdraw that determination
 21 because EPA determined that perchlorate doesn't
 22 occur with a frequency and at levels of public
 23 health concern within the meaning of SDWA.
 24 So there was litigation over that,
 25 and in 2023 the DC Circuit held that EPA must

Page 85

1 proceed to regulate a contaminant after finalizing a
 2 determination to regulate, even where the agency
 3 later determines the contaminant does not satisfy
 4 the statutory standard for regulation.
 5 And so through a consent decree, EPA
 6 was required to sign a proposed rule by January 2,
 7 2026 and a final rule by May 21st of 2027 to issue
 8 this Drinking Water Standard.
 9 So the proposal would, among other
 10 things, set a Maximum Contaminant Level at either
 11 20, 40, or 80 milligrams per liter, which is a
 12 different unit than was the previous rule that EPA
 13 set, it was 56 micrograms per liter. It would
 14 require testing for perchlorate and require
 15 monitoring and mitigation of any systems that find
 16 perchlorate above the MCL.
 17 And EPA states in this proposed rule
 18 that it's unlikely that perchlorate would be found
 19 in the vast majority of systems.
 20 Under the Clean Air Act, EPA
 21 finalized on January 15th of 2026 the Natural Gas
 22 Turbine Rule, or otherwise known as "NSPS for
 23 Stationary Combustion Turbines and Stationary Gas
 24 Turbines".
 25 This creates a new NSPS Subpart

Page 86

1 Quad-Ka - so that's KKKKa - for this source
 2 category, which is applicable to affected sources
 3 constructed, modified, or reconstructed after
 4 December 13th of 2024.
 5 And so background on this one is that
 6 EPA proposed a revision of this rule in December of
 7 2024, and under the new Administration, the new
 8 Administration extended the comment period in March
 9 of 2025 and so now this rule is final.
 10 This rule is interesting for a couple
 11 of different reasons. So the first one is that the
 12 rule creates a subcategory for stationary temporary
 13 combustion turbines. And I don't know if anyone's
 14 been following this in the news, but there have been
 15 some data centers who have implemented stationary
 16 combustion turbines that they classify as temporary
 17 and "non road engines", which would be regulated
 18 under Title II of the Clean Air Act, which is mobile
 19 sources, and so they were not getting a stationary
 20 source construction or operating permit from their
 21 local regulatory authority. And so this rule
 22 affirmatively states that those types of turbines
 23 require a stationary source permit and are regulated
 24 under the NSPS.
 25 And EPA said -- I took some dicta

Page 87

1 from this rule. EPA stated that technically these
 2 temporary engines could be regulated as "non road
 3 engines" subject to mobile source rules, but that
 4 there are currently no regulations for such engines
 5 under Title II and this approach, regulating under
 6 Title II, would leave these engines subject to no
 7 emission standards at all. So, I find that
 8 interesting.
 9 The second thing that's been in the
 10 news about this rule that is interesting is that EPA
 11 states in this rule it is no longer monetizing
 12 benefits from PM2.5 and ozone reductions, but will
 13 continue to quantify emissions, until the agency is
 14 confident enough in the modeling to properly
 15 monetize the impacts of exposure. So EPA reasons
 16 that its past analytical practices often provided
 17 the public with a false sense of precision and more
 18 confidence regarding the impacts of exposure than
 19 the underlying science could fully support. So that
 20 part has been in the news a lot, too, lately, so if
 21 you see that, that is related to this Natural Gas
 22 Turbine Rule.
 23 The next Clean Air Act Rule to talk
 24 about is related to the Once In Always In policy for
 25 HAPs. This rule is titled "Congressional Review Act

Page 88

1 Revocation of 2024 Review of Final Rule
 2 Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources
 3 under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act". This rule
 4 went final on January 2, 2026.
 5 And so in layman's terms, this rule
 6 provides that, once and for all, any major source of
 7 HAP under Clean Air Act 112 can reclassify as a
 8 minor source or an area source and discontinue being
 9 subject to major source requirements under NESHAPs.
 10 And background on this is in 1995,
 11 EPA issued guidance that stated a major source that
 12 is subject to a MACT standard, or otherwise known as
 13 NESHAP, could not reclassify as an area source after
 14 the first compliance date. So this means that if
 15 you didn't limit out of the rule before the
 16 compliance date and didn't maybe accept a limit or
 17 something that made you a minor source, then you
 18 have to always be subject to the major source
 19 requirements of that rule regardless of whether your
 20 emissions dropped or decreased below major source
 21 thresholds at some point in the future.
 22 And in 2020, EPA issued a final rule
 23 that reversed this policy, and it was called the
 24 Major MACT to Area rule, MM2A.
 25 And so in September of 2024, EPA

Page 89

1 finalized a rule that provided that even if a major
 2 source reclassified to area source, for seven
 3 specific persistent bioaccumulative pollutants those
 4 sources must remain subject to the major source
 5 requirements of the NESHAP, and this amounted to 33
 6 subparts total, to 33 NESHAP.
 7 So in May of 2025, Congress used the
 8 Congressional Review Act, passed a joint resolution
 9 under the CRA to repeal this 2024 rule, and this was
 10 signed by the President in June of 2025. And so the
 11 2024 rule is no longer -- no longer has force or
 12 effect based on this Congressional Review Act
 13 action, and so what this Final Rule in January of
 14 2026 does is amend the CFR to provide that.
 15 Now, as I stated at the beginning,
 16 any source can reclassify as an area source under
 17 NESHAP and not be subject to major source
 18 requirements.
 19 So Methane Delay Rule. So this is
 20 related to the Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate
 21 Review, OOOOb and OOOOc, in December of 2025.
 22 December 3rd of 2025, an extension of deadlines in
 23 NSPS OOOOb and OOOOc was finalized. And it had been
 24 proposed earlier as an interim final rule and then
 25 it was actually finalized in December.

Page 90

1 So this extended compliance deadlines
 2 for certain provisions related to control devices,
 3 equipment leaks, storage vessels, process
 4 controllers, and covers or closed vent systems; it
 5 extended compliance events for future implementation
 6 of the superemitter program; and net heating value
 7 monitoring and initial reporting deadlines; and the
 8 state plan submittal deadline in OOOOc, which is the
 9 emission guidelines for existing sources, that was
 10 extended to January 22nd of 2027.
 11 This is being litigated, so we're
 12 watching what's coming out of this case, and it's
 13 procedural at this point. Environmental groups have
 14 asked the DC Circuit for "summary vacatur", meaning
 15 that the court would vacate the rule, not on the
 16 merits, but on the grounds that the rule is
 17 procedurally defective.
 18 And the argument is that EPA should
 19 have "considered the amount of emission reductions
 20 in health/environmental impacts resulting from
 21 compliance delays and weighed those harms against
 22 industry's feasibility and cost concerns".
 23 And as pertains to the OOOOc state
 24 emission guidelines, we have a state director's
 25 meeting with Region 6 leadership next week and we've

Page 91

1 added this topic to the agenda, to talk about
 2 whether or not -- what we can expect as far as
 3 restarting our work on OOOOc or not and getting an
 4 extension from EPA, I know there was a question at
 5 our last board meeting about that.
 6 So the last rule is the PFAS as a
 7 Hazardous Substance Rule. So in 2024, EPA issued a
 8 final rule that listed PFAS as a hazardous substance
 9 under CERCLA, and this rule has been in litigation
 10 ever since then.
 11 And there's not a regulatory
 12 development on this, but we're watching the
 13 litigation, and the new Administration is defending
 14 the Biden rule in court, and the name of this case
 15 is Chamber of Commerce v. EPA.
 16 Oral argument was held at the DC
 17 Circuit, actually, yesterday on this case, on
 18 January 20th of 2026.
 19 And currently, the parties are
 20 arguing over whether EPA violated the notice and
 21 comment procedures when it released a 300-page
 22 cost-benefit analysis with the final rule, while
 23 only conducting an informal economic analysis in the
 24 proposed rule and stating that costs did not need to
 25 be weighed. And I quoted that from a news article,

Page 92

1 so that's not me, you know, weighing in on any of
 2 that.
 3 So the way this rule affects the
 4 agency is that DEQ could be required to evaluate
 5 sites for PFAS that have not been deleted from the
 6 National Priorities List or that are pre-decisional
 7 for PFAS, and it could also require an evaluation of
 8 closed sites where PFAS substances were not
 9 previously evaluated. And that's what we have
 10 stated in our Environmental Quality Report that you
 11 received at our last board meeting.
 12 Okay. So that's all of my
 13 substantive updates, but I wanted to give you a
 14 little list. There are some things that we've
 15 talked about before, but there haven't been any
 16 change in status, and that is Ozone transport/Good
 17 Neighbor Reconsideration, EPA said that it would --
 18 it's on EPA's agenda, but nothing's been proposed
 19 with respect to that; PM NAAQS Designations and/or
 20 Reconsideration, nothing's been proposed;
 21 Reconsideration of Oil and Gas sector review/OOOOb
 22 and OOOOc, nothing's been proposed there, only the
 23 extension of deadlines; Repeal of Endangerment
 24 Finding for Greenhouse Gases is proposed, but not
 25 final; Repeal of Greenhouse Gases standards for

Page 93

1 Fossil fuel fired electric generating units is
 2 proposed, but not final, and that's an NSPS with
 3 respect to greenhouse gases from fossil fuel fired
 4 electric generating units; the Revisions to the
 5 Regional Haze State Plan requirements was proposed,
 6 but not final; Revision of PFAS National Primary
 7 Drinking Water Standard is not proposed because
 8 EPA's working through that through the litigation
 9 that's ongoing on that rule; and PFAS as a Hazardous
 10 Constituent under RCRA, that was proposed in 2024
 11 and it's on EPA's agenda, but no action has been
 12 taken on that; and the Lead and Copper Rule, we are
 13 watching litigation, EPA's defending that rule in
 14 court and nothing regulatorily has happened there.
 15 That's it.
 16 DR. FERRELL: That's all?
 17 MR. SINGLETARY: That's only, like, two
 18 months' worth.
 19 DR. FERRELL: Madison, thank you so much
 20 for doing that. Like we've mentioned earlier,
 21 there's so much change at the federal level it's
 22 important for us to stay up to date on that, so
 23 thank you all for staying on top of that. We know
 24 that is not an easy task, so thank you for your
 25 diligence on that front, as well.

Page 94

1 MS. MILLER: Of course, it's my pleasure.
 2 DR. FERRELL: All right. If you thought
 3 that was exciting, wait until you see agenda item
 4 19, the budget update.
 5 Kathy, the floor is yours.
 6 MS. AEBISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
 7 Members of the Board. Kathy Aebischer, Director of
 8 Administrative Services, and this report is going to
 9 go over the first six months, so we're halfway
 10 through the fiscal year.
 11 Our revenue is looking really good.
 12 We are lower than last year, but we've reduced our
 13 projections, so we're kind of expecting that.
 14 There's really not any concerns with operations,
 15 things are going really well. The lab has picked up
 16 from last year, they're doing really well, so
 17 nothing -- no concerns on the revenue front.
 18 So if we look at expenditures, we
 19 have expended \$51 million of the \$230 million. We
 20 have a lot of projects that we're overseeing. We
 21 should see some good expenditures on that with the
 22 parking garage, the elevator, so we're in good shape
 23 there.
 24 If we look at the funding source, you
 25 know, we have the \$70 million with the Tulsa Levee

Page 95

1 and Guymon. Guymon's moving along, hopefully
 2 they'll expend their portion in a year. Tulsa
 3 Levee's kind of picking up slowly, but -- so those
 4 are kind of why we have -- still showing some funds
 5 kind of sitting there, but those projects are under
 6 contract, and you know how construction and projects
 7 go, so -- and we also have the elevators that that
 8 will be picking up, but our expenditures are doing
 9 really well and there's no concerns on that point.
 10 Do we have any questions on the
 11 budget?
 12 MR. PAQUE: Kathy, I mean, local
 13 government and nonprofit projects and programs, I
 14 understand what most of the local government would
 15 be here. What are some examples of nonprofit
 16 projects? I expect they're minor, but just a couple
 17 examples of what might be minor.
 18 MS. AEBISCHER: Yeah, we give funding to,
 19 like, nonprofits for projects for, like, cleaning up
 20 -- oh, my gosh, my brain's -- we do cities and
 21 towns, and some of the divisions award nonprofits --
 22 MR. SINGLETARY: Is that part of the solid
 23 waste grants, too --
 24 MS. AEBISCHER: Yes.
 25 MR. SINGLETARY: -- come out of that?

Page 96

1 MS. AEBISCHER: I can give you more of a
 2 list of kind of what the --
 3 MR. PAQUE: Yeah, I was just -- I can get
 4 with you for a drill-down on it, but I was curious,
 5 thanks.
 6 MS. AEBISCHER: Yeah, the large amount of
 7 that, the 125, that's for where Guymon project and
 8 your Tulsa Levee Project is. So the majority of
 9 those projects are down in the nonprofit and your
 10 local governments is where --
 11 MR. PAQUE: Where would the Blue River
 12 project end up in the budget?
 13 MS. AEBISCHER: It's going to be your
 14 professional services.
 15 MR. PAQUE: Okay.
 16 DR. FERRELL: Any other questions from the
 17 board? Anybody else?
 18 Kathy, thank you very much for that
 19 update. And again, not to belabor the point, but as
 20 we reflect back to the shutdown, thank you all so
 21 much for your vision that you had in seeing that
 22 coming and positioning the agency well so that there
 23 weren't those different gaps, we really very much
 24 appreciate that. Thank you.
 25 All right. That then brings us to

Page 97

1 agenda item 20, which is New Business, any matter
 2 not known about and which could not have been
 3 reasonably foreseen prior to the posting of the
 4 agenda.
 5 Is there any new business to bring
 6 before the board? Any new business? Very good.
 7 That brings us to agenda item 21,
 8 which is our next meeting, which is scheduled for
 9 June 9, 2026 at 9:30 a.m., right where you are, same
 10 time, same channel, in the offices of the Department
 11 of Environmental Quality.
 12 And I know that, historically, that
 13 has been the meeting that sometimes we will forego
 14 if there's not sufficient justification or business
 15 being conducted there; given the legislative slate
 16 that we have seen at the state level, given the
 17 amount of flux at the federal level, I highly doubt
 18 that will be the case. I imagine we will have
 19 business to attend to at that meeting, so make sure
 20 that you do circle that date on your calendar.
 21 If there's nothing else, that brings
 22 us to agenda item 22, which tends to be people's
 23 favorite item, which is Adjournment.
 24 Is there a motion to adjourn?
 25 MR. MUNSON: So move.


Page 98

1 DR. FERRELL: Motion. Is there a second?
 2 MR. AUER: Second.
 3 DR. FERRELL: Any discussion? Any
 4 discussion? Any discussion?
 5 Ms. Fields, would you please call the
 6 roll?
 7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Auer?
 8 MR. AUER: Yes.
 9 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Kinder?
 10 MR. KINDER: Yes.
 11 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Kindrick?
 12 MS. KINDRICK: Yes.
 13 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Lowry?
 14 MS. LOWRY: Yes.
 15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Mason?
 16 MR. MASON: Yes.
 17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Munson?
 18 MR. MUNSON: Yes.
 19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Paque?
 20 MR. PAQUE: Yes.
 21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Peterson?
 22 MR. PETERSON: Yes.
 23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schultze?
 24 MR. SCHULTZE: Yes.
 25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Tatum?

Page 99

1 MR. TATUM: Yes.
 2 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Ferrell?
 3 DR. FERRELL: Yes.
 4 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.
 5 DR. FERRELL: We are adjourned.
 6 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:09 AM)
 7 DR. FERRELL: That brings us to our public
 8 forum. Do we have any sign-ins for the public
 9 forum? None? Okay. Well, seeing none, to all of
 10 the DEQ staff and personnel that are here, the
 11 people of Oklahoma thank you so much for your
 12 service, we appreciate you greatly.
 13 For everyone who's come just to show
 14 your interest and involvement, thank you. As I tell
 15 my students, democracy is not a spectator sport, so
 16 thank you for being a part of it.
 17 Thank you all for everything, be safe
 18 on your way home.
 19 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 11:10 AM)
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 100

1 CERTIFICATE
 2 I, Jenny Longley, Certified Shorthand
 3 Reporter within and for the State of Oklahoma, do
 4 hereby certify that the above and foregoing meeting
 5 was by me taken in shorthand and thereafter
 6 transcribed; and that I am not an attorney for nor
 7 relative of any of said parties or otherwise
 8 interested in the event of said action.
 9 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
 10 set my hand and official seal this 29th day of
 11 January, 2026.
 12
 13 
 14 Jenny Longley, CSR
 15 CSR # 1903
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25



**OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality**

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

Attendance Record
January 21, 2026
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Public Record Notice: Information provided on this sign-in sheet is subject to disclosure under the Oklahoma Open Records Act and may be released as a public record. Entries will not be redacted. By signing, you acknowledge and accept this condition.

Name	Affiliation	Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail
Stacy Tucker	DEQ	DEQ
Pete Schulte	EQB	
Brian Duzan	UOMAC	HEQ
Lynn Lopez	AOC	
Bad Smmung	EFD	
Brandi hury	EQB	
Kole Kennedy	DEQ	Kole.kennedy@deq.ok.gov
Jeff Ewert	DEQE	ewertj@deq.com
Skyler McAloney	DEQ	
Shirley Chavez	EQB EQB LLC Environmental Solutions LLC	Shirley.Chavez@eqb.com
Tim Mynson	DEQ	



OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

Attendance Record
January 21, 2026
 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Public Record Notice: Information provided on this sign-in sheet is subject to disclosure under the Oklahoma Open Records Act and may be released as a public record. Entries will not be redacted. By signing, you acknowledge and accept this condition.

Name	Affiliation	Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail
George Russell	DEQ	george.russell@deq.ok.gov
Taryn Hurley	DEQ	tarynhurley@deq.ok.gov
Rick Ayler	DEQ	
Beverly Botchley-Smith	DEQ	/
Londel Stegmann	DEQ	
Tarris Couch	DEQ	
Ariya Wilkins	DEQ	ariya.wilkins@deq.ok.gov
John Brown	DEQ	john.brown@deq.ok.gov
Nicholas Hill	DEQ	
April Sharpe	DEQ	April.Sharpe@deq.ok.gov
Malcolm Zachariah	DEQ	



**OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality**

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

Attendance Record
January 21, 2026
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Public Record Notice: Information provided on this sign-in sheet is subject to disclosure under the Oklahoma Open Records Act and may be released as a public record. Entries will not be redacted. By signing, you acknowledge and accept this condition.

Name	Affiliation	Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail
Dustin Davidson	DEQ	dustin.davidson@deg.ok.gov
Kylen Huffman	DEQ	
TATIANA RIVER	DEQ	
KATHY AEBISCHER	DEQ	kathy.aebischer@deg.ok.gov
Rygn McIntosh	DEQ	
Phillana Fields	DEQ	
Larrea Padgett	DEQ	
Brianna Claggy	DEQ	
MEGANIE FOSTER	DEQ	
Jimmy Kinlow	Board	
Jennifer Lewis	OAG	



**OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality**

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

Attendance Record
January 21, 2026
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Public Record Notice: Information provided on this sign-in sheet is subject to disclosure under the Oklahoma Open Records Act and may be released as a public record. Entries will not be redacted. By signing, you acknowledge and accept this condition.

Name	Affiliation	Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail
Ryan King	DEQ	
Jayme Jones	DEQ	
Kinnaman Clark	HUMAC	
Kelly Dixon	DEQ	
Karon Steels	DEQ	
Michelle Staszczak	DEQ	
Chris Fossace	DEQ	
Robert Hildebrand	DEQ	
BRIAN MELDOWIN	OGE	
GARY HENRY	DEQ	
Vance Pennington	DEQ	



**OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality**

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

Attendance Record
January 21, 2026
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Public Record Notice: Information provided on this sign-in sheet is subject to disclosure under the Oklahoma Open Records Act and may be released as a public record. Entries will not be redacted. By signing, you acknowledge and accept this condition.

Name	Affiliation	Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail
Whitney Hall	Envirotech Engr & Consulting	whall@envirotechconsulting.com
GREGG CARR	DEA	gregg.carr@dy.ok.gov
Travis Mensik	DEQ	travis.mensik@deq.
Chifon Hayler	DEQ	
Michelle Wynn	DSEE	michelle.wynn@ee.ok.gov
Kambridge Stephens	DEA	Kambridge.Stephens@deq.ok.gov
New Aernour	DEA	NewAernour@DEA.ok.gov
Alexis Kindrick	EOB	akindrick@wef.org
Patrick Rusch	DEA	patrick.rusch@deq.ok.gov
Susan Mensik	DEQ	susan.mensik@deq.ok.gov



**OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality**

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

Attendance Record

January 21, 2026

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Public Record Notice: Information provided on this sign-in sheet is subject to disclosure under the Oklahoma Open Records Act and may be released as a public record. Entries will not be redacted. By signing, you acknowledge and accept this condition.

Name	Affiliation	Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail
ERIC POLVAKO	AEOB	4205 N. Lincoln Blvd OKC, OK 73105 epolvako@ao.org
Caitlyn Prather	COSWA	