

MINUTES
WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
January 7, 2025
Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality
Multipurpose Room
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Official WQMAC

Approved at the September 23, 2025 Meeting

Notice of Public Meeting – The Water Quality Management Advisory Council (WQMAC) convened for a Regular Meeting at 2:00 p.m. at the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), 707 North Robinson, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The meeting was held in accordance with the Open Meeting Act, with notice of the meeting given to the Secretary of State on October 24, 2024. The agenda was posted at DEQ twenty-four hours prior to the meeting. Mr. Brian Duzan, Chair, called the meeting to order. Ms. Quiana Fields called roll and confirmed that there was a quorum.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ron Jarman
Eric Lee
Mary Mach
Andrew Pawlisz
Kenneth Schwab
Bill Smith
Steve Sowers
Brian Duzan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mark Matheson
Rick Moore
Debbie Wells

DEQ STAFF PRESENT

Shellie Chard
Karen Steele
Brian Clagg
George Russell
Brandon Tyler
Mark Stasyszen
Michelle Wynn
Jennifer Boyle
Madison Miller
Mark Hildebrand
Greg Carr
Susan Mensik
Erin Hatfield
Dustin Davidson
Lloyd Kirk
John Brown
Luke Mills
Lynzie Chan
Chris Robinson
Cody Danielson
Afiya Wilkins
April Eberle
Quiana Fields

OTHERS PRESENT

Jenny Longley, Court Reporter

Approval of Minutes from the September 24, 2024 Meeting – Mr. Duzan called for a motion to approve the September 24, 2024 minutes, Mr. Smith moved to approve and Mr. Winegardner made the second.

	<i>See transcript pages 3-4</i>		
Ron Jarman	Yes	Kenneth Schwab	Yes
Eric Lee	Yes	Bill Smith	Yes
Mary Mach	Abstain	Steve Sowers	Yes

Andrew Pawlisz

Yes

Brian Duzan

Yes

ELECTION OF THE VICE-CHAIR – Mr. Duzan opened discussion for nominations for Vice-Chair. Mr. Duzan nominated Mr. Sowers to remain as Vice-Chair and Ms. Mach made the second.

See transcript pages 4 - 5

Ron Jarman

Yes

Kenneth Schwab

Yes

Eric Lee

Yes

Bill Smith

Yes

Mary Mach

Yes

Steve Sowers

Yes

Andrew Pawlisz

Yes

Brian Duzan

Yes

ELECTION OF THE CHAIR – Mr. Sowers opened discussion for nominations for Chair. Mr. Sowers nominated Mr. Duzan to remain as Chair and Mr. Schwab made the second.

See transcript pages 5 - 7

Ron Jarman

Yes

Kenneth Schwab

Yes

Eric Lee

Yes

Bill Smith

Yes

Mary Mach

Yes

Steve Sowers

Yes

Andrew Pawlisz

Yes

Brian Duzan

Yes

PERMANENT RULEMAKING OAC 252:306 – STATE ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY SERVICES – Ms. Susan Mensik, Environmental Programs Manager of the State Environmental Laboratory Services Division (SELSD), stated that the DEQ staff is proposing this new rule that if recommended by the Council will replace OAC 252:305 which will be revoked. This Chapter contains rules regarding fees and services offered by the SELSD. Chapter 306 provides updated fees and services offered by SELSD, in compliance with Oklahoma Statutes. Chapter 306 includes updated references to statutory language. The types of services provided are detailed for both the agency's needs as well as those outside of DEQ including citizens, municipalities, industry and other agencies. The number and types of laboratory analysis services offered are detailed, including all applicable base fees, in Appendix A, and an annual optional, fee adjustment using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) is included. Chapter 306 also details other analysis, special services, possible discounts for large volume requests with Director approval and EPA's grant of primacy naming SELSD as the Principal State Laboratory with laboratory accreditation responsibilities for analytical measuring of contaminants specified in OAC 252:631 (state primary drinking water requirements). Hearing no questions or comments by the Council or the public, Mr. Duzan called for a motion. Dr. Jarman moved to approve and Mr. Lee made the second.

See transcript pages 7 - 15

Ron Jarman

Yes

Kenneth Schwab

Yes

Eric Lee

Yes

Bill Smith

Yes

Mary Mach

Yes

Steve Sowers

Yes

Andrew Pawlisz

Yes

Brian Duzan

Yes

PERMANENT RULEMAKING OAC 252:305 – LABORATORY SERVICES – Ms. Mensik stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to revoke this rule since it will be replaced by OAC 252:306. Hearing no questions or comments by the Council or the public, Mr. Duzan called for a motion. Ms. Mach made a motion to remove Chapter 305 and Mr. Lee made the second.

See transcript pages 15 - 16

Ron Jarman

Yes

Kenneth Schwab

Yes

Eric Lee

Yes

Bill Smith

Yes

Mary Mach

Yes

Steve Sowers

Yes

Andrew Pawlisz

Yes

Brian Duzan

Yes

PERMANENT RULEMAKING OAC 252:606 – OKLAHOMA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (OPDES) STANDARDS – Mr. Clagg stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to update its rules related to the date of incorporation by reference for the Code of Federal Regulations from July 12, 2023, to July 8, 2024. The first regulatory change was the Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification Improvement Rule that became effective November 27, 2023. The purpose of the final rule was to provide stakeholders with a clear and consistent certification process while ensuring protection of vital state, territory and Tribal water resources. The second regulatory change, effective on June 17, 2024, consisted of EPA finalizing changes to its test procedures required to be used by industries and municipalities when analyzing the chemical, physical and biological properties of wastewater and other samples for reporting under the EPA’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit program. This provides timelier access to new measurement techniques and greater flexibility in the selection of analytical methods, thereby reducing monitoring costs while maintaining the protection of public health and the environment. A third regulatory change was the Steam Electric Power Generating Effluent Guidelines final rule which became effective July 8, 2024. This rule revises the technology-based effluent limitation guidelines and standards for the steam electric power generating point source category applicable to flue gas desulfurization (FGD) wastewater, bottom ash transport water, legacy wastewater at existing sources and combustion residual leachate at new and existing sources. Lastly, EPA designated two per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances -perfluorooctanoic acid (“PFOA”) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (“PFOS”), including their salts and structural isomers, as hazardous substances under section 102(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”). As a result of designation, CERCLA and EPCRA reporting requirements apply to releases of PFOA or PFOS or their salts and structural isomers. Hearing no questions or comments by the Council or the public, Mr. Duzan called for a motion. Mr. Sowers moved to approve and Dr. Jarman made the second.

See transcript pages 17 - 20

Ron Jarman	Yes	Kenneth Schwab	Yes
Eric Lee	Yes	Bill Smith	Yes
Mary Mach	Yes	Steve Sowers	Yes
Andrew Pawlisz	Yes	Brian Duzan	Yes

PERMANENT RULEMAKING OAC 252:631 – PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY OPERATION – Mr. Clagg stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to: update the rule concerning the date of incorporation by reference of certain federal regulations from August 17, 2022, to October 30, 2024; correct a grammatical error; remove references to Fecal Coliform and replace, where appropriate, with *E.coli*; update laboratory emergency notification requirements to match Tier 1 public notice (PN) requirements in the C.F.R.; update validation of data requirements for sampling procedures to match the intent of the C.F.R.; update Consumer Confidence Reports (CCR) delivery requirements to match the CCR requirements in the C.F.R.; remove total chlorine residual testing requirements for systems that use free chlorine; and update public water supply (PWS) immediate notification requirements to match Tier 1 PN requirements in the C.F.R. and to account for physical and cybersecurity concerns. Following questions and comments by the Council and none by the public, Mr. Duzan called for a motion. Mr. Lee made a motion to approve the rule with the change to include “DEQ” in front of “Water Quality

Division” and in front of the “State Environmental Laboratory” under 631-3-21 and Dr. Jarman made the second.

See transcript pages 20 - 36

Ron Jarman	Yes	Kenneth Schwab	Yes
Eric Lee	Yes	Bill Smith	Yes
Mary Mach	Yes	Steve Sowers	Yes
Andrew Pawlisz	Yes	Brian Duzan	Yes

PERMANENT RULEMAKING OAC 252:710 – WATERWORKS AND WASTEWATER WORKS OPERATOR CERTIFICATION – Mr. Clagg stated that the DEQ staff is proposing to update the rule to correct grammatical errors; clarify that operator experience means licensed experience, allow approval of virtual classes that are less than 4 hours; require attendance records to be submitted in a DEQ-approved format; cite military exception statute for renewals; rename registered helper to non-certified helper; change CPI from every five years to annually; allow DEQ to determine if a non-community and minor systems need an operator; clarify approved equivalents and fix footnote in Appendices A & B. Following questions and comments by the Council, Ms. Shellie Chard, Division Director of the WQD, advised that if Mr. Duzan could entertain a motion to take a five- or ten-minute recess so the lawyers can look up the statutory language and then reconvene immediately. Mr. Duzan called for a motion to take a recess. Ms. Mach moved to approve and Mr. Schwab made the second.

See transcript pages 36 - 49

Ron Jarman	Yes	Kenneth Schwab	Yes
Eric Lee	Yes	Bill Smith	Yes
Mary Mach	Yes	Steve Sowers	Yes
Andrew Pawlisz	Yes	Brian Duzan	Yes

Following the ten-minute recess Mr. Duzan called for a motion to reconvene the meeting, Ms. Mach moved to approve and Mr. Sowers made the second.

See transcript pages 49 - 50

Ron Jarman	Yes	Kenneth Schwab	Yes
Eric Lee	Yes	Bill Smith	Yes
Mary Mach	Yes	Steve Sowers	Yes
Andrew Pawlisz	Yes	Brian Duzan	Yes

Following questions and comments by the Council and none by the public, Mr. Duzan called for a motion. Mr. Schwab made a motion to approve the rule as written, with clarifying footnote on the classroom training in Appendix C and Mr. Lee made the second.

See transcript page 50 - 59

Ron Jarman	Yes	Kenneth Schwab	Yes
Eric Lee	Yes	Bill Smith	Yes
Mary Mach	Yes	Steve Sowers	Yes
Andrew Pawlisz	Yes	Brian Duzan	Yes

DIRECTOR’S REPORT – Ms. Chard introduced George Russell as the Director of the SELSD he is no longer the interim. Mr. Russell then introduced the Assistant Division Director of the SELSD, Dustin Davidson. Ms. Chard provided an update on division activities.

See transcript pages 59 - 73

NEW BUSINESS – None

ANNOUNCEMENTS – The next scheduled meeting is on Tuesday, April 22, 2025, 2:00p.m. at DEQ.

ADJOURNMENT – Mr. Duzan called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Smith moved to adjourn and Dr. Jarman made the second. The meeting was adjourned at 3:43p.m.

See transcript page 73 – 74

Ron Jarman	Yes	Kenneth Schwab	Yes
Eric Lee	Yes	Bill Smith	Yes
Mary Mach	Yes	Steve Sowers	Yes
Andrew Pawlisz	Yes	Brian Duzan	Yes

Transcript and Attendance Sheet are attached as an official part of these Minutes.

<p>1 REGULAR MEETING</p> <p>2 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</p> <p>3 WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL</p> <p>4 ON JANUARY 7, 2025 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 MEMBERS PRESENT</p> <p>8 Ron Jarman</p> <p>9 Eric Lee</p> <p>10 Mary Mach</p> <p>11 Steve Sowers</p> <p>12 Bill Willard Smith</p> <p>13 Andrew Pawlisz</p> <p>14 Brian Duzan</p> <p>15 Kenneth Schwab</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 MEMBERS ABSENT</p> <p>18 Mark Matheson</p> <p>19 Rick Moore</p> <p>20 Debbie Wells</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 REPORTED BY: Jenny Longley, CSR</p>	<p>1 Dr. Moore is absent.</p> <p>2 Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>3 DR. PAWLISZ: Here.</p> <p>4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>5 MR. SCHWAB: Here.</p> <p>6 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>7 MR. SMITH: Here.</p> <p>8 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>9 MR. SOWERS: Here.</p> <p>10 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Wells is absent.</p> <p>11 Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>12 MR. DUZAN: Here.</p> <p>13 MS. FIELDS: We have a quorum.</p> <p>14 MR. DUZAN: Okay. The first thing is the</p> <p>15 Approval of the Minutes from the September 24, 2024</p> <p>16 meeting. Any comments?</p> <p>17 MR. SMITH: I make a motion to approve the</p> <p>18 minutes as written.</p> <p>19 DR. JARMAN: Second.</p> <p>20 MR. DUZAN: We have a motion and a second,</p> <p>21 we'll have a vote.</p> <p>22 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>23 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>25 MR. LEE: Yes.</p>
<p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 MR. DUZAN: Okay. This regular meeting of</p> <p>3 the Water Quality Management Advisory Council was</p> <p>4 called in accordance with the Open Meeting Act.</p> <p>5 Notice for this January 7, 2025 regular meeting was</p> <p>6 filed with the Secretary of State on October 24,</p> <p>7 2024. The agenda was duly posted at DEQ at least 24</p> <p>8 hours prior to the meeting.</p> <p>9 Only matters appearing on the posted</p> <p>10 agenda may be considered at this regular meeting.</p> <p>11 In the event that this meeting is continued or</p> <p>12 reconvened, public notice of the date, time, and</p> <p>13 place of the continued meeting will be given by</p> <p>14 announcement at this meeting. Only matters</p> <p>15 appearing on the agenda of a meeting which is</p> <p>16 continued may be discussed at the continued or</p> <p>17 reconvened meeting.</p> <p>18 And we will have a roll call.</p> <p>19 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>20 DR. JARMAN: Here.</p> <p>21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>22 MR. LEE: Here.</p> <p>23 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>24 MS. MACH: Here.</p> <p>25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Matheson is absent.</p>	<p>1 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>2 MS. MACH: Abstain.</p> <p>3 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>4 DR. PAWLISZ: Approve.</p> <p>5 MS. FIELDS: Excuse me?</p> <p>6 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>8 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>9 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>10 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>12 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>13 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>14 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>15 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>16 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Since we are in the</p> <p>17 start of a new year, the first thing we have to do</p> <p>18 is elect officers, and the first thing we'll do is</p> <p>19 elect the Vice Chair.</p> <p>20 And I know Steve has done it in the</p> <p>21 last few years; so if he's willing, I would nominate</p> <p>22 Steve.</p> <p>23 MR. SOWERS: I'm willing.</p> <p>24 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Do we --</p> <p>25 MS. MACH: I second the motion to nominate</p>

<p>Page 5</p> <p>1 Mr. Sowers as the Vice Chair.</p> <p>2 MR. DUZAN: Okay. We have a motion and a</p> <p>3 second. Do we have anybody else?</p> <p>4 Then we'll have a vote.</p> <p>5 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>6 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>8 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>9 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>10 MS. MACH: Yes.</p> <p>11 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>12 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>13 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>14 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>16 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>17 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>18 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>20 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>21 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>22 MR. DUZAN: Okay. I'll turn the gavel</p> <p>23 over to Mr. Sowers now to elect the Chair.</p> <p>24 MR. SOWERS: Yes, I know Brian has been</p> <p>25 our Chair and I think he has agreed to do it.</p>	<p>Page 7</p> <p>1 we'll try this another year.</p> <p>2 We're going to move -- we have quite</p> <p>3 a few rulemakings today; so we're going to jump</p> <p>4 right into it. The first one is on OAC 252:306,</p> <p>5 State Environmental and Laboratory rules and fees,</p> <p>6 and so I believe we have a presentation from Susan</p> <p>7 Mensik.</p> <p>8 Susan?</p> <p>9 MS. MENSİK: Good afternoon, everyone.</p> <p>10 Again, I am Susan Mensik, I am an Environmental</p> <p>11 Programs Manager for the State Environmental</p> <p>12 Laboratory Services Division, and this afternoon I'm</p> <p>13 going to be presenting discussion for permanent</p> <p>14 rulemaking for Chapter 306 and Chapter 305.</p> <p>15 And before proceeding, I just wanted</p> <p>16 to note that all of the rules that are on the agenda</p> <p>17 today being presented have been discussed at the</p> <p>18 September 24th council meeting. I'd also like to</p> <p>19 note that the DEQ conducted two informal public</p> <p>20 stakeholder meetings regarding all of the rules.</p> <p>21 The first was conducted November 7th at the</p> <p>22 Centennial Center in Veterans Park in Tulsa, and</p> <p>23 there were approximately 10 attendees. The second</p> <p>24 meeting was here at DEQ on November 13th and there</p> <p>25 were approximately 15 attendees.</p>
<p>Page 6</p> <p>1 Brian, is that correct?</p> <p>2 MR. DUZAN: That is correct.</p> <p>3 MR. SOWERS: Okay. I make a motion that</p> <p>4 we -- any discussion for that? If none, I make a</p> <p>5 motion that we approve Brian as the Chair for the</p> <p>6 next session.</p> <p>7 MR. SCHWAB: Second.</p> <p>8 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>9 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>10 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>11 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>12 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>13 MS. MACH: Yes.</p> <p>14 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>15 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>16 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>17 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>18 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>19 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>20 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>21 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>23 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>24 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>25 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Thanks, everybody,</p>	<p>Page 8</p> <p>1 So I'm going to move to discuss</p> <p>2 252:306, "State Environmental Laboratory Services".</p> <p>3 DEQ staff is proposing this new rule that, if</p> <p>4 recommended by the council, will replace OAC</p> <p>5 252:305, which will be revoked. This chapter</p> <p>6 contains rules regarding fees and services offered</p> <p>7 by the State Environmental Laboratory Services</p> <p>8 Division, or the SELSD.</p> <p>9 Chapter 306 provides updated</p> <p>10 statutory authority for the rulemaking processes, in</p> <p>11 compliance with Oklahoma Statutes. It updates the</p> <p>12 types of services available for DEQ's needs as well</p> <p>13 as those outside DEQ, including citizens,</p> <p>14 municipalities, industry, and other agencies.</p> <p>15 Chapter 306 also includes language that allows for</p> <p>16 some flexibility to provide other analyses and</p> <p>17 special services under certain circumstances, as</p> <p>18 well as possible discounts for bulk volume sample</p> <p>19 testing with the approval of the Executive Director</p> <p>20 or his or her designee, as well as other potential</p> <p>21 charges in extraordinary circumstances.</p> <p>22 Chapter 306 references SELSD's</p> <p>23 authority under 40 C.F.R. 142.10 as the State</p> <p>24 Principal Laboratory in a primacy state, with</p> <p>25 responsibilities including the accreditation of</p>

<p>1 laboratories performing analytical testing of</p> <p>2 drinking water contaminants specified in 252:631,</p> <p>3 which is our Public Water Supply Operations rule.</p> <p>4 Chapter 306 also ensures that under</p> <p>5 certain circumstances, new services may be added and</p> <p>6 other services may be decommissioned at the</p> <p>7 discretion of the Executive Director.</p> <p>8 The optional use of applying an</p> <p>9 annual Consumer Price Index, or CPI, to our Base</p> <p>10 fees, as is currently done in Chapter 305, is also</p> <p>11 included in the new Chapter 306.</p> <p>12 And finally, there is a new and</p> <p>13 improved single appendix, which is Appendix A, that</p> <p>14 consolidates and eliminates the second appendix,</p> <p>15 which was found in 305, for all of our current</p> <p>16 services offered and each associated Base Fee. No</p> <p>17 fee increases are proposed with this new rule.</p> <p>18 Appendix A is simply an updated list of all of our</p> <p>19 current services offered by the SELSD. No Base Fee</p> <p>20 increases are included or proposed.</p> <p>21 Note that the Final Chapter 306 Rule</p> <p>22 Text and Appendix A being proposed for the council's</p> <p>23 recommendation to the board are in your binders</p> <p>24 behind an orange tab which is titled "306: RIS, NRI,</p> <p>25 Final Rule Text, and Appendix A". And I mention</p>	<p>Page 9</p> <p>1 our website. But those -- again, these are not the</p> <p>2 final texts that you're going to be looking at for</p> <p>3 recommendation to the board.</p> <p>4 Beyond the draft text, there's also a</p> <p>5 supplemental Appendix A which lists all of our fees</p> <p>6 and our services, and this supplemental document is</p> <p>7 basically the original version of the appendix that</p> <p>8 was made available for public comment on</p> <p>9 December 2nd.</p> <p>10 So now I'll go over the individual</p> <p>11 comments and the lab responses. The first comment</p> <p>12 from the City of Tulsa requested clarification as to</p> <p>13 whether a listed sample preparation test and its</p> <p>14 associated fee would be applied to every sample or</p> <p>15 to every analyte.</p> <p>16 And again, this is a change that is</p> <p>17 occurring in Appendix A. There's a column on that</p> <p>18 appendix listing our fees that's called "Prep Test",</p> <p>19 and so what we did is we made a modification to</p> <p>20 that, changed the "Prep Test" designator to say</p> <p>21 "Prep Test Fee". We included a footnote on the</p> <p>22 bottom of the table, and that footnote would clarify</p> <p>23 that any prep test fee required by a method would be</p> <p>24 applied per sample and not per analyte.</p> <p>25 The added footnote also refers the</p>
<p>Page 10</p> <p>1 that because in a second, I'm going to go over the</p> <p>2 comments and there'll be some changes between the</p> <p>3 comments that were made and edited in those final</p> <p>4 documents and they'll show -- I'll point those out</p> <p>5 to you in your binders. So if you have a question,</p> <p>6 please let me know and I can try to clarify where</p> <p>7 those are located.</p> <p>8 The DEQ received public comments from</p> <p>9 the City of Tulsa for Chapter 306. The comments</p> <p>10 were for the proposed new Appendix A, "Laboratory</p> <p>11 Services and Fee Schedule", of the draft Chapter</p> <p>12 306. No comments were received for the Chapter 306</p> <p>13 proposed draft text.</p> <p>14 So I'd ask that you refer to the</p> <p>15 materials in your binder that are behind -- there's</p> <p>16 a yellow tab which is "306: Response to Comments".</p> <p>17 And so in that particular section, there is the</p> <p>18 official public comments from the City of Tulsa.</p> <p>19 There is -- on the next page, there is a summary of</p> <p>20 the comments and the DEQ responses.</p> <p>21 And then on the next page, which is</p> <p>22 listed as a supplemental 306 draft rule text, these</p> <p>23 are changes that we've made to the rule since it was</p> <p>24 published. So these are things that are not out</p> <p>25 there for public review currently, but they're on</p>	<p>Page 11</p> <p>1 user to a separate Prep Test table in the appendix</p> <p>2 for that associated fee, thus the final fee would be</p> <p>3 the analytical Base Fee plus the Prep Test Base Fee.</p> <p>4 The second comment recommended</p> <p>5 removal of a line item for the Toxic Characteristic</p> <p>6 Leaching Procedure, or the TCLP, Method 6010 and the</p> <p>7 listed Prep Test of EPA 1311 from the Metals table</p> <p>8 on page 7 of the supplemental document, towards the</p> <p>9 bottom.</p> <p>10 The DEQ agreed with the statement and</p> <p>11 removed the line listing with the 1311 Prep Test</p> <p>12 from the Metals table at Figure 7 to eliminate what</p> <p>13 looked like a duplication.</p> <p>14 There was a third comment, basically</p> <p>15 an inquiry that there were six PFAS for drinking</p> <p>16 water compliance listed in the draft appendix under</p> <p>17 EPA 537.1, which is on Figure 1 of the published</p> <p>18 draft. The commenter asked whether the analysis of</p> <p>19 the 29 PFAS that were included in the UCMR 5</p> <p>20 monitoring would still be offered by the DEQ.</p> <p>21 The DEQ response was that the SELSD</p> <p>22 has completed all of the requested UCMR 5 monitoring</p> <p>23 analysis for PFAS testing. The SELSD will only</p> <p>24 offer PFAS testing using EPA method 537.1 for the</p> <p>25 six drinking water compliance PFAS.</p> <p>Page 12</p>

<p>Page 13</p> <p>1 A fourth comment was whether or not</p> <p>2 solid matrix, or non-drinking water, PFAS analysis</p> <p>3 would be offered by SELSD. The response was that</p> <p>4 SELSD does not anticipate offering PFOA or PFOS</p> <p>5 testing for non-drinking water compliance.</p> <p>6 In addition to the published draft</p> <p>7 Appendix A edits addressing the public comments, the</p> <p>8 DEQ staff also made some other Appendix A</p> <p>9 improvements including: a reference listing the Base</p> <p>10 Fees are adjusted to include the FY25 Consumer Price</p> <p>11 Index on the Figure 1; it also included a movement</p> <p>12 of a prep test from the main section to the Prep</p> <p>13 Test section; and then we also reformatted the</p> <p>14 appendix from 10 pages down to nine.</p> <p>15 So those changes that we've made are</p> <p>16 reflected in the documents under your orange tab.</p> <p>17 So those are the final documents that have included</p> <p>18 those changes in the draft text as well as in the</p> <p>19 Appendix A's fee schedule.</p> <p>20 The supplemental Chapter 306 State</p> <p>21 Environmental Laboratory Services document does</p> <p>22 reflect some staff improvements to the draft text</p> <p>23 since the opening of the public comment period.</p> <p>24 These include: correcting typographical errors;</p> <p>25 removal of redundant terms; expanding some acronyms;</p>	<p>Page 15</p> <p>1 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>3 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>4 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>5 MS. MACH: Yes.</p> <p>6 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>7 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>8 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>9 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>10 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>11 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>12 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>13 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>15 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>16 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>17 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Now we're moving on to</p> <p>18 number 7, which is 252:305.</p> <p>19 Susan?</p> <p>20 MS. MENSİK: DEQ staff is proposing to</p> <p>21 revoke this rule since it will be replaced by OAC</p> <p>22 252:306. We did not receive any official comments</p> <p>23 for Chapter 305. In conclusion, DEQ is asking the</p> <p>24 council to recommend to the Environmental Quality</p> <p>25 Board this permanent rulemaking for Chapter 305.</p>
<p>Page 14</p> <p>1 rewording some sentences; and changing the</p> <p>2 definition of "Director" from the Director of the</p> <p>3 SELSD to the Executive Director of DEQ, and each</p> <p>4 reference to "Director" was expanded to also include</p> <p>5 "or his or her designee".</p> <p>6 In conclusion, DEQ is asking the</p> <p>7 council to recommend to the EQ Board this permanent</p> <p>8 rulemaking for Chapter 306.</p> <p>9 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. So</p> <p>10 you -- basically, you're changing the wording but</p> <p>11 there's no fee changes?</p> <p>12 MS. MENSİK: There is no -- there are no</p> <p>13 fee increases in Appendix A from what we're</p> <p>14 currently charging our customers.</p> <p>15 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Any questions or</p> <p>16 comments from the council? Questions or comments</p> <p>17 from the public?</p> <p>18 Hearing none, I'll entertain a</p> <p>19 motion.</p> <p>20 DR. JARMAN: I move approval of the</p> <p>21 changes.</p> <p>22 MR. LEE: Second.</p> <p>23 MR. DUZAN: We have a motion and a second,</p> <p>24 we'll have a vote.</p> <p>25 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p>	<p>Page 16</p> <p>1 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Questions or comments</p> <p>2 from the council?</p> <p>3 MS. MACH: I make a motion to remove</p> <p>4 Chapter 305.</p> <p>5 MR. LEE: Same.</p> <p>6 MR. DUZAN: We have a motion and a second,</p> <p>7 we'll have a vote.</p> <p>8 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>9 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>10 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>11 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>12 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>13 MS. MACH: Yes.</p> <p>14 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>15 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>16 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>17 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>18 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>19 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>20 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>21 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>22 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>23 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>24 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>25 MR. DUZAN: Thank you, Susan.</p>

<p>Page 17</p> <p>1 We're going to move on to number 8, 2 which is Permanent Rulemaking OAC 252:606, the 3 "Oklahoma Pollutant Discharge Elimination System 4 Standards", and I think Brian Clagg has a 5 presentation. 6 MR. CLAGG: All right. Good afternoon, 7 Council. I am Brian Clagg, I will be presenting 8 several rules today. 9 The first rule is OAC 252:606, that's 10 our "Oklahoma Pollutant Discharge Elimination System 11 Standards", and your binders include a tab for the 12 Rule Impact Statement, Notice of Rulemaking Intent, 13 and the draft text. 14 For permanent rulemaking, DEQ is 15 proposing an update of the federal rules 16 incorporated by reference from July 12, 2023 to 17 July 8, 2024. 18 The regulatory changes include the 19 following. First, the Clean Water Act Section 401 20 Water Quality Certification Improvement Rule that 21 aims to provide stakeholders with a clear and 22 consistent certification process while ensuring 23 protection of vital state, territory, and Tribal 24 water resources. 25 Secondly, EPA finalized changes to</p>	<p>Page 19</p> <p>1 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, 2 and Liability Act. As a result of designation, 3 CERCLA and EPCRA reporting requirements apply to 4 releases of PFOA or PFOS or their salts and 5 structural isomers. This rule became effective 6 July 8, 2024. 7 So in conclusion, DEQ is asking the 8 council to recommend to the Environmental Quality 9 Board this permanent rulemaking for Chapter 606. 10 MR. DUZAN: Thanks, Brian. Any questions 11 or comments from the council? Questions or comments 12 from the public? 13 Hearing none, I'll entertain a 14 motion. 15 MR. SOWERS: I make a motion to approve. 16 DR. JARMAN: Second. 17 MR. DUZAN: We have a motion and a second, 18 we'll have a vote. 19 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman? 20 DR. JARMAN: Yes. 21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee? 22 MR. LEE: Yes. 23 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach? 24 MS. MACH: Yes. 25 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p>
<p>Page 18</p> <p>1 its test procedures required to be used by 2 industries and municipalities when analyzing the 3 chemical, physical, and biological properties of 4 wastewater and other samples for reporting under the 5 EPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination 6 System permit program. This provides timelier 7 access to new measurement techniques and greater 8 flexibility in the selection of analytical methods, 9 thereby reducing monitoring costs while maintaining 10 protection of public health and the environment. 11 The third regulatory change concerned 12 the Steam Electric Power Generating Effluent 13 Guidelines final rule that revises the 14 technology-based effluent limitation guidelines and 15 standards for the steam electric power generating 16 point source category applicable to flue gas 17 desulfurization wastewater, bottom ash transport 18 water, legacy wastewater at existing sources, and 19 combustion residual leachate at new and existing 20 sources. 21 Lastly, EPA designated two per- and 22 polyfluoroalkyl substances: perfluorooctanoic acid, 23 PFOA, and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid, PFOS, 24 including their salts and structural isomers, as 25 hazardous substances under Section 102(a) of the</p>	<p>Page 20</p> <p>1 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes. 2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab? 3 MR. SCHWAB: Yes. 4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith? 5 MR. SMITH: Yes. 6 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers? 7 MR. SOWERS: Yes. 8 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan? 9 MR. DUZAN: Yes. 10 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed. 11 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Moving on to 252:631, 12 "Public Water Supply Operation". 13 Brian? 14 MR. CLAGG: Okay. As with the other in 15 your binders, there's a tab for the Rule Impact 16 Statement, Notice of Rulemaking Intent, and the 17 draft text. The proposed updates to OAC 252:631, 18 "Public Water Supply Operation", are necessary for 19 DEQ to retain primacy for enforcing Safe Drinking 20 Water Act requirements, to better align state 21 regulations with new and existing federal 22 regulations and to both simplify and improve public 23 water supply system operations and incident 24 reporting. 25 So for Subchapter 1, titled</p>

<p>Page 21</p> <p>1 "Introduction", DEQ staff is proposing to update the 2 incorporation by reference date from August 17, 2022 3 to October 30, 2024, the date the Lead and Copper 4 Rule Improvements, or LCRI, was promulgated. This 5 change will also capture the recent changes to the 6 Consumer Confidence Report Rule and the finalized 7 Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Rule. 8 In this and following subchapters, 9 grammatical and/or styled changes such as removing 10 "the" before DEQ, capitalizing the "L" in mg/L, 11 placing periods following the C, F and R when 12 identifying CFR have been made throughout this rule. 13 For Subchapter 3, titled 14 "Operations", in 252:631-3-2, titled "Laboratory 15 Accreditation", language has been added to update 16 laboratory emergency notification requirements to 17 match Tier 1 public notice requirements in the 18 C.F.R. This will require notification by 19 laboratories to DEQ of nitrate results above the MCL 20 and lead results above the action level. Earlier 21 notification of lead action level exceedances and 22 nitrate MCL violations by laboratories will enable 23 DEQ to better assist the affected PWS systems in 24 meeting their public notice requirements and 25 addressing potential public health risks more</p>	<p>Page 23</p> <p>1 Control Tests", total chlorine residual testing 2 requirements for systems that use free chlorine is 3 proposed to be removed to reduce confusion and 4 streamline the testing process for operators. 5 Currently, these systems are required to test for 6 both free chlorine and total chlorine; however, 7 testing for total chlorine in these systems isn't 8 particularly useful and this extra testing is not a 9 requirement found in the C.F.R. 10 In 252:631-3-11(a), titled "Operating 11 records & reports", language is proposed requiring 12 immediate notification to DEQ of lead action level 13 exceedances, acts or threats of physical attacks, 14 and acts or threats of cybersecurity attacks. This 15 will better align Chapter 631 requirements with the 16 new federal rules, including the Lead and Copper 17 Rule Revisions and the LCRI, and will help DEQ 18 better assist PWS systems in responding to security 19 incidents. PWS systems are already required to 20 report cybersecurity attacks to the FBI or 21 Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, 22 but these agencies are not well positioned to assist 23 the affected PWS system in determining the threat to 24 public health these incidents present. 25 Lastly, in 252:631-3-21, titled</p>
<p>Page 22</p> <p>1 swiftly. 2 In 252:631-3-3(1)(2)(B), that was 3 titled "Mandatory disinfection", and elsewhere, 4 references to fecal coliform have been replaced with 5 E. coli to ensure that DEQ's rules are aligned with 6 current testing and monitoring standards. 7 In 252:631-3-4, titled "Validation of 8 data", language is proposed so that sampling 9 procedures match the intent of the C.F.R. with the 10 goal being to ensure that the water being sampled 11 represents the quality of water in the distribution 12 system during typical day-to-day operations. 13 Section 252:631-3-9, titled "Annual 14 Consumer Confidence Report", updates delivery 15 requirements to match the new CCR requirements in 16 the C.F.R. Under these new federal requirements, 17 large PWS systems will be required to produce and 18 deliver Consumer Confidence Reports twice a year 19 instead of just once annually, which was the 20 previous requirement for all systems, regardless of 21 size, and which is specified in Chapter 631 22 currently. The proposed changes will help keep 23 Chapter 631 requirements in line with the new 24 federal requirements. 25 In 252:631-3-10(6), titled "Process</p>	<p>Page 24</p> <p>1 "Public water supply annual service fees", the 2 introductory sentence has been edited by removing 3 "To assist in meeting rising costs..." through 4 "drinking water standards". This was a stylistic 5 change only and does not impact service fees. 6 So in conclusion, DEQ is asking the 7 council to recommend to the Environmental Quality 8 Board this permanent rulemaking for 631. 9 MR. DUZAN: Thanks, Brian. So the CFR is 10 now C.F.R.? 11 MR. CLAGG: That's correct. 12 MR. DUZAN: Is there -- is that the 13 lawyers involved in that? 14 MR. CLAGG: I believe that would be -- 15 MR. DUZAN: We'll leave it at that. 16 MR. CLAGG: Yeah. 17 MR. DUZAN: Any questions or comments from 18 the council? 19 DR. JARMAN: I would like to -- I'm 20 curious about changing the terminology from fecal 21 coliform to Escherichia coli. What's -- 22 MR. CLAGG: I know that E. coli is a 23 better indicator for pollution and that's why we've 24 changed over to that. I'm not sure I could tell you 25 how it's a better indicator, I'm sure there's others</p>

<p>Page 25</p> <p>1 in here that could, but it is a better indicator and 2 is -- supposedly gives better, you know, results. 3 DR. JARMAN: Okay. 4 MS. MACH: Yes, I had a question. What 5 constitutes a threat? 6 MR. CLAGG: Okay. I'm going to have to -- 7 yep. 8 MS. MACH: Physical or cyber. 9 MS. CHARD: So this is Shellie Chard, 10 Water Quality Division Director. I see Mark 11 Stasyszen is also making his way to a microphone. 12 These are changes that we're making 13 in accordance with some of the definitions and 14 things that EPA, CISA, FBI, National Security 15 Council have been placing in guidance documents and 16 those types of things, and basically it would be if 17 the system is impacted in some way physically, 18 somebody cuts a lock. 19 We've had somebody they found in a 20 situation in Southern Oklahoma, someone cut a lock 21 to get into a plant, broke out a window to access 22 the building. There were no operational controls 23 that were manipulated and, as it turned out, it was 24 a stupid story of knowing where a restroom is 25 located and while following his wife to determine if</p>	<p>Page 27</p> <p>1 threat to public health and we would expect that we 2 would be working hand in hand with the water system 3 and with the appropriate federal agencies. 4 If you're looking for a very specific 5 definition, as far as I know there hasn't been one 6 established. 7 MS. MACH: Well, just one concern I have 8 is, you know, operators have a lot on their plate, 9 and if they miss something that was just a physical 10 threat, not an actual physical act, that then they 11 might be held liable or in violation of the C.F.R.s. 12 So I was just curious if there was a 13 more succinct definition to that to make sure that 14 our unfair, you know, notice was not put on 15 operators that are running those facilities. 16 MS. CHARD: I absolutely understand that 17 concern. I will tell you, some of the federal 18 language used the word "vulnerability". We don't 19 use that unless we are specifically talking about 20 the vulnerability assessments that EPA requires of 21 larger drinking water systems. 22 I can assure you the intent is -- 23 this is not a gotcha list, this is not something 24 that is a minor kind of thing. If we have an 25 operator who tells us, 'Somebody cut the lock but</p>
<p>Page 26</p> <p>1 she was having an inappropriate relationship, and so 2 the water plant was easier than other places. That 3 was a threat, but there was no actual impact, but 4 that was of course reported, investigated, that's 5 how we learned what actually happened. 6 There have been several water 7 systems, wastewater systems across the country and 8 even in Oklahoma that have had breaches of data 9 systems, breaches of their operational controls from 10 -- in some cases, it was students who were playing 11 high-powered video games and figured out how to 12 access high-powered servers, so they were playing a 13 game using the water system's computer system. You 14 know, those are threats that we expect to be 15 reported to us so we can take steps to address those 16 working with the cybersecurity agencies and the 17 state cybersecurity command. 18 We would also obviously, where we've 19 had situations of ransomware where they've gotten 20 into HR or billing, maybe not all the way into the 21 operational technology, would still consider that a 22 threat because there wasn't a firewall between them, 23 they just didn't really know how to impact. 24 And then obviously when operational 25 controls are breached, impacted, that is clearly a</p>	<p>Page 28</p> <p>1 didn't take anything, nothing's damaged', if they 2 tell us that in an inspection six months after the 3 fact, you know, our response is going to be, 'Ooh, 4 let us know when those things happen'. 5 Now, if a city has a major breach or 6 they have their operational technology compromised 7 and they report to FBI and they report to CISA and 8 they don't report to us, that's something that we're 9 going to say, you know, 'You are required to report 10 to us'. 11 But this is not something that's 12 going to be similar to what EPA is doing with the 13 vulnerability assessments when they do on-site 14 inspections. It's not a gotcha list thing, this is 15 we're hoping to get the word out for that to be 16 reported to us so we can assist however we need to, 17 whether it be with a system or with federal 18 partners. 19 If you have a suggestion for us, I 20 think we would be happy to consider it. 21 MS. MACH: It's just the threat aspect of 22 this is just a very difficult thing to define and 23 what constitutes a threat versus an act is, you 24 know, physical. I'm not sure. 25 MS. CHARD: And I will tell you, we have</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 had a couple of water systems that had things that I 2 think we would all recognize as a threat, a 3 disgruntled former employee who said, 'I am going to 4 destroy the plant, I am going to attack the water 5 system'; so sometimes it is very clear. 6 I don't disagree with you. Like I 7 said, I'm happy to entertain a solution that makes 8 everybody feel better. 9 MR. SMITH: I have a question. Is there a 10 prioritization of notification? In our dam safety, 11 for example, we have to notify local officials - 12 emergency managers, for example - first, and then we 13 go down the list and then notify OWRB. 14 So is there a priority of -- or, 15 prioritization of notification? 16 MS. CHARD: Not that I'm aware. 17 MR. STASYSZEN: Hi, Mark Stasyszen, I'm 18 the acting Public Water Supply Group Manager. There 19 isn't a prioritization that we're proposing. What 20 we're looking for is within 24 hours, similar to our 21 other notifications, so... 22 MS. MACH: Well, I guess maybe is there 23 guidance documents that you could provide operators 24 about threats? 25 MS. CHARD: Yes, there is --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 reporting structure and level of kind of elevated 2 levels of concern, so... 3 MS. CHARD: So from my perspective, I 4 would say it is something along the lines of when 5 one of those attacks gets through your defenses. 6 Like I said, Mark? 7 MR. STASYSZEN: Yeah, I mean, I would add 8 to that it's obviously not a one-size-fits-all type 9 solution here, but for y'all, like you said, you get 10 them every day, threats and things. I think it's 11 once y'all find it's a problem, recognize that 12 threat as being a legitimate credible threat, would 13 be when we would want to know. 14 Now, a system that does not get 15 threats every day, that would be one we would want 16 to hear from more immediately. 17 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Any other questions or 18 comments from the council? 19 DR. PAWLISZ: I do. 20 So this is requirements for 21 notification, Chapter 631, Rule Impact Statement, 22 and I will read you the first declaration, "Probable 23 Costs and Benefits to DEQ to Implement and Enforce". 24 And it states, "There are anticipated additional 25 costs to DEQ to implement and enforce the proposed</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 MS. MACH: Or -- 2 MS. CHARD: -- a litany of information 3 that's available, primarily developed by our federal 4 partners, CISA. There -- the Critical 5 Infrastructure Partnership Council also has done 6 several documents, fact sheets. 7 The Water/Wastewater Task Force under 8 the Federal Advisory Committee on Cybersecurity has 9 -- I think there are eight specific steps that need 10 to be considered or taken, it's a 60, 80-page 11 document. I know AWWA has done some work under 12 their Security & Resilience Certificate Program. 13 So there's quite a bit of information 14 out there, and something I'm going to talk about 15 later is some cybersecurity training that will be 16 coming to Oklahoma later in the spring and summer. 17 MS. MACH: Okay. Thank you. 18 MR. LEE: So I think with a utility as 19 large as Tulsa, and I'm sure Oklahoma City has this, 20 as well, you know, we're under constant barrage of 21 cyberattacks. And so I guess to Mary Elizabeth's 22 point it's, you know, to what level of threat are we 23 needing to, you know, respond to. 24 So I can see where there's going to 25 be some gray areas to try to figure out that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 rules, especially related to the federal mandates 2 regarding the PFAS" - and I underscored PFAS - "and 3 lead and copper rules". So that's one statement. 4 Then looking at the other 5 declaration, reading, "Source of Revenue to be Used 6 to Implement and Enforce Rule", it states, "DEQ is 7 requesting \$470,187 from General Revenue funds to 8 help implement the lead and copper rules". So it's 9 silent on PFAS. Could you elaborate on the lack of 10 reference to PFAS? 11 MS. CHARD: So, yes. The lead and copper 12 was specifically included because of the nature of 13 the requirements, the significant increase in work 14 for the DEQ drinking water staff. That was 15 something that had been identified. 16 We knew it was coming based on the 17 Trump era, or I guess it's first Trump 18 administration Lead and Copper Rule; so we were 19 already anticipating the need for additional 20 staffing. It was already included as part of the 21 DEQ budget request; so that is what has been moving 22 forward and why it was focused on lead and copper. 23 We recognize PFAS, there's going to 24 be additional costs associated with implementation, 25 but the way that that rule is set up, we have this</p>

<p>Page 33</p> <p>1 two-year - now, left - two-and-a-half-year 2 monitoring period before we know which water systems 3 are actually going to have to comply with the PFAS 4 standards. And it's looking at data, applying the 5 Hazard Index, trigger levels. 6 So based on the preliminary data that 7 we have, we don't think it's going to be a very 8 large percentage of our drinking water systems, 9 where we know lead and copper is just under 1,000 10 drinking water systems. 11 When we look at UCMR data on PFAS 12 sampling, it's less than 5, 7 percent, something 13 like that are actually detecting, is that right? Is 14 that -- 15 MR. STASYSZEN: Around there, Shellie. 16 MS. CHARD: Okay. So we know it's a 17 significantly smaller part of the universe. Is the 18 rule going to be difficult, is it going to be 19 cumbersome, is it going to be complex, is it going 20 to take time? Yes. 21 We just don't know what that's going 22 to look like, where with lead and copper we do know 23 what it's going to look like, and that's why we were 24 moving forward. Our budget hearing is tomorrow, and 25 that \$470,000 is part of our request.</p>	<p>Page 35</p> <p>1 I'll make a motion to approve this 2 chapter with that change. 3 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Any other questions or 4 comments from the public? 5 DR. JARMAN: I'll second the motion. 6 MR. DUZAN: Any questions or more comments 7 from the council? 8 Then we'll entertain a motion. 9 MR. LEE: I'll make a motion with the 10 change to include "DEQ" in front of "Water Quality 11 Division" and in front of "State Environmental 12 Laboratory" under 631-3-21. 13 DR. JARMAN: Second. 14 MR. DUZAN: Okay. We have a motion and a 15 second, we'll have a vote. 16 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman? 17 DR. JARMAN: Yes. 18 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee? 19 MR. LEE: Yes. 20 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach? 21 MS. MACH: Yes. 22 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz? 23 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes. 24 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab? 25 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p>
<p>Page 34</p> <p>1 DR. PAWLISZ: Thank you. 2 MR. DUZAN: Any other questions or 3 comments from the council? 4 MR. LEE: Yeah, I have one more. 5 This is just a simple question, I 6 guess, is on page 7 -- well, page 5, under 7 252:631-3-2, under (b)(2), "Emergency notification", 8 the last -- towards the end of the sentence, it 9 talks about the "Water Quality Division" and it 10 doesn't say DEQ in front of it, but then later on, 11 on page 7, it talks about "DEQ Water Quality 12 Division" under 631-3-10. 13 Just a kind of consistency basis, I 14 don't know if you want to say "DEQ" in front of 15 "Water Quality Division" or not, so just bringing 16 that up. 17 MS. CHARD: We can make that change, and 18 we would ask that when you make a motion on this 19 chapter, should you go down a path of recommending 20 it to the Environmental Quality Board, include that 21 change. 22 MR. LEE: Which one would you prefer, 23 "DEQ" in front of or not in front of? 24 MS. CHARD: Yes. 25 MR. LEE: In front? Okay.</p>	<p>Page 36</p> <p>1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith? 2 MR. SMITH: Yes. 3 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers? 4 MR. SOWERS: Yes. 5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan? 6 MR. DUZAN: Yes. 7 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed. 8 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Moving on to 252:710, 9 "Waterworks and Wastewater Works Operator 10 Certification". 11 Mr. Clagg? 12 MR. CLAGG: All right. Again, there are a 13 couple of tabs in your binder for Chapter 710; so 14 give me a second and I'll explain what is contained 15 within each of those tabs. The first tab contains 16 the Rule Impact Statement, the Notice of Rulemaking 17 Intent, and a text document there, which is a 18 version of the text. Now, it may be labeled 19 December 2, 2024, at least it's got a supplemental 20 watermark on it, but the significance of that date 21 is that's the date that the proposed rules were 22 published in the Office of Administrative Rules, or 23 the OAR. This document is watermarked as 24 "Supplement" and is only intended to show what was 25 originally drafted and published in the OAR there in</p>

<p>Page 37</p> <p>1 early December.</p> <p>2 So likewise, in the next tab, there's</p> <p>3 a file that shows a marked-up version of the</p> <p>4 appendices, and again this shows you proposed</p> <p>5 changes to the appendices as they were published on</p> <p>6 December 2, 2024.</p> <p>7 The next document under this tab</p> <p>8 includes public comments that were received and</p> <p>9 DEQ's response to the comments.</p> <p>10 The final document is the final</p> <p>11 proposed rule text that incorporates the original</p> <p>12 changes proposed in the OAR filing as well as the</p> <p>13 additional changes that were made as a result of the</p> <p>14 public comments received. And speaking generally,</p> <p>15 the suggestions in the public comments are generally</p> <p>16 intended to clarify definitions and terms throughout</p> <p>17 the rule.</p> <p>18 So let me begin with a review of the</p> <p>19 final proposed rule, beginning with Subchapter 1,</p> <p>20 titled "General Provisions". This subchapter</p> <p>21 contains Definitions. There are several proposed</p> <p>22 changes, a few that were made in response to the</p> <p>23 public comments. You will notice a new definition</p> <p>24 for "Licensed experience" and also that the</p> <p>25 definition of "Operating experience" is deleted.</p>	<p>Page 39</p> <p>1 "Certification". As with the previous subchapter,</p> <p>2 several of the proposed changes result from the</p> <p>3 public comments and are intended to clarify</p> <p>4 definitions and terms.</p> <p>5 Section 710-3-31, titled "Certificate</p> <p>6 required", proposes a change that allows DEQ to</p> <p>7 determine if Non-community and minor systems are</p> <p>8 required to have certified operators. This would be</p> <p>9 based on the complexity of the system as determined</p> <p>10 by DEQ.</p> <p>11 Section 710-3-36, titled "Approved</p> <p>12 equivalents for waterworks/wastewater works</p> <p>13 operators", proposes changes that clarify approved</p> <p>14 equivalents.</p> <p>15 Subchapter 5, titled "Duties and</p> <p>16 Responsibilities". Changes to this subchapter are</p> <p>17 minor style-type corrections and clarification of</p> <p>18 terms, such as replacing "registered helper" with</p> <p>19 "Non-certified helper".</p> <p>20 Subchapter 7, titled "Shared</p> <p>21 Operators for Small Systems". Proposed changes for</p> <p>22 this subchapter rephrases current language and</p> <p>23 contains minor changes to improve the readability of</p> <p>24 the rule.</p> <p>25 In conclusion, DEQ is asking the</p>
<p>Page 38</p> <p>1 This is to clarify that Operating experience means</p> <p>2 licensed experience. Another change in the</p> <p>3 definitions is changing the name "Registered helper"</p> <p>4 to "Non-certified helper".</p> <p>5 In Section 252:710-1-5, clarification</p> <p>6 is proposed for "Application requirements" and</p> <p>7 includes several changes from the public comments in</p> <p>8 order to better define terms and requirements.</p> <p>9 In Section 252:710-1-7(d), this is</p> <p>10 changed to cite the military exception statute for</p> <p>11 renewals.</p> <p>12 Section 252:710-1-7.1, titled</p> <p>13 "Submission of standard and general courses", is a</p> <p>14 new section that, in part, requires attendance</p> <p>15 records for classes to be submitted in an</p> <p>16 established format in order to ensure accuracy and</p> <p>17 transparency. Another proposed change allows</p> <p>18 approval of webinars and online courses that are</p> <p>19 less than four hours.</p> <p>20 Section 710-1-12, titled "Fee</p> <p>21 Schedules", now provides for automatically adjusting</p> <p>22 fees in correspondence with the Consumer Price Index</p> <p>23 from every five years to annually in order to meet</p> <p>24 rising costs of the operator certification program.</p> <p>25 Next is Subchapter 3,</p>	<p>Page 40</p> <p>1 council to recommend to the Environmental Quality</p> <p>2 Board this permanent rulemaking for Chapter 710.</p> <p>3 MR. DUZAN: Thanks, Brian. A lot of</p> <p>4 little things in there. Did this roll through their</p> <p>5 -- didn't they have a group that -- or was this all</p> <p>6 generated from the DEQ?</p> <p>7 MR. CLAGG: I may ask Brandon if he would</p> <p>8 like to come up to speak to that.</p> <p>9 MR. DUZAN: Because I know in the past,</p> <p>10 they've had --</p> <p>11 MR. CLAGG: Stakeholder meetings?</p> <p>12 MR. DUZAN: -- stakeholder meetings that</p> <p>13 have driven a lot of this.</p> <p>14 MR. TYLER: Yes, hi, I'm Brandon. This</p> <p>15 kind of started last minute, and so it was done with</p> <p>16 the Op Cert group and then just inside the public</p> <p>17 meetings itself, there wasn't another group on this</p> <p>18 one.</p> <p>19 MR. DUZAN: Any questions or comments from</p> <p>20 the council?</p> <p>21 MR. LEE: Yes. So just help me</p> <p>22 understand, on 252:710-1-7, towards the bottom of</p> <p>23 page 7 -- or, .1, "Submission of standard and</p> <p>24 general courses". And so we have (a), "Standard</p> <p>25 courses", which, "provide DEQ with quantity of</p>

<p>Page 41</p> <p>1 proposed professional development hours"; then we 2 get into "In-person general courses" and we say, 3 "provide DEQ with documentation of a minimum of four 4 hours"; and then we go to "Other general courses" 5 and we say, "provide DEQ with documentation of a 6 minimum of 30 minutes". 7 So standard courses we submit with 8 any quantity? 9 MR. TYLER: Standard courses are your -- 10 it's another word for the examination courses that's 11 happening. So which part of the language are you 12 exactly talking about here? 13 MR. LEE: I'm just curious that we have 14 three different timeframes. One is any hours that 15 we choose, another's four hours, another's 30 16 minutes, and so -- 17 MR. TYLER: The standard courses are set 18 by what license experience it is, so it's dependent 19 in general on that. So if you're going for an A, 20 that's normally a 40-hour course, compared to a D, 21 which is a 16-hour course. And the standard courses 22 cover all of those classes. 23 MR. LEE: And then on the four hours or 24 the 30 minutes? 25 MR. TYLER: Those are your renewal is your</p>	<p>Page 43</p> <p>1 Chard. For conferences and events that are maybe 2 all day with different speakers or it may be 3 multi-day, we do have a process and have approved 4 those based on however many hours you attend those 5 presentations. 6 We have a form that gets initiated by 7 the moderator or someone from DEQ who is in the room 8 for that purpose. We do approve those, and that may 9 be anywhere from a small number up to three days' 10 worth of presentations. 11 MR. LEE: Okay. 12 Kenny, how do you feel about this? 13 MR. SCHWAB: I use what she said right 14 there. But basically on Appendix C, every class has 15 four hours -- or, sorry, every license has four 16 hours of classroom training. 17 MR. TYLER: Yes. 18 MR. SCHWAB: So as long as it's -- I think 19 you need the segments. 20 MR. LEE: Right, so -- but based on what 21 I'm hearing is I go to a conference and I get three 22 hours. Now, do I have to sit through a class for 23 four hours after that to make up my last hour? 24 MR. TYLER: Can I come in here real quick 25 with this? So what happens to a lot of operators</p>
<p>Page 42</p> <p>1 four-hour, your general in-person renewal classes 2 done across the state that I think D-level licenses 3 are required to have four in-person hours no matter 4 what, so that's kind of there. 5 But the aspect of the 30 minutes or 6 less came to play because a lot of the webinars that 7 are coming out and things that didn't meet our rules 8 and able to approve that for operator credit, we 9 were trying to put something in the rules that would 10 allow us to be able to get those good classes out 11 there, like go over cybersecurity and things like 12 that, to the operators and have it be approvable 13 under our rules. 14 MR. LEE: Are there scenarios where 15 in-person general courses could or should be less 16 than four hours that total up to four? 17 MR. TYLER: Can you say that again? 18 MR. LEE: So when an instructor -- 19 MR. SCHWAB: Two two-hour courses? 20 MR. LEE: Yeah. 21 MR. TYLER: Is that what you're meaning? 22 MR. LEE: Yeah. 23 MR. TYLER: Right now how the rules are 24 written, no, it would just be one four-hour course. 25 MS. CHARD: I would -- this is Shellie</p>	<p>Page 44</p> <p>1 when that happens is the class itself is four hours, 2 the operator will usually, if they're at that type 3 of situation, they will fill out their thing and get 4 two hours and have it signed off and then we'll 5 record two hours for them. 6 The class itself has to be approved 7 to four hours; the individuals attending the course 8 could be there for one to four, however long it is, 9 because emergency happens. We make sure to give 10 operators that are at least there because these guys 11 are there, stuff happens that they got to leave, 12 we're only giving them the credit they are in class 13 for that time, whether it's one hour, three hours, 14 however long it is. 15 MR. LEE: All right. So I'm running a 16 utility and I've got a training scheduled and I've 17 got a bunch of people that they just have an hour 18 left and I'm going to sit in a four-class, do you 19 then sign them all out in one hour? 20 MR. TYLER: Feel like that would be an 21 abuse of something. That is -- under the rules, 22 that seems like that could be something that could 23 happen, yes. 24 MR. LEE: Okay. Thanks. 25 MR. DUZAN: Any other questions or</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 comments from the council?</p> <p>2 MR. LEE: Yeah, sorry.</p> <p>3 Brandon, can you talk to me about on</p> <p>4 page 11, 252:710-3-32, the sentence that says, "Not</p> <p>5 more than one temporary" -- it's underlined, it's a</p> <p>6 new sentence. "Not more than one temporary</p> <p>7 certificate shall be issued to the same individual</p> <p>8 during any five-year period."</p> <p>9 So can I get a temporary water or a</p> <p>10 temporary wastewater, but not both?</p> <p>11 MR. TYLER: You can get both at the same</p> <p>12 time you're offering. Are you saying can you get</p> <p>13 one separate years apart, is that what you're</p> <p>14 asking?</p> <p>15 MR. LEE: Yeah, because it says here, "Not</p> <p>16 more than one temporary certificate shall be issued</p> <p>17 to the same individual", so is that -- and up above,</p> <p>18 you know, as we lead off this section under</p> <p>19 "Temporary", it's, "A person age 18 without valid</p> <p>20 certification shall apply for temporary</p> <p>21 certification as a waterworks or wastewater works",</p> <p>22 so they can apply for one or the other, but --</p> <p>23 MR. TYLER: I would go up a little bit</p> <p>24 higher with that, too, where it begins, "A temporary</p> <p>25 certificate is valid from one year from the date of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 back and bring back and forth.</p> <p>2 You're removing data at that point in</p> <p>3 time, going back and forth between the two, and so</p> <p>4 it's more of a policy on the inside of trying to</p> <p>5 keep everything standard and treating everybody the</p> <p>6 same across that, across the board.</p> <p>7 MR. LEE: So it's a limitation of the</p> <p>8 system we have in place?</p> <p>9 MR. TYLER: Yes.</p> <p>10 MR. LEE: Yes, Shellie?</p> <p>11 MS. CHARD: So we are in the process of</p> <p>12 updating that system and are going through the state</p> <p>13 process of purchasing a system that will serve our</p> <p>14 needs better.</p> <p>15 That being said, I am certainly</p> <p>16 willing to entertain an improvement to that</p> <p>17 sentence. If the council would like to specify that</p> <p>18 it is one water or wastewater certificate in that</p> <p>19 five years, I am certainly interested if that's what</p> <p>20 you would like to do.</p> <p>21 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>22 MS. CHARD: And it is very clear.</p> <p>23 MR. LEE: Yes, so I totally understand</p> <p>24 having the waterworks license for a five-year period</p> <p>25 or the wastewater works for a five-year period, but</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 employment and is not renewable" at that point in</p> <p>2 time.</p> <p>3 So that's taking the step that if you</p> <p>4 were already working at that facility, you could not</p> <p>5 apply for a water -- if you had a wastewater</p> <p>6 temporary when you got hired and you were already at</p> <p>7 that place for a year, you couldn't move over and</p> <p>8 apply for the temporary of the other site, you would</p> <p>9 need to go through the process.</p> <p>10 But if you stopped working for five</p> <p>11 years and came back into the industry, you could</p> <p>12 then apply for a temporary license again.</p> <p>13 MR. LEE: So I'm working on a temporary</p> <p>14 water license, I leave the industry and I come back</p> <p>15 three years later and do a temporary wastewater, I</p> <p>16 can't do that?</p> <p>17 MR. TYLER: How it is written, how it's</p> <p>18 there, "Not more than one temporary certificate</p> <p>19 shall be issued to the same individual during any</p> <p>20 five-year period", I would side with no on that.</p> <p>21 MR. LEE: Why is that?</p> <p>22 MR. TYLER: You -- it's kind of -- a</p> <p>23 little bit of this is kind of with the current</p> <p>24 database that we're working in. When you have that</p> <p>25 number in there and how it's gone, it's hard to tie</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 when we have small systems and people trying to get</p> <p>2 one or the other and we have such a hard time</p> <p>3 getting operators these days, I don't want to limit</p> <p>4 them from coming back and working in one of the</p> <p>5 other disciplines. So if it could be rewritten in</p> <p>6 such a way --</p> <p>7 MR. TYLER: This is how I believe the</p> <p>8 statute was written in occupational licensing. I</p> <p>9 don't know if that's one to look at changing, as</p> <p>10 well.</p> <p>11 MS. CHARD: Okay.</p> <p>12 Mr. Chairman, would you like to</p> <p>13 entertain a five-to-ten-minute recess or a break,</p> <p>14 whatever we need to call it, so the lawyers can look</p> <p>15 up the statutory language and then we'll reconvene</p> <p>16 immediately, as soon as she has a chance to do that?</p> <p>17 MR. DUZAN: Yeah.</p> <p>18 I would like to suggest that we take</p> <p>19 a five-to-ten-minute recess while we and the lawyers</p> <p>20 have a chance to review that.</p> <p>21 MS. MACH: I make a motion.</p> <p>22 MR. SCHWAB: I second.</p> <p>23 MR. DUZAN: We'll have a vote.</p> <p>24 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>25 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p>

<p>Page 49</p> <p>1 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>2 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>3 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>4 MS. MACH: Yes.</p> <p>5 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>6 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>7 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>8 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>9 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>10 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>11 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>12 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>13 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>14 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>15 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>16 MR. DUZAN: Okay. We are in recess.</p> <p>17 (Break taken from 2:59 p.m. to 3:09 p.m.)</p> <p>18 MR. DUZAN: Okay. We're going to go ahead</p> <p>19 and reconvene, so I think we'll have to have a vote</p> <p>20 to get us back in session.</p> <p>21 MS. MACH: I make a motion to reconvene</p> <p>22 our session.</p> <p>23 MR. SOWERS: Second.</p> <p>24 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Let's have a vote.</p> <p>25 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p>	<p>Page 51</p> <p>1 attorney for the Water Quality Division. We did</p> <p>2 take an opportunity to confirm by looking at</p> <p>3 statute, the underlying provision that we were</p> <p>4 speaking about before you took a recess does require</p> <p>5 that, quote, "Not more than one temporary</p> <p>6 certificate shall be issued to the same individual</p> <p>7 during any five-year period", and that is found at</p> <p>8 Title 59 Oklahoma Statutes Section -- I'm sorry,</p> <p>9 it's 1108. So that would -- that's required by</p> <p>10 statute.</p> <p>11 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Comments?</p> <p>12 MR. SMITH: I have a question. If it's</p> <p>13 required by statute, is it even needed in this</p> <p>14 language?</p> <p>15 MS. EBERLE: It is not necessarily needed</p> <p>16 in the rule. I'll defer to Brandon on this; I</p> <p>17 believe it was added to maybe clarify for the</p> <p>18 customer what it was.</p> <p>19 MR. TYLER: Yes, this is more for customer</p> <p>20 service purposes. With a lot of environmental</p> <p>21 rules, they can be found in a certain area; with</p> <p>22 occupational licensing, it's in a completely</p> <p>23 different area and a lot of people don't know where</p> <p>24 to look.</p> <p>25 So we do try to put as much -- got to</p>
<p>Page 50</p> <p>1 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>3 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>4 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>5 MS. MACH: Yes.</p> <p>6 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>7 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>8 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>9 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>10 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>11 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>12 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p> <p>13 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>14 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>15 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>16 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>17 MR. DUZAN: Now we messed up, probably,</p> <p>18 all your voting boxes by adding stuff.</p> <p>19 MS. FIELDS: It's okay.</p> <p>20 MR. DUZAN: Okay. So we're now back in</p> <p>21 session, and I believe we're going to have a</p> <p>22 statement from the lawyers as to what can and can't</p> <p>23 be done here.</p> <p>24 MS. EBERLE: Thank you.</p> <p>25 This is April Eberle, I'm the</p>	<p>Page 52</p> <p>1 put as much clarity in there as we can, especially</p> <p>2 with -- I mean, the temporary licenses are just a</p> <p>3 certain license of their own, so just kind of add</p> <p>4 that language in there for customer service, to an</p> <p>5 extent.</p> <p>6 DR. JARMAN: So is the only fix a change</p> <p>7 in the state law through the legislature?</p> <p>8 MS. EBERLE: I'm sorry, do you mind</p> <p>9 repeating the question?</p> <p>10 DR. JARMAN: So is the only fix to change</p> <p>11 the state law through the legislature?</p> <p>12 MS. EBERLE: Yes, sir.</p> <p>13 DR. JARMAN: Okay.</p> <p>14 MR. DUZAN: Any other comments?</p> <p>15 MR. LEE: Yeah, Mr. Chair, is it possible</p> <p>16 -- I heard that there was a working group that maybe</p> <p>17 has been used in the past.</p> <p>18 Is it possible to maybe reconvene</p> <p>19 that working group to go through this chapter and</p> <p>20 maybe evaluate and see if that change impacts</p> <p>21 operators and/or any other language within this</p> <p>22 section maybe to review it again?</p> <p>23 MR. DUZAN: Shellie?</p> <p>24 MS. CHARD: So we have a couple of</p> <p>25 options. I would suggest not reconvening just</p>


<p>Page 53</p> <p>1 because people have retired, have moved to different 2 positions. If the council would like for a 3 workgroup to be formed of affected stakeholders, we 4 would be happy to go through that process if you -- 5 you could just tell us that that's what you would 6 like to do.</p> <p>7 The other question that I would have 8 and would ask for clarification from the council is 9 do you want this rulemaking to be stopped here? I 10 would request if that is what you would like to do 11 that you allow me to withdraw that rulemaking just 12 because if you vote to not move it forward to the 13 Environmental Quality Board, there are certain 14 timelines that apply that we would need to follow.</p> <p>15 But if you feel strongly enough that 16 you would like us to convene a workgroup, go through 17 that process first before you vote on this chapter, 18 please let me know so that I can withdraw the rule 19 so you don't have to vote on that.</p> <p>20 MR. LEE: Mr. Chair, I would recommend not 21 withdrawing the rules because it is under state 22 statute so there's not really anything we can do 23 this, but in general it would be good to review this 24 chapter and make sure that the language we have here 25 as it applies to state statutes also fills the needs</p>	<p>Page 55</p> <p>1 there items within these current proposed rules that 2 are going to assist in your daily work and provide 3 clarification to the state that utilize these rules 4 quite often?</p> <p>5 MR. TYLER: As Shellie had mentioned 6 earlier, we're currently doing a large-scale upgrade 7 across the section and we have that bid out. We 8 don't know what's coming in with it yet, but 9 depending on what comes in with it, there could be a 10 large overhaul of the rules and how it's being done 11 now to make those changes.</p> <p>12 MS. MACH: I guess I mean are there things 13 that you need in there that are currently proposed 14 that will make your lives easier?</p> <p>15 MR. TYLER: I think there are certain 16 things in there for operators that make their lives 17 easier, especially --</p> <p>18 MS. MACH: Or clarifies?</p> <p>19 MR. TYLER: Yeah, or clarifies, especially 20 the approval of smaller -- of shorter class sizes 21 and things like that, I think that would be very 22 beneficial to have approved as soon as possible.</p> <p>23 MS. MACH: Given that, then I make a 24 motion to approve these rules as written.</p> <p>25 DR. JARMAN: Second.</p>
<p>Page 54</p> <p>1 that we have for operators within the state.</p> <p>2 And if we do need to make a change at 3 the state level with legislation changes that, you 4 know, we've had a group that has reviewed that and 5 we can actually propose something that shows that 6 there's been work behind that review, so, and that 7 proposal.</p> <p>8 MR. DUZAN: Okay. So basically we can 9 approve as written today, but still request a 10 workgroup be started for future changes down the 11 line, which may be a year from now or on down? Is 12 that what I'm hearing.</p> <p>13 MS. CHARD: Mr. Chairman, just a point of 14 clarification, once this rule goes to the 15 Environmental Quality Board and if they approve it, 16 we would have a minimum of one year before we would 17 open the rule again.</p> <p>18 That does give us plenty of time to 19 have a workgroup convened, but I just wanted to make 20 sure that the council understood that it would be at 21 least a year, possibly longer than that, before you 22 would see a product from the workgroup.</p> <p>23 MS. MACH: Thank you, Shellie.</p> <p>24 So from a staff perspective and those 25 of you that administer operator certifications, are</p>	<p>Page 56</p> <p>1 MR. DUZAN: Okay. We have a motion and a 2 second, we'll have a vote.</p> <p>3 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>4 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>5 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>6 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>7 Did we get comments from the public?</p> <p>8 MR. DUZAN: No, I don't think we did. Is 9 there any questions or comments from the public?</p> <p>10 Seeing none, we can --</p> <p>11 MR. SCHWAB: I do have one, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>12 MR. DUZAN: Okay.</p> <p>13 MR. SCHWAB: On -- back to the four hours, 14 the classroom, can there be a footnote on there that 15 says that this can be a combination of, I don't 16 know, 30-minute-minimum sessions or something to 17 equal a four-hour, something of that nature?</p> <p>18 MR. TYLER: Under that exact part of the 19 class --</p> <p>20 MR. SCHWAB: Yeah, that was in your 21 Appendix C.</p> <p>22 MR. TYLER: Oh, under Appendix C, okay.</p> <p>23 MR. SCHWAB: There was some discussion 24 about whether it was four hours -- kind of goes back 25 to the conferences that you talked about. Because</p>

<p>Page 57</p> <p>1 most of those conferences are 30-minute-to-45-minute 2 sessions that we sign over the course of a day or 3 two that they end up equaling that four-hour, if we 4 just have some footnote for clarification. 5 MR. TYLER: Okay. I think we can do that. 6 MS. CHARD: If the council would like to 7 amend the motion when it is made to direct the staff 8 to add a clarifying footnote, we will do that. 9 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Does somebody want to 10 make the motion? 11 MR. SCHWAB: I make the motion to approve 12 as written, with a clarifying footnote on the 13 classroom training in Appendix C. 14 MR. LEE: Second. 15 MR. DUZAN: Okay. We have a motion and a 16 second, we'll have a vote. 17 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman? 18 DR. JARMAN: Yes. 19 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee? 20 MR. LEE: Yes. 21 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach? 22 MS. MACH: Yes. 23 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz? 24 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes. 25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p>	<p>Page 59</p> <p>1 MR. LEE: I was going to nominate 2 Mr. Schwab. 3 MS. CHARD: Okay. So we have Ms. Mach, 4 Mr. Schwab, Mr. Smith. We will then ask that the 5 others of you, should you develop an interest, 6 please contact us before you attend a meeting to 7 ensure that we don't violate Open Meetings Act, and 8 so we will take it from there. Thank you. 9 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Thank you, Shellie. 10 And now you're next on the agenda with the 11 Director's Report. 12 MS. CHARD: Great. Thank you all very 13 much. 14 The first thing I would like to do is 15 make an announcement that was announced to the 16 senior leadership at the agency two or three hours 17 ago, and that is George Russell is no longer the 18 interim Director of the State Environmental 19 Laboratory. The "Interim" has been removed; so he 20 is now officially the full-time Director of the 21 State Environmental Laboratory Services Division. 22 [Applause.] 23 MS. CHARD: And then I'll turn things over 24 to George first and then I've got a couple of things 25 that I would like to discuss with you.</p>
<p>Page 58</p> <p>1 MR. SMITH: Yes. 2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab? 3 MR. SCHWAB: Yes. 4 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers? 5 MR. SOWERS: Yes. 6 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan? 7 MR. DUZAN: Yes. 8 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed. 9 MR. DUZAN: Okay. So that I guess is 10 closed, but we can still look at forming the 11 workgroup, which will probably be more important if 12 you're changing your software, you're probably going 13 to want to change other stuff; so this probably will 14 come up after a year from now and probably ongoing. 15 MS. CHARD: And so we will convene the 16 stakeholder group while we're still going through 17 this process because some of this is not software or 18 tracking related, and then we will continue to have 19 that group operate as we get the new program 20 purchased, installed, operational, and then at that 21 time we could reevaluate everything, continuing with 22 the same workgroup. 23 I would ask, are there any council 24 members that would like to be a participant in that 25 workgroup?</p>	<p>Page 60</p> <p>1 MR. RUSSELL: Thank you for the applause, 2 I appreciate that. That was very nice, made me feel 3 good inside. I also want to introduce somebody new. 4 So we recently hired a new Assistant Division 5 Director for the State Environmental Lab and his 6 name's Dustin Davidson, he's in the back. 7 So Dustin, you can direct any 8 complaints, comments, questions to him and he will 9 just -- no, we're happy to have him on board and 10 excited to do some really good things here in the 11 future with the lab. 12 So thank you, Shellie. 13 MS. CHARD: Okay. There are a couple of 14 things that I do want to touch on a little bit, a 15 couple of things that we've covered already, that is 16 the DEQ budget hearing is tomorrow. So we will 17 perhaps have an indication on the likelihood of some 18 funding that we requested related to lead and 19 copper, although it won't be final until all the 20 votes are taken, likely in mid-to-late May, but that 21 is something that is high on our list. 22 I'm sure you all have heard we are 23 having a new President, a new administration coming 24 later this month. One of the things that happens 25 when we have a change in federal administration,</p>

<p>Page 61</p> <p>1 there's the Congressional Review Act that kicks in. 2 Any rule, policy guidance, those 3 types of things, the new Congress has 90 days to -- 4 or, a 90-day look-back so they can determine if 5 something should be overturned or remanded to the 6 Agency of the rules and issues we've talked about 7 here.</p> <p>8 There is one of the rules that is 9 subject to that, that's the Lead and Copper 10 Improvement Rule. Don't know what's going to 11 happen, but that is one that is in that window that 12 it's relatively easy for that to be pulled back.</p> <p>13 Based on the fact that the original 14 version of this rule was the first Trump 15 administration putting together this rule and 16 getting that out and in effect, I don't know if that 17 will have any bearing on whether it will be 18 reviewed, changed, or left in place, but I think 19 we'll know relatively soon what's going to happen 20 there.</p> <p>21 For PFAS, the drinking water rules, 22 they're outside that window. There are multiple 23 lawsuits from some of the bigtime players in the 24 water sector. They won't be able to pull back that 25 rule, but there could be a federal court that makes</p>	<p>Page 63</p> <p>1 if y'all figure that out. 2 So, you know, there's -- obviously 3 there's some education that has to happen. DEQ has 4 had conversations with the author, but his 5 constituents are very unhappy about the land 6 application of biosolids. So that's something we 7 will definitely be talking about at each of our 8 meetings until we have some resolution there, but 9 that's going to be a big one for sure.</p> <p>10 One piece of good news that I did 11 want to share with you is through our enforcement 12 process at a drinking water facility, in lieu of a 13 pretty significant cash penalty, we are contracting 14 with a national expert to come in and do free 15 water/wastewater cybersecurity training.</p> <p>16 We will have at the joint meeting of 17 the Oklahoma Water Environment Association and 18 American Public Works Association of Oklahoma, there 19 will be a half-day cybersecurity workshop that the 20 contractor will come in and do. They will also be 21 doing cybersecurity for water/wastewater in a 22 similar manner that we do what we refer to as our 23 road show.</p> <p>24 So we will be having the contractors 25 going out to a variety of areas in the state. We're</p>
<p>Page 62</p> <p>1 a decision that some or all of that rule be 2 remanded, repealed, an injunction, or continue on. 3 So we will definitely be paying attention on that, 4 but it will not fall under the easy button to 5 review.</p> <p>6 There are two PFAS related on the 7 wastewater side, also. Human health criteria is the 8 most recent that's been released. Those numbers -- 9 we thought the drinking water numbers were tiny, 10 these numbers make those look enormous. It's about 11 -- I don't remember the exact numbers, but it's 12 0.0000 and then numbers, nanograms or parts per 13 trillion, so that's -- we can't measure that; so I 14 suspect that's one that may get a look, definitely.</p> <p>15 The other PFAS sort of related item, 16 we do have a bill, it's Senate Bill 3. It's really 17 tied to biosolids and a moratorium that would revoke 18 any existing permits and would not allow any new 19 permits for the land application of biosolids. Some 20 of the concerns historically have been odor, metals, 21 and now PFAS.</p> <p>22 You know, I've heard lots of 23 conversations about this one, don't know what's 24 going to happen. One of the suggestions was that 25 cities should stop making biosolids, so let me know</p>	<p>Page 64</p> <p>1 looking at at least four, maybe seven or eight 2 in-person cybersecurity training events for water 3 and wastewater operators, public works directors, 4 city managers.</p> <p>5 We will be inviting systems that are 6 kind of in the geographic area and certainly we 7 will, you know, be doing at least one in the 8 Oklahoma City area and one in the Tulsa area and 9 then around the state. So that's going to be a 10 great opportunity to get that needed training at no 11 cost and to limit the travel required to 12 participate.</p> <p>13 The other part of that penalty 14 settlement is a minimum of ten - if there's 15 additional funding, it would go into additional 16 training sessions - that we will have basically a 17 learning library, e-learning so that we could make 18 available top-tier-level training to anyone in 19 Oklahoma, any of our operators would be able to 20 access that training for free.</p> <p>21 We have a prioritized list. It's 22 things where we see a lot of noncompliance, where we 23 see new rule requirements, developing emergency 24 response plans, some things that we definitely have 25 seen and need over the years. So that will be</p>

<p>Page 65</p> <p>1 rolling out probably spring, all of the contracts 2 are to be in place no later than March. So we're 3 very excited to have some of those opportunities 4 that we have not had in the past to get that kind of 5 training available.</p> <p>6 With that, I know we've been here a 7 while today, I will stop there and be happy to 8 answer any questions that any of you have.</p> <p>9 MR. LEE: Hi, Shellie. So you mentioned 10 the PFAS human health criteria for the three PFAS 11 chemicals. The way I understand it is states can 12 choose whether to adopt those or not. Do you have 13 an opinion on that at this point?</p> <p>14 MS. CHARD: So those criteria would have 15 to go into Oklahoma Water Quality Standards, those 16 were transferred to us now a couple of years ago. 17 We are working through all of the requested changes 18 that are needed by Oklahoma permitted facilities.</p> <p>19 We have a long list of things that we 20 have to work through that were EPA-requested changes 21 to existing standards and we'll have to make those 22 decisions, and when we get through that then we 23 would have to look at the new recommended-by-EPA 24 standards.</p> <p>25 And so at this time, we are not</p>	<p>Page 67</p> <p>1 hazardous waste, then they would have to go to the 2 hazardous waste landfills.</p> <p>3 We know right now that some of the 4 solid waste landfills, you know, certainly take 5 biosolids, they mix it with other materials they 6 receive. There's some concern about slope 7 stabilization or destabilization if they are taking 8 large quantities of biosolids.</p> <p>9 There are also -- some experts say we 10 absolutely do not have landfill capacity for 11 biosolids, others say, 'Oh, yeah, there's plenty of 12 capacity'. So I don't know enough to confirm one 13 way or the other, but those are certainly 14 conversations that we're going to be having.</p> <p>15 MR. LEE: And so I guess that would also 16 mean that any biosolids mixed with wood chips to 17 create compost would also be considered potentially 18 hazardous, as well, not be able to be manufactured 19 or processed?</p> <p>20 MS. CHARD: I would say the one thing we 21 know for sure, if you could be Class A designation 22 it is no longer a sewage sludge, a biosolid, it is a 23 consumer product and has a very different regulatory 24 process that is not a DEQ process.</p> <p>25 As many of you may know, if you buy</p>
<p>Page 66</p> <p>1 working to include this into Oklahoma's Water 2 Quality Standards. Within a short amount of time, a 3 couple of years maybe, if this standard stands, then 4 EPA would have the ability to object to any Oklahoma 5 permits that do not consider those standards.</p> <p>6 So we will be working through all of 7 that process. As of right now, we are not doing 8 anything with the proposed or finalized in the last 9 90 days water quality standards until we know if 10 they're going to stand through the Congressional 11 Review Act or a Presidential executive order that 12 would require that they be pulled back and something 13 happen. So right now we're not, but that's right 14 now.</p> <p>15 MR. LEE: Thank you.</p> <p>16 And then also, you mentioned State 17 Senate Bill 3. If PFOA and PFAS are labeled 18 hazardous and biosolids cannot be land applied, 19 would they go to a -- what is it, a Subtitle D 20 landfill or would they go to a hazardous waste 21 landfill or where would those go?</p> <p>22 MS. CHARD: I think that's an excellent 23 question. That -- it would have to be determined if 24 they are considered a hazardous waste and the 25 biosolids contained enough that they trigger</p>	<p>Page 68</p> <p>1 fertilizer at Walmart, Lowe's, Home Depot called 2 Milorganite, it is Milwaukee Class A biosolids. So 3 it is -- once it meets Class A, it's no longer 4 considered a biosolid or something regulated in the 5 environmental statutes.</p> <p>6 MR. LEE: And maybe this question is for 7 legal counsel, I don't know, but are there any rules 8 that require wastewater treatment plants to take 9 landfill leachate?</p> <p>10 MS. CHARD: It is not required.</p> <p>11 MR. LEE: So --</p> <p>12 MS. CHARD: Yeah, it's not required.</p> <p>13 MR. LEE: -- just out of curiosity - do 14 you see where I'm connecting the dots - so what 15 happens to landfill leachate if wastewater treatment 16 plants no longer take it because they don't want the 17 PFAS in their biosolids?</p> <p>18 MS. CHARD: There are some I know around 19 the country, they have their own UIC well and they 20 inject the leachate.</p> <p>21 MR. LEE: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>22 DR. JARMAN: Shellie, some time back you 23 talked about the EPA reviewing the water quality 24 standards and the consternation they have about 25 annual standards rather than triennial. Can you</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 kind of give us an update on that?</p> <p>2 MS. CHARD: They still prefer triennial</p> <p>3 review that is specified. It's a workload issue for</p> <p>4 them. Because of the movement of the standards to</p> <p>5 DEQ from the Water Board, we will do a triennial</p> <p>6 review, a once-every-three-year review and</p> <p>7 submission because it's taken us a couple years to</p> <p>8 get the rules in place. And we will do that,</p> <p>9 already starting to work on it.</p> <p>10 They haven't told us we cannot do an</p> <p>11 annual update. I think we will be making that</p> <p>12 decision based on what makes sense to us. If they</p> <p>13 sit on it and don't review or respond, I guess</p> <p>14 that's their prerogative, but we are building</p> <p>15 relationships with the standards people; so that's</p> <p>16 going to be helpful for us.</p> <p>17 Another change of personnel that</p> <p>18 should be helpful to us in looking at what we need</p> <p>19 to do with whether it be our rules or our permits</p> <p>20 or, in this case, standards, as some of you know,</p> <p>21 Troy Hill was named the Director of the Office of</p> <p>22 Water in Dallas. He's got a lot of experience in</p> <p>23 the water programs and has really good relationships</p> <p>24 with a lot of us at DEQ.</p> <p>25 And just in the last two or three</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 Clean Water Act, there's a draft --</p> <p>2 MS. CHARD: The final has come out. The</p> <p>3 final was published, I thought.</p> <p>4 DR. PAWLISZ: The Aquatic Life Criteria</p> <p>5 was final, but I'm talking about --</p> <p>6 MS. CHARD: Yes.</p> <p>7 DR. PAWLISZ: -- human health --</p> <p>8 MS. CHARD: Okay.</p> <p>9 DR. PAWLISZ: -- criteria which was</p> <p>10 drafted in December.</p> <p>11 MS. CHARD: Yes.</p> <p>12 DR. PAWLISZ: So in context of the</p> <p>13 Congressional Review Act - I'm not a legal scholar -</p> <p>14 but does the CRA apply to draft rules, as well?</p> <p>15 MS. CHARD: It applies -- yes and no.</p> <p>16 Because it's not final, it does not have to go</p> <p>17 through the official Congress taking an action.</p> <p>18 Something that is not finalized, the President, who</p> <p>19 is head of the Executive Branch agencies - which</p> <p>20 includes EPA - could simply say, 'I want that pulled</p> <p>21 back, we're not moving forward', or, 'I definitely</p> <p>22 am in favor of something, I want that to move</p> <p>23 forward'.</p> <p>24 Typically, that's what we see for</p> <p>25 something that is not final, but it just stays as</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 weeks, his Assistant Director for the Office of</p> <p>2 Water has been named, Curry Jones, he also has a</p> <p>3 very long history in the water programs, both in</p> <p>4 program and enforcement side, and he definitely has</p> <p>5 a lot of really good relationships with DEQ staff;</p> <p>6 so I think that will be helpful.</p> <p>7 Not that we would take advantage of</p> <p>8 the relationships we have built over the years, but</p> <p>9 we absolutely will if we need to. We have an</p> <p>10 agreement, Troy and I do, that one text message from</p> <p>11 the other is an immediate meeting and we've got to</p> <p>12 figure it out, whatever it is.</p> <p>13 So at this point, I am not concerned</p> <p>14 about us needing to make a change and EPA saying,</p> <p>15 'No, you have to wait two years'. But time will</p> <p>16 tell.</p> <p>17 MR. DUZAN: Okay. Any other questions or</p> <p>18 comments for Shellie?</p> <p>19 DR. PAWLISZ: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I know</p> <p>20 we are running over time here, but maybe a couple</p> <p>21 questions.</p> <p>22 MR. DUZAN: Okay.</p> <p>23 DR. PAWLISZ: Thank you.</p> <p>24 Shellie, similar to the previous</p> <p>25 questions on the draft, human life material under</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 proposed or it is -- the agency pulls it back and</p> <p>2 may or may not do something.</p> <p>3 We have not been given a lot of clear</p> <p>4 indication of what they will do, but with that said,</p> <p>5 I will tell you that members of the new</p> <p>6 administration have reached out to certain</p> <p>7 governors, including Oklahoma's governor, to ask if</p> <p>8 there are rules, policies, guidance, whatever it is,</p> <p>9 that we think should be evaluated or left in place;</p> <p>10 so that process is happening across the country. So</p> <p>11 it may be three weeks before we know, or two weeks</p> <p>12 now, I guess, but then we'll get an idea of what's</p> <p>13 happening.</p> <p>14 The other big study that was supposed</p> <p>15 to be out before the end of calendar year '24 that</p> <p>16 I've been told is still coming, and that is the</p> <p>17 biosolids risk assessment out of the EPA Office of</p> <p>18 Science and Technology. Don't know, but their</p> <p>19 longtime director for that office retired effective</p> <p>20 in December; so I don't know who's championing</p> <p>21 getting that out, but that's one I suspect we may</p> <p>22 see between now and inauguration.</p> <p>23 DR. PAWLISZ: Thank you, Shellie, that was</p> <p>24 my specific question; so thank you for reading my</p> <p>25 mind.</p>

<p>1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>2 MR. DUZAN: Any other questions for</p> <p>3 Shellie?</p> <p>4 Okay. We'll move on. There is no</p> <p>5 New Business, and our next scheduled meeting is</p> <p>6 April 22nd, 2:00, in this room.</p> <p>7 So having said that, I will entertain</p> <p>8 a motion to dismiss.</p> <p>9 MR. SMITH: Move to adjourn.</p> <p>10 DR. JARMAN: Second.</p> <p>11 MR. DUZAN: We have a motion and a second,</p> <p>12 we'll have a vote.</p> <p>13 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Jarman?</p> <p>14 DR. JARMAN: Yes.</p> <p>15 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Lee?</p> <p>16 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>17 MS. FIELDS: Ms. Mach?</p> <p>18 MS. MACH: Yes.</p> <p>19 MS. FIELDS: Dr. Pawlisz?</p> <p>20 DR. PAWLISZ: Yes.</p> <p>21 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Schwab?</p> <p>22 MR. SCHWAB: Yes.</p> <p>23 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Smith?</p> <p>24 MR. SMITH: Yes.</p> <p>25 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Sowers?</p>	<p>Page 73</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE</p> <p>2 I, Jenny Longley, Certified Shorthand</p> <p>3 Reporter within and for the State of Oklahoma, do</p> <p>4 hereby certify that the above and foregoing meeting</p> <p>5 was by me taken in shorthand and thereafter</p> <p>6 transcribed; and that I am not an attorney for nor</p> <p>7 relative of any of said parties or otherwise</p> <p>8 interested in the event of said action.</p> <p>9 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto</p> <p>10 set my hand and official seal this 8th day of</p> <p>11 January, 2025.</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 </p> <p>14 Jenny Longley, CSR</p> <p>15 CSR # 1903</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p>1 MR. SOWERS: Yes.</p> <p>2 MS. FIELDS: Mr. Duzan?</p> <p>3 MR. DUZAN: Yes.</p> <p>4 MS. FIELDS: Motion passed.</p> <p>5 MR. DUZAN: We are adjourned.</p> <p>6 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:43 PM)</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 74</p>



**OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality**

WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

Attendance Record
January 7, 2025
Department of Environmental Quality
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

CHECK BOX TO COMMENT

<u>NAME and/or AFFILIATION</u>	<u>Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail</u>
Brian Duzon WQMAC	or file
Bill Smith WQMAC	wbsmith@hustle.us
Brian Clagg DEQ	brian.clagg@deg.ok.gov
Rob Jarman NQAAC	jarman.env@coz.net
ANDREW PAWLISZ EFO	AWPAWLISZ@MAIL.COM
Emily Rowland COBA	ERowland@brokenarrowok.gov
Charlie Bright COBA	cbright@brokenarrowok.gov
Kenny Schwab COBA	kschwab@brokenarrowok.gov
Shellee Chard DEQ	shellee.chard@deg.ok.gov
George Russell DEQ	george.g.russell@deg.ok.gov
April Eberle DEQ	april.eberle@deg.ok.gov
Quiana Fielder DEQ	
Afiya Wilkins DEQ	afiya.wilkins@deg.ok.gov
John Brown DEQ	john.brown@deg.ok.gov
MARK STASYSZEN DEQ	mark.stasyszen@deg.ok.gov
Bryce Callies Gower	brcallies@gowerusa.com
Dustin Davidson DEQ	dustin.davidson@deg.ok.gov
Tita Lindsey Comanche Nation DEPA	Tita.Lindsey@ComancheNation.com
Andrew Thomas Muscogee (Creek) Nation	athomas@muscogeenation.com
Cyrus Blankenship Muscogee (Creek) Nation	cblankenship@muscogeenation.com
Karen Steele DEQ	karen.steele@deg.ok.gov
Erin Hatfield DEQ	
Eric Lee City of Tulsa	elec@cityoftulsa.org
Luke Mills DEQ	luke.mills@deg.ok.gov



**OKLAHOMA
Environmental
Quality**

WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

Attendance Record

January 7, 2025

Department of Environmental Quality
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

CHECK BOX TO COMMENT

NAME and/or AFFILIATION

Address and/or Phone and/or E-Mail

Phillip Cravatt Chickasaw Nation phillip.cravatt@chickasaw.net
Kelsey Norton " " kelsey.norton@chickasaw.net

Susan Mensik

DEQ

susan.mensik@deq.ok.gov

Cathy Gillingham City of Tulsa

cgillingham@cityoftulsa.org

CHRIS ROBINSON ODEQ

Sydney Hames ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ (405) 412-1516

Michelle Wynn

DEQ

Wynnie Chan

DEQ

405-702-9113

Jeremy B. Toole

OGE

Madison Miller

OGE

Madison Miller

ODEQ

Nathan Riley

OOWA

nriley@maip.com

GREG CARR

ODEQ

gregory.carr@deq.ok.gov

Mark Hildebrand

ODEQ

mark.hildebrand@deq.ok.gov

Jeff Everett

OGE

everettj@oqe.com

Ed Fite

GRDA-ECO

edwardofite@grda.com

Lloyd Kirk

ODEQ

lloyd.kirk@deq.ok.gov