Minutes
Environmental Management Commission Meeting
Alabama Department of Environmental Management Building
1400 Coliseum Boulevard
Montgomery, Alabama 36110-2400
June 15, 2012

This is to certify that the Minutes contained herein are a true and accurate account of actions taken by the Alabama Environmental Management Commission on June 15, 2012.

John H. Lester, D.V.M.

Invironmental Management Commission

Certified this 17th day of August 2012.

Minutes

Environmental Management Commission Meeting Alabama Department of Environmental Management Building 1400 Coliseum Boulevard Montgomery, Alabama 36110-2400 June 15, 2012

Convened:

11:00 a.m.

Adjourned:

11:30 a.m.

Part A

Transcript Word Index

Part B

Attachment 1 - Agenda

Part A

			Julie 13, 2012
	Page 1	:	Page 3
1	ALABAMA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	1	(The meeting begins at 11:00 a.m.)
2	COMMISSION MEETING	2	,
3		3	CHAIRMAN LESTER: We call
4		4	the meeting to order, but we don't have a
5		1	quorum. Scott had a wreck coming down here
6			this morning, and it wasn't but four of us
7			going to be here, and there's a few out.
8			So we hope he's going to be all right.
9	ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL		He's carrying to the hospital.
10	MANAGEMENT	10	That's what you understand?
11	Alabama Room	11	So we hope he's going to be all
12	1400 Coliseum Boulevard	12	right. So as far as our meeting will go,
13	Montgomery, Alabama 36110-2400		we can go we can take no action because
14	June 15, 2012	1	there's not a quorum. But we are going to
15	11:00 a.m.		call on the Director to give his report,
16		1	and then we will set our next meeting
17		1	which we can't vote on that either, but we
18			will put it out, and our secretary will
19			contact each member.
20		20	And if I could, I just wanted
21		1	Robert as the fourth member today, but he
22		1	said that wasn't legal. So it's one of
	Taken by: Victoria M. Castillo, CCR#17		these situations you get into when
			are so stantions you get into when
	Page 2		Page 4
1	APPEARANCES	1	everybody's busy and you have a wreck or
2			something. We will all have him in our
3	COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:	1	prayers.
4	John H. Lester, D.V.M., Chair	4	Here's the Director.
5	Terry D. Richardson, Ph.D.	5	MR. LeFLEUR: Thank you,
6	Samuel L. Miller, M.D.	1 -	Mr. Chairman. Would you like for me to
7		i	drag this out as long as I can?
8	COMMISSION MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:	8	CHAIRMAN LESTER: The good
9	James B. Laier, Ph.D., P.B.	_	thing about him, he meets with each
10	H. Lanier Brown, II, Esquire, Vice		Commissioner individually, wherever you
11	Chair		live. Some of them's in north Alabama,
12	W. Scott Phillips	1	south Alabama, west Alabama, east Alabama,
13		1	everywhere. And he meets with us and goes
14	ALSO PRESENT:		through everything that's happening, in
15	Robert Tambling, EMC Legal Counsel		detail. That's the long version he's
16	Debi Thomas, EMC Executive Assistant	16	talking about.
17	Lance R. LeFleur, ADEM Director	17	So each Commissioner is always
18		18	abreast of what is going on as far as the
19		19	Department and what's happening in the
20			state. And especially with this budget
21		1	we're going through now, and how he and the
22			Department survive going through this, I
23		1	don't know. I've never seen anything like
		دء	don't know. I vo hever seen anything fixe
		1	

Ala Co	abama Department of Enviromental Management mmission Meeting		June	15, 2012
	Page 5			Page 7
1	this where the State is taking our money,	1	for our operating budget, which is 30	
- 1	turns around and withholds a million of it,	2	percent less than last year, and a special	
3	and then gives it back to us. It's our	3	11 1 0000000000000000000000000000000000	
	money of our deposit. When he gets	4	Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations	
1	doing that, I don't know how he does it,	5	~	
6	but he and the Department does. And the	6	At this funding level, the	
7	attorney keeps us out of jail, and Debi	7	Department will only be able to operate the	
8	keeps us going good. So that's my speech.	1	water program and generate sufficient	
9		1	matching funds to secure all available	
10	illustrated that there's a lot of people	10		
11	involved in making things work.	11	resources in fiscal '13. Those one-time	
12	Good morning, and welcome to all	12	resources will not be available in fiscal	
13		13		
14	scheduled meetings of the Alabama	14	moving forward.	
15	Environmental Management Commission for	15	It should further be noted that	
16	fiscal year 2012.	16	the legislature transferred \$4.1 million	
17	I will briefly report on the	17	out of the Scrap Tire Fund into the General	
18	fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013	18	Fund in the same action that appropriated	
19	budgets, and then focus the bulk of this	19	the \$3.2 million to the Department's	
20	report on what I believe are crucial	20	budget.	
21	decisions regarding the future operation of	21	The Scrap Tire Fund, funded with	
22	the Department. I will close with a brief	22	a special one dollar fee on each new tire	
23	summary of environmental legislative	23	purchase, was created for the express	
	Page 6			Page 8
1	activity during the recently completed	1	purpose of cleaning up scrap tire dumps and	
2	legislative session.	2	promoting beneficial reuse of scrap tires	
3		3	to keep new dumps from being created.	
4	the final one-third of fiscal year 2012.	4	With this action, in effect, the	
5	There have been no additional cuts to this	5	Department's budget was cut from	

- 6 year's budget since we last met. As a
- 7 result of the implementation of previously
- 8 announced cost cutting measures, the
- 9 Department is on target to operate for the
- 10 remainder of the year within our budget as
- 11 it now stands.
- I can also report that EPA has 12
- 13 now released the remaining five percent of
- 14 our federal funding allotment, which was
- 15 being held back, so our liquidity has
- 16 improved.
- 17 2013 budgets -- the Legislature
- 18 recently finished its 2012 regular session,
- 19 as well as a special session. The final
- 20 State General Fund fiscal year 2012 budget
- 21 that was passed by the Legislature, and
- 22 subsequently signed by Governor Bentley,
- 23 provided the Department with \$2.9 million

- 6 approximately \$4.2 million in fiscal year
- 7 2012 to \$3.2 million in fiscal year 2013,
- 8 and that \$3.2 million in fiscal '13 was
- 9 funded with Scrap Tire money. The
- 10 remaining approximately one million dollars
- 11 taken out of the Scrap Tire Fund went into
- 12 other uses within the State General Fund.
- 13 2014 budgets -- as we look at
- 14 the path forward to fiscal year 2014 and
- 15 beyond, we must consider that the Governor
- 16 and the Legislature have clearly spoken.
- 17 No new General Fund revenue will be
- 18 available in fiscal year 2014.
- 19 Additionally, demands for the limited
- 20 available funding for critical State
- 21 services are anticipated to increase in
- 22 fiscal year 2014.
- Since the Department actually 23

23 State to have the services provided by a

	mmission Meeting		June	15, 2012
	Page	9		Page 11
1	provided funds to, rather than receiving	1	state agency whenever possible, rather than	
	funds from, the General Fund in fiscal year		having them provided by EPA.	
3		3		
4	best, no funding of the Department from the	4	would like to address the remaining	
t	State general funds in fiscal year 2014.		questions. Our second question is, "What is	
6	The consequences of continuing		the quality of the service provided by the	
7	the funding scheme utilized in 2013 are		Department?" And please direct your	
1	far-reaching. Many state agencies are in		attention to the monitor, and I will	
l	similar situations. So before presenting a		apologize if you're unable to see all of	
	plan on how to address our situation, it's	1	the detail on these slides. I have copies	
ł	important to consider questions that the		of them for anybody who would like copies	
	people of Alabama should rightly ask of any		of these slides at the end of this	
	agency in these difficult financial times.		presentation.	
14	First, "Are the Department's	14		
	services necessary?" Second, "What is the		was generated by the United States Office	
	quality of the service provided by the		-	
	• •	16		
1	Department?" And third, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?"	17		
	funding level for the Department?"	18	,	
19	Addressing the first question,	19		
	the Department was created in 1982 to be a	- 1	2011 by the Office of Inspector General.	
	one-stop shop for the issuance of permits	21	1	
	required by the federal laws known as the	- 1	performance of the air, water, and land	
23	Clean Air Act; the Clean Water Act; and the	23	programs for each environmental agency in	
	Page 1	0		Page 12
1	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, or	1	each of the 50 states. The Office of	
	RCRA.	- 1	Inspector General is an authoritative,	
3	The State was delegated	1	independent, and impartial entity. These	
4	authority to administer the requirements of		maps were generated from data in the EPA	
	these federal laws when the State met EPA	4	Office of Enforcement and Compliance	
	standards for having enabling legislation		Assurance database for the period 2003	
l	in place and an entity with the necessary	- 1	through 2009.	
l	resources to issue, determine compliance	8	/mi.' . ! 1 1! .!	
	with, and appropriately enforce the	1 -	is the only one of its kind comparing the	
1	conditions of the required permits.		performance of all the states. The ranking	
11	T0.1 G	1	criteria include rates of inspections,	
12		12		
ľ	authority to administer that program will		facilities or high priority violators, and	
ľ.	be withdrawn and the responsibilities for		penalties assessed.	
	11 TDD 4	15		
15 16	The answer to the question "Are	16		
	the Department's services required?" Is that	- 1		
17	-	17	_	
18	1	18	1	
	,	19	1 8	
	provided by either EPA or the State.		nation, and obviously it was therefore in	
21		Ì	the top quartile.	
	statutes, it has been the policy of the	22	This next slide shows the	

23 Department's water program, which was

CO	mmission Meeting			Jun	e 15, 2012
		Page 13			Page 15
1	likewise in the top quartile. It's a		1	to last bar on the left, all data on this	
2	little difficult to see, but the light			and the next three slides is from 2008,	
3	blue, just as the light red on the previous		F .	which is the most current data available	
4	slide, indicates the top quartile.		1	for all states. The data is from the	
5	On this slide you can see that		ı	Environmental Council of States, which is	
6	the Department's land program is in the		1		
7	third quartile.		1	belong. This is the most reliable and	
8	The map you now see ranks the		1	current data available.	
9	overall programs for each of the states.		9	The graph shows the total	
10	The dark green states are those with two or		10	dollars of funding for each state listed.	
11	three programs in the top quartile. There		1	The next to last bar is the Department's	
12			1	fiscal year 2013 budget. Below the state	
13	you can see, California, Florida, North		13	name I don't know if it's able to be	
14	Carolina, and others are in this group.		14	seen but below the state's name is the	
15	Alabama is also in this group. The ten		15	national ranking among the 50 states. As I	
16	states are not ranked one through ten, but			hope you can see, Alabama has the lowest	
17	rather are simply identified as being the		17	level of total funding among the region	
18	ten best performers.		18	four states and is ranked 46th among all	
19	Other independent studies,		19	states in terms of total dollars of funding	
20	including one funded by the Kaufman		20	from all sources for environmental	
21	Foundation, which was reported on in the		21	programs.	
22	May 31st, 2012 edition of the Birmingham		22	This next slide shows the	
23	News, indicate environmental programs in		23	percentage of total funding that comes from	
-			-		
		Page 14			Page 16
1	Alabama are highly regarded.	Page 14	1	all state sources. State sources include	Page 16
1 2	The take-away message is that	Page 14	2	general funds, permit fees, earmarked	Page 16
1	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified	Page 14	2		Page 16
2	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the	Page 14	2	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources.	Page 16
2 3 4 5	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high	Page 14	2 3 4 5	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained	Page 16
2 3 4 5	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality.	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total	Page 16
2 3 4 5	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding,	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you — it is a little difficult to read—but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally.	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four.	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you — it is a little difficult to read—but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four. Environmental programs in all	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of funding, are the same data that is shown in	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four. Environmental programs in all states are funded from three sources	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of funding, are the same data that is shown in graph form on the slide before the last	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four. Environmental programs in all states are funded from three sources state general funds, shown in this slide in	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of funding, are the same data that is shown in graph form on the slide before the last one. Since there are large variations	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four. Environmental programs in all states are funded from three sources state general funds, shown in this slide in blue; federally provided funds, the red	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of funding, are the same data that is shown in graph form on the slide before the last one. Since there are large variations among the 50 states, it's helpful to view	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four. Environmental programs in all states are funded from three sources state general funds, shown in this slide in blue; federally provided funds, the red portion; and other state funds, which	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of funding, are the same data that is shown in graph form on the slide before the last one. Since there are large variations among the 50 states, it's helpful to view funding levels at the states on some more	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four. Environmental programs in all states are funded from three sources state general funds, shown in this slide in blue; federally provided funds, the red portion; and other state funds, which includes permit fees, earmarked funds, and	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of funding, are the same data that is shown in graph form on the slide before the last one. Since there are large variations among the 50 states, it's helpful to view funding levels at the states on some more comparable basis.	Page 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The take-away message is that knowledgeable, independent, qualified parties using objective measures deemed the Department's performance to be of high quality. That brings us to our third question. The third and final question at hand is, "What is the proper funding level for the Department?" The slide before you it is a little difficult to read but the slide before you shows the total amount of funding for environmental programs in each of the eight southeastern states comprising EPA region four. Environmental programs in all states are funded from three sources state general funds, shown in this slide in blue; federally provided funds, the red portion; and other state funds, which	Page 14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	general funds, permit fees, earmarked funds, and any other funds derived from the state sources. As you can see, Alabama obtained something less than 60 percent of its total funding from state sources and ranks 44th nationally. This chart compares the level of state funding, which is the set of columns on the left, and the total funding, the set of columns on the right, for the region four states and all states nationally. The left hand columns under both headings, showing the dollar amounts of funding, are the same data that is shown in graph form on the slide before the last one. Since there are large variations among the 50 states, it's helpful to view funding levels at the states on some more	Page 16

Co	mmission Meeting	June	15, 2012	
	Page 17			Page 19
1	comparison of the funding by each listed	1	with our region four sister states, Alabama	
1	state on a per capita basis. This can be		environmental funding has experienced	
	looked on as the average financial burden		disproportionately larger cuts than other	
	for environmental regulation carried by		states. It is anticipated that Alabama's	
5	each citizen in the state.	1	fiscal year 2013 ranking on funding will	
6	As you can see, in Alabama our		decline from the 44th, 46th, and 49th	
7	citizens carry a burden of slightly less	ı	ranking shown on the earlier slides.	
ſ	than seven dollars in state provided	8	The funding outlook for the	
1	funding for environmental regulation.	9	Department for fiscal year 2014, the 2014	
10	Nationally we rank 49th in state provided	10		
11	funding.	1		
12	The take-away message from these		action, ADEM will be unable to fund	
13	last three slides is that, by whatever	1	operation of the water division.	
14	measure total dollars, percentage of	14	In 2008, the Department was	
15	total budget, or per capita in 2008 the	15	already an exceptionally low cost	
16	Department was clearly an exceptionally low	16	provider. And with the cost cutting	
17	cost provider of environmental regulation.	17	measures implemented since then, especially	
18	When taken in the context of the	18	over the last few years, there is very	
19	first three slides, the message is that the	19	little, if any, room for further cost cuts	
20	Department has historically provided	20	to help the budget situation.	
21	exceptionally high quality environmental	21	Federal funding for all states	
22	regulation at an exceptionally low cost.	22	is declining, so that is not a feasible	
23	Now, I will show you one final	23	source to make up for declining or	
1				
-	Page 18			Page 20
1	Page 18 slide. This graph shows the Department's	1	disappearing state general funds.	Page 20
1	-	1 2	disappearing state general funds. The potential far reaching	Page 20
2	slide. This graph shows the Department's	2		Page 20
2	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989.	2	The potential far reaching	Page 20
2	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not	2 3 4	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the	Page 20
2 3 4 5	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted.	2 3 4 5	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to	2 3 4 5 6	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the	2 3 4 5 6 7	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides — these previous slides	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits.	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides — these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State General Fund appropriation for 2013 is 57	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user permit fees. In the coming months, we will	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State General Fund appropriation for 2013 is 57 percent below the 2008 level. It's well-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user permit fees. In the coming months, we will be engaging various stakeholders throughout	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State General Fund appropriation for 2013 is 57 percent below the 2008 level. It's well-known that virtually all states have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user permit fees. In the coming months, we will be engaging various stakeholders throughout the State to address the situation. The	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State General Fund appropriation for 2013 is 57 percent below the 2008 level. It's well-known that virtually all states have experienced general fund budget constraints	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user permit fees. In the coming months, we will be engaging various stakeholders throughout the State to address the situation. The message delivered to you here today will be	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State General Fund appropriation for 2013 is 57 percent below the 2008 level. It's well-known that virtually all states have experienced general fund budget constraints since 2008. Actual data, up to the fiscal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user permit fees. In the coming months, we will be engaging various stakeholders throughout the State to address the situation. The message delivered to you here today will be delivered to potentially impacted	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State General Fund appropriation for 2013 is 57 percent below the 2008 level. It's well- known that virtually all states have experienced general fund budget constraints since 2008. Actual data, up to the fiscal year 2013 budget year, will be available	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user permit fees. In the coming months, we will be engaging various stakeholders throughout the State to address the situation. The message delivered to you here today will be delivered to potentially impacted stakeholders.	Page 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	slide. This graph shows the Department's General Fund appropriations since 1989. The amounts are in actual dollars and not inflation adjusted. Please direct your attention to 2008. For those of you who can't see the years on this slide, the 2008 bar is the one toward the right hand side that is the highest among the last six bars. The previous slides these previous slides showing the funding levels were based on 2008 data. Please note that the that 2008 was the high watermark in general funding in the last 20 years. The State General Fund appropriation for 2013 is 57 percent below the 2008 level. It's well-known that virtually all states have experienced general fund budget constraints since 2008. Actual data, up to the fiscal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The potential far reaching impacts of inadequate funding include the withdrawal of the State's authority to issue NPDES water permits. Were that to occur, EPA would assume that responsibility and would dictate both the conditions included in those permits and the timing for permit issuance. All new and existing industry would go to EPA region four in Atlanta for water permits. For these reasons, it is imperative that the Department take steps to assure adequate funding by looking to the only remaining source of funding, user permit fees. In the coming months, we will be engaging various stakeholders throughout the State to address the situation. The message delivered to you here today will be delivered to potentially impacted	

Co	ommission Meeting		June 1	15, 2012
	Page 21		F	Page 23
1 1	in June of 2013 with proposed rulemaking to	1	law.	
	increase permit fees by approximately \$3	2	Senate bill 477, enrolled as act	
	million to \$4 million. This amount will be	3	2012 500 1111	
	spread across the entire regulated	1 -	regulation without due process of law. We	
1	community. The percentage increase will be		do not expect this to affect any of the	
- 1	quite substantial, in the range of 50	6		
	percent.		regulatory processes comport with the	
8			requirements of due process.	
9		9	House bill 341, enrolled as act	
10	impacted than others because permit fees	10	2012-317, exempts motor fuel storage tanks	
	represent a greater portion of their	1	from the requirements of the Uniform	
	overall cost. The proposed fee increase	1	Environmental Covenants Act. Contrary to	
	will not represent an increase in overall		previous practice, landowners will no	
	funding for the Department, rather it will		longer have restrictive covenants placed on	
15		1	their property when a motor fuel spill is	
16	from the State General Fund.	1	not cleaned up to unrestricted use.	
17	This fee increase will also be	1	Landowners will, however, continue to be	
18	fully in keeping with the directive of the	1	required to disclose any spill or	
19			contaminant to the subsequent purchasers	
20	D' and	1	under state property law provisions.	
21	agencies make every effort to increase	21	House bill 556, enrolled as act	
22	fees, and thus avoid the need for any	22	2012-434, extended the moratorium on the	
23	additional tax increases.	1	Department's ability to issue any permits	
	Page 22		F	Page 24
1	Moving on, let me now, quickly,	1	for new public solid waste landfill	
2	update you on four environmental bills that		facilities until May 31, 2014. This	
3	passed in the 2013 legislature and were	1	moratorium period was originally	
4	signed into law by Governor Bentley.		established to allow the Department and the	
5	During the 2012 legislative session, four		Department of Public Health to review their	
6	bills passed and were signed into law by		duties and responsibilities pursuant to the	
7	Governor Bentley that have some impact upon		Solid Waste and Recyclable Materials	
8	the environment.	8	Management Act and to make recommendation	ıs
9	House bill 447, enrolled as act	9	for necessary legislation or undertake	
10	2012-551, requires financial assurance for	10	rulemaking to implement enhancements	
11	any facility classified as a centralized	11	identified during this review process.	
12	,	12	In connection with this, it was	
13	1 0	13	previously reported that the Department has	
14	assurance in the Department's permits has	14	signed a formal contract with Auburn	ľ
15	,	ſ	University to assist the Department in a	
16	8 1		review by providing administrative and	
17	1 , ,	17	technical support and in evaluating public	
18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	18	input on potential enhancements to the	
19	1 11 2 1 2	1	Solid Waste Management Program.	
20	1	20	Auburn is planning to conduct	
21				
1	8	21	the first of several public meetings in	1
22	the Commission in the future meetings to	22	Montgomery near the end of June and will	
22		22		

Co	mmission Meeting		June 15, 2012	2
	Page 25	ľ	Page 27	
1	Numerous other activities are	1	thanks to you for serving the state as	
	currently ongoing, such as evaluation of		Commissioners on the Environmental	
	other EPA region four states landfill	1	Management Commission and for allowing me	
	siting requirements, as well as their		to serve the state in my current capacity.	
5	landfill permitting processes. The	5	If there are any questions, I	
6	Department hopes to announce the kickoff of		will be pleased to try to answer them now.	
7	41 00 11	7	CHAIRMAN LESTER: Any	
8	I'd like to now the Alabama	8	Commissioners?	
9	Department of Environmental Management has	9	DR. RICHARDSON: I don't	
1	been recognized for a second consecutive	10	have any questions. I have a couple	
}	year for its leadership and innovation		comments I'd like to make.	
l	regarding the electronic flow of data and	12	I think it's quite commendable	1
ı	sharing of data through the Exchange	13	where the program stands with respect to	
l	Network.		the nation-wide rankings. I'd like to	
15	The Department was recently		commend you and your staff for that.	
16	honored by The U.S. EPA with the	1	Because, you know, it's striking to me when	1
	presentation of the Exchange Network		I see that for two of our three programs	
	Leadership Award. The Exchange Network		that, you know, we're up there with just	
	Leadership Award was presented for the	I .	right off the bat California and	
	Department's and I quote outstanding	[Florida, which I think are two of the	
	leadership in achieving the Exchange		environmental leaders as far as enforcement	
22	Network's strategic vision.	22	and regulation and policy. And it puts us	
23	The recent award follows on the		above a couple of others that I would also	ļ
	Page 26		Page 28	Ī
1	heels of the Department's receipt in 2011	1	put at the top, like Oregon and	
	of the Exchange Network Progress Award for	l .	Washington. And I just think that given	
3	outstanding progress in meeting the	l .	the incredible fiduciary constraints that	
4	Exchange Network's goals.	l .	you guys are under, that that's incredible,	
5	I'd like to ask Eric Cleckler to	5	and I appreciate you-all's efforts.	
6	come forward and receive this award. He	6	MR. LeFLEUR: I appreciate	
7	will be receiving it on behalf of all those	7	that comment, and I will accept it on	
8	in our information services branch, as well	8	behalf of the people of ADEM who have done	
9	as those in the divisions that support the	9	this work over the years.	
10	Exchange Network, all of whom have been	10	CHAIRMAN LESTER: We thank	
11	doing exemplary work. Eric,	11	you.	
12	congratulations.	12	(Audience applause)	
13	(Audience applause)	13	MR. LeFLEUR: Any other	
14	MR. LeFLEUR: For those of	14	questions?	
15	you involved with the Exchange Network in	15	CHAIRMAN LESTER: No. Thank	
16	the other divisions, I'd like for you to	16	you.	
17	stand and be recognized, if you're here.	17	At this point, I will announce	
18	(Audience applause)	1	that our next meeting will be August 17th.	
19	MR. LeFLEUR: This is a very		Can't vote on it or anything. And also I	
20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		will say that this gathering is now	
21	*	21	dismissed.	
22	involved in EPA with EPA.	22	(The meeting ended at 11:30 a.m.)	
23	Once again, let me close with my	23	*********	
				1

Commission Meeting		June 15, 201
	Page 29	
1 STATE OF ALABAMA)		
2 COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY)		
3		
4 I hereby certify that the above		
5 proceedings were taken down by me and		
6 transcribed by me using computer-aided		
7 transcription and that the above is a true		
8 and accurate transcript of said proceedings		
9 taken down by me and transcribed by me.		
I further certify that I am		
11 neither of kin nor of counsel to any of the		
l2 parties nor in anywise financially		
13 interested in the outcome of this case.		
I further certify that I am duly		
15 licensed by the Alabama Board of Court		
16 Reporting as a Certified Court Reporter as		
17 evidenced by the ACCR number following my		
18 name found below.		
19		
20		
21		
VICTORIA CASTILLO, ACCR #17, 9/30/12		
23 FREELANCE COURT REPORTER		

1	STATE OF ALABAMA)
2	COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY)
3	
4	I hereby certify that the above
5	proceedings were taken down by me and
6	transcribed by me using computer-aided
7	transcription and that the above is a true
8	and accurate transcript of said proceedings
9	taken down by me and transcribed by me.
10	I further certify that I am
L1	neither of kin nor of counsel to any of the
L2	parties nor in anywise financially
L3	interested in the outcome of this case.
L 4	I further certify that I am duly
L5	licensed by the Alabama Board of Court
L6	Reporting as a Certified Court Reporter as
L7	evidenced by the ACCR number following my
L8	name found below.
L9	
20	
21	VictoriaCastillo
22	VICTORIA CASTILLO, ACCR #17, 9/30/12
23	FREELANCE COURT REPORTER

Commission Wiceting		<u> </u>		June 15, 20
	22:10	achieving (1)	11:17	26.12 19.29.12
C	2012-598 (1)	25:21		26:13,18;28:12
\$	- 23:3	1	Although (1)	August (1)
		across (1)	22:12	28:18
§2.9 (1)	2013 (12)	21:4	always (1)	authoritative (1)
6:23	5:18;6:17;8:7;9:3,7;	Act (9)	4:17	12:2
63 (1)	15:12;18:16,21;19:5,11;	9:23,23;10:1;22:9;	among (5)	authority (3)
21:2	21:1;22:3	23:2,9,12,21;24:8	15:15,17,18;16:19;	10:4,13;20:4
3.2 (3)	2014 (9)	action (4)	18:9	available (8)
7:19;8:7,8	7:13;8:13,14,18,22;	3:13;7:18;8:4;19:12	amount (2)	7:9,10,12;8:18,20;
350,000 (1)	9:5;19:9,9;24:2	activities (1)	14:13;21:3	15:3,8;18:21
		25:1	amounts (2)	average (1)
7:3	3	activity (1)	16:15;18:3	17:3
4 (1)	3	6:1		
21:3	20 (1)		Animal (1)	avoid (1)
4.1 (1)	30 (1)	actual (2)	7:4	21:22
7:16	7:1	18:3,20	announce (2)	Award (5)
4.2 (1)	31 (1)	actually (1)	25:6;28:17	25:18,19,23;26:2,6
8:6	24:2	8:23	announced (1)	
	- 31st (1)	additional (2)	6:8	\mathbf{B}
*	13:22	6:5;21:23	anticipate (1)	
	341 (1)	Additionally (1)	20:22	back (2)
***************************************	1	8:19	anticipated (2)	5:3;6:15
	36110-2400 (1)	address (3)	8:21;19:4	bar (3)
28:23				
	1:13	9:10;11:4;20:18	apologize (1)	15:1,11;18:7
1		Addressing (1)	11:9	bars (1)
	4	9:19	applause (3)	18:9
1:00 (2)		ADEM (2)	26:13,18;28:12	based (2)
1:15;3:1	447 (1)	19:12;28:8	appreciate (2)	18:11,23
1:30 (1)	22:9	adequate (1)	28:5,6	basis (2)
28:22	44th (2)	20:14	appropriated (1)	16:21;17:2
3 (2)	16:7;19:6	adjusted (1)	7:18	bat (1)
7:11;8:8	46th (2)	18:4	appropriately (1)	27:19
	15:18;19:6	administer (2)	10:9	begins (1)
400 (1)	477 (1)	10:4,13	appropriation (1)	3:1
1:12	23:2	administrative (1)	18:16	
5 (1)				behalf (2)
1:14	49th (2)	24:16	appropriations (1)	26:7;28:8
7th (1)	17:10;19:6	adversely (1)	18:2	belong (1)
28:18	_	21:9	approximately (3)	15:7
982 (1)	5	affect (1)	8:6,10;21:2	Below (3)
9:20		23:5	arena (1)	15:12,14;18:17
989 (1)	50 (4)	again (1)	22:18	beneficial (1)
18:2	12:1;15:15;16:19;21:6	26:23	around (1)	8:2
10.2	556 (1)	agencies (2)	5:2	Bentley (3)
•	23:21	9:8;21:21	assessed (1)	6:22;22:4,7
2		1 '	12:14	
	57 (1)	agency (4)		best (3)
0 (1)	18:16	9:13;11:1,17,23	assesses (1)	9:4;12:19;13:18
18:15		ago (1)	11:21	beyond (1)
003 (1)	6	11:19	assist (1)	8:15
12:6		Air (3)	24:15	bill (4)
008 (9)	60 (1)	9:23;11:22;12:19	assume (1)	22:9;23:2,9,21
15:2;17:15;18:6,7,12,	16:6	ALABAMA (18)	20:6	bills (2)
		1:1,9,11,13;4:11,12,	Assurance (3)	22:2,6
14,17,20;19:14	A	12,12;5:14;9:12;13:15;	12:6;22:10,14	Birmingham (1)
009 (1)	12	14:1;15:16;16:5;17:6;	assure (1)	13:22
12:7	shiller (1)	19:1;22:17;25:8	20:14	
011 (2)	ability (1)			blue (2)
11:20;26:1	23:23	Alabama's (1)	Atlanta (1)	13:3;14:19
012 (10)	able (2)	19:4	20:11	bonding (1)
1:14;5:16,18;6:3,4,18,	7:7;15:13	allotment (1)	attention (2)	22:16
20;8:7;13:22;22:5	above (1)	6:14	11:8;18:5	both (3)
2012-317 (1)	27:23	allow (1)	attorney (1)	16:14;20:7;26:20
23:10	abreast (1)	24:4	5:7	Boulevard (1)
	4:18	allowing (1)	Auburn (2)	1:12
2012-434 (1)		27:3	24:14,20	branch (1)
22.22				NI 44 HOR (1)
23:22 2012-551 (1)	accept (1) 28:7	along (1)	Audience (3)	26:8

brief (1)	22:11	connection (1)	database (1)	10.12
5:22	Clean (2)	24:12	database (1) 12:6	19:13
briefly (1)	9:23,23	consecutive (1)	debated (1)	divisions (2) 26:9,16
5:17	cleaned (1)	25:10	22:15	dollar (2)
brings (1)	23:16	consequences (1)	Debi (1)	7:22;16:15
14:7	cleaning (1)	9:6	5:7	dollars (6)
budget (13)	8:1	Conservation (1)	December (1)	8:10;15:10,19;17:8,
4:20;6:6,10,20;7:1,20;	clearly (2)	10:1	11:19	14;18:3
8:5;15:12;17:15;18:19,	8:16;17:16	consider (2)	decisions (1)	done (2)
21;19:10,20	Cleckler (1)	8:15;9:11	5:21	19:10;28:8
budgets (4)	26:5	constraints (2)	decline (1)	down (1)
5:19;6:3,17;8:13	close (2)	18:19;28:3	19:6	3:5
bulk (1)	5:22;26:23	contact (1)	declining (2)	DR (1)
5:19	Coliseum (1)	3:19	19:22,23	27:9
burden (2)	1:12	contaminant (1)	deemed (1)	drag (1)
17:3,7	columns (3)	23:19	14:4	4:7
busy (1)	16:10,11,14	context (1)	delegated (2)	due (2)
4:1	coming (5)	17:18	10:3,12	23:4,8
	3:5;18:22;20:16,23;	continue (1)	delivered (2)	dumps (2)
C	22:21	23:17	20:19,20	8:1,3
	commend (1)	continuing (1)	demands (1)	during (3)
California (2)	27:15	9:6	8:19	6:1;22:5;24:11
13:13;27:19	commendable (1)	contract (1)	DEPARTMENT (29)	duties (1)
call (2)	27:12	24:14	1:9;4:19,22;5:6,22;	24:6
3:3,15	comment (1)	Contrary (1)	6:9,23;7:7;8:23;9:4,17,	
can (12)	28:7	23:12	18,20;11:7;14:10;17:16,	E
3:13,13;4:7;6:12;	comments (1)	copies (2)	20;19:9,14;20:13;21:14;	
10:19;12:15;13:5,13;	27:11	11:10,11	24:4,5,13,15;25:6,9,15;	earlier (1)
15:16;16:5;17:2,6	COMMISSION (5)	cost (7)	26:21	19:7
capacity (1)	1:2;5:15;20:23;22:22;	6:8;17:17,22;19:15,	Department's (15)	earmarked (2)
27:4	27:3	16,19;21:12	7:19;8:5;9:14;10:17;	14:21;16:2
capita (3)	Commissioner (2)	Council (1)	12:18,23;13:6;14:5;	east (1)
16:23;17:2,15	4:10,17	15:5	15:11;18:1;22:14;23:6,	4:12
Carolina (1)	Commissioners (2)	couple (2)	23;25:20;26:1	ECOS (1)
13:14	27:2,8	27:10,23	deposit (1)	18:22
carried (1)	community (1)	Covenants (2)	5:4	edition (1)
17:4	21:5	23:12,14	derived (1)	13:22
carry (1)	comparable (1)	created (3)	16:3	effect (1)
17:7	16:21	7:23;8:3;9:20	detail (2)	8:4
carrying (1)	compares (1)	criteria (1)	4:15;11:10	effort (2)
3:9	16:8	12:11	determine (1)	21:21;25:7
Castillo (1)	comparing (1)	critical (1)	10:8	efforts (1)
1:23	12:9	8:20	dictate (1)	28:5
category (1)	comparison (1)	crucial (1)	20:7	eight (1)
13:12	17:1	5:20	difficult (3)	14:14
cause (1)	completed (1)	current (4)	9:13;13:2;14:11	either (2)
7:13	6:1	15:3,8;23:6;27:4	direct (2)	3:17;10:20
CCR#17 (1)	compliance (2)	currently (1)	11:7;18:5	electronic (1)
1:23	10:8;12:5	25:2	directive (1)	25:12
ceases (1)	comport (1)	cut (1)	21:18	enabling (1)
10:11	23:7	8:5	Director (3)	10:6
centralized (1)	comprising (1)	cuts (3)	3:15;4:4;21:20	enactment (1)
22:11	14:15	6:5;19:3,19	disappearing (1)	10:21
CHAIRMAN (6)	Concentrated (1)	cutting (2)	20:1	end (2)
3:3;4:6,8;27:7;28:10,	7:4	6:8;19:16	disclose (1)	11:12;24:22
15	concern (1)	n	23:18	ended (1)
chart (1)	7:13	D	discussions (1)	28:22
16:8	conditions (2)	J = =-l- (1)	18:23	enforce (1)
citizen (1) 17:5	10:10;20:7	dark (1)	dismissed (1)	10:9
	conduct (1)	13:10	28:21	Enforcement (2)
citizens (1)	24:20	data (10)	disproportionately (1)	12:5;27:21
17:7 classified (1)	congratulations (1) 26:12	12:4;15:1,3,4,8;16:16; 18:12,20;25:12,13	19:3 division (1)	engaging (1) 20:17
				. 76 84 1 7

Commission Meeting				June 15, 2012
enhancements (2)	far-reaching (1)	22:2,5;25:3	grave (1)	illustrated (1)
24:10,18	9:8	fourth (1)	7:13	5:10
enrolled (4)	feasible (1)	3:21	greater (1)	impact (1)
22:9;23:2,9,21	19:22	frankly (1)	21:11	22:7
entire (1)	federal (8)	19:11	green (2)	
21:4	6:14;7:10;9:22;10:5,	fuel (2)		impacted (2)
entity (2)			13:10;14:22	20:20;21:10
	18,21;11:17;19:21	23:10,15	group (2)	impacts (1)
10:7;12:3	federally (1)	fully (1)	13:14,15	20:3
environment (1)	14:19	21:18	groups (1)	impartial (1)
22:8	fee (3)	functions (1)	21:8	12:3
ENVIRONMENTAL (21)	7:22;21:12,17	23:6	guys (1)	imperative (1)
1:1,9;5:15,23;11:23;	Feeding (1)	Fund (14)	28:4	20:13
13:23;14:13,16;15:5,20;	7:4	6:20;7:3,17,18,21;		implement (2)
17:4,9,17,21;19:2;22:2;	fees (6)	8:11,12,17;9:2;18:2,16,	H	22:23;24:10
23:3,12;25:9;27:2,21	14:21;16:2;20:16;	19;19:12;21:16		implementation (1)
EPA (14)	21:2,10,22	funded (4)	hand (3)	6:7
6:12;10:5,11,15,20;	few (2)	7:21;8:9;13:20;14:17	14:9;16:14;18:8	implemented (1)
11:2;12:4;14:15;20:6,	3:7;19:18	funding (32)	happening (2)	19:17
10;25:3,16;26:22,22	fiduciary (1)	6:14;7:6,10;8:20;9:4,	4:14,19	important (2)
Eric (2)	28:3	7,18;14:9,13;15:10,17,	headings (1)	9:11;26:20
26:5,11	fifth (1)	19,23;16:7,9,10,16,20;	16:15	imposed (1)
especially (2)	5:13	17:1,9,11;18:11,15;19:2,	Health (1)	22:17
4:20;19:17	final (4)	5,8,21;20:3,14,15;21:14,	24:5	improved (1)
established (1)	6:4,19;14:8;17:23	15	heels (1)	6:16
24:4	Finance's (1)	funds (12)	26:1	inadequate (1)
evaluating (1)	21:20	7:9;9:1,2,5;14:18,19,	held (1)	20:3
24:17	financial (4)	20,21;16:2,3,3;20:1	6:15	include (3)
evaluation (1)	9:13;17:3;22:10,13	further (2)	help (1)	12:11;16:1;20:3
25:2	finished (1)	7:15;19:19		
	6:18		19:20	included (2)
everybody's (1) 4:1		future (3)	helpful (1)	11:18;20:8
	First (5)	5:21;22:22;25:7	16:19	includes (1)
everywhere (1)	9:14,19;17:19;22:15;		Here's (1)	14:21
4:13	24:21	G	4:4	including (2)
exception (1)	fiscal (20)		high (4)	12:8;13:20
14:23	5:16,18,18;6:4,20;	gathering (1)	12:13;14:5;17:21;	increase (7)
exceptionally (4)	7:11,12;8:6,7,8,14,18,	28:20	18:14	8:21;21:2,5,12,13,17,
17:16,21,22;19:15	22;9:2,5;15:12;18:20;	General (17)	highest (1)	21
Exchange (8)	19:5,9,11	6:20;7:17;8:12,17;9:2,	18:9	increases (1)
25:13,17,18,21;26:2,4,	five (1)	5;11:16,20;12:2;14:18;	highly (1)	21:23
10,15	6:13	16:2;18:2,14,16,19;20:1;	14:1	incredible (2)
exemplary (1)	Florida (2)	21:16	historically (1)	28:3,4
26:11	13:13;27:20	generate (1)	17:20	independent (4)
exempts (1)	flow (1)	7:8	holders (1)	11:16;12:3;13:19;14:3
23:10	25:12	generated (2)	21:9	indicate (1)
existing (1)	focus (1)	11:15;12:4	honored (1)	13:23
20:9	5:19	gets (1)	25:16	indicates (1)
expect (1)	follow (1)	5:4	hope (3)	13:4
23:5	11:18	given (1)	3:8,11;15:16	individually (1)
experienced (2)	following (1)	28:2	hopefully (1)	4:10
18:19;19:2	11:3	gives (1)	12:15	industries (2)
express (1)	follows (1)	5:3	hopes (1)	21:8;22:20
7:23	25:23	goals (1)	25:6	industry (2)
extended (1)	form (1)	26:4	hospital (1)	20:10;22:17
23:22	16:17	goes (1)	3:9	inflation (1)
23.22	formal (1)	4:13	l .	18:4
${f F}$	24:14	good (3)	House (3) 22:9;23:9,21	
L'	forward (3)		44.7,43.7,41	information (1)
facilities (2)		4:8;5:8,12	T	26:8
facilities (2)	7:14;8:14;26:6	Governor (4)	I	initiative (1)
12:13;24:2	Foundation (1)	6:22;8:15;22:4,7		26:20
facility (2)	13:21	Governor's (1)	identification (1)	innovation (1)
22:11,12	four (10)	21:19	12:12	25:11
far (4)	3:6;12:18;14:15;	graph (3)	identified (2)	input (1)
3:12;4:18;20:2;27:21	15:18;16:12;19:1;20:10;	15:9;16:17;18:1	13:17;24:11	24:18
	I	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>

Commission Meeting				June 15, 201
inspections (1)	22:19	12:16,17	moving (2)	Once (1)
12:11	leaders (1)	lowest (1)	7:14;22:1	26:23
Inspector (3)	27:21	15:16	must (1)	one (11)
11:16,20;12:2	leadership (4)	13.10	8:15	
into (5)	25:11,18,19,21	M	8.13	3:22;7:22;8:10;12:9,
3:23;7:17;8:11;22:4,6		171	N.T	18;13:16,20;16:18;
	LeFLEUR (6)	1. (4)	N	17:23;18:8;20:23
involved (3)	4:5;5:9;26:14,19;28:6,	making (1)		one-stop (1)
5:11;26:15,22	13	5:11	name (2)	9:21
ssuance (2)	left (3)	MANAGEMENT (7)	15:13,14	one-third (1)
9:21;20:9	15:1;16:10,14	1:1,10;5:15;24:8,19;	nation (1)	6:4
ssue (3)	legal (1)	25:9;27:3	12:20	one-time (2)
10:8;20:5;23:23	3:22	Many (1)	national (1)	7:10,11
tem (1)	legend (1)	9:8	15:15	ongoing (1)
7:3	12:16	map (2)	nationally (3)	25:2
	legislation (2)	11:14;13:8	16:8,13;17:10	only (3)
J	10:6;24:9	maps (3)	nation-wide (1)	7:7;12:9;20:15
F-1	legislative (3)	11:17;12:4,8	27:14	operate (2)
ail (1)	5:23;6:2;22:5	matching (1)	near (2)	6:9;7:7
5:7	Legislature (5)	7:9	24:22;25:7	operating (1)
June (3)	6:17,21;7:16;8:16;	Materials (1)	necessary (4)	7:1
1:14;21:1;24:22	22:3	24:7		
1.14,21.1,24.22			9:3,15;10:7;24:9	operation (2)
K	less (3)	May (2)	need (1)	5:21;19:13
K	7:2;16:6;17:7	13:22;24:2	21:22	Operations (1)
	LESTER (5)	measure (1)	Network (6)	7:4
Kaufman (1)	3:3;4:8;27:7;28:10,15	17:14	25:14,17,18;26:2,10,	order (1)
13:20	level (6)	measures (3)	15	3:4
keep (1)	7:6;9:18;14:9;15:17;	6:8;14:4;19:17	Network's (2)	Oregon (1)
8:3	16:8;18:17	meet (1)	25:22;26:4	28:1
keeping (1)	levels (2)	10:11	new (6)	organization (1)
21:18	16:20;18:11	MEETING (8)	7:22;8:3,17;20:9;	15:6
keeps (2)	light (2)	1:2;3:1,4,12,16;26:3;	22:23;24:1	originally (1)
5:7,8	13:2,3	28:18,22	News (1)	24:3
kickoff (1)	likewise (1)	meetings (3)	13:23	others (3)
25:6	13:1	5:14;22:22;24:21	next (7)	13:14;21:10;27:23
kind (1)	limited (1)	meets (2)	3:16;12:22;14:23;	out (6)
12:9	8:19	4:9,13	15:2,11,22;28:18	3:7,18;4:7;5:7;7:17;
knowledgeable (1)	line (1)	member (2)	noncompliance (1)	8:11
14:3	7:3	3:19,21	12:12	outlook (1)
known (2)	liquidity (1)	message (4)	north (2)	19:8
9:22;18:18	6:15	14:2;17:12,19;20:19	4:11;13:13	outside (1)
7.22,10.10	listed (2)	met (2)		22:18
L	15:10;17:1	6:6;10:5	note (1)	1
L			18:13	outstanding (2)
1.0	little (3)	million (10)	noted (1)	25:20;26:3
land (2)	13:2;14:11;19:19	5:2;6:23;7:16,19;8:6,	7:15	over (2)
11:22;13:6	live (1)	7,8,10;21:3,3	NPDES (1)	19:18;28:9
andfill (3)	4:11	money (3)	20:5	overall (3)
24:1;25:3,5	long (3)	5:1,4;8:9	Numerous (1)	13:9;21:12,13
landowners (2)	4:7,15;22:15	monitor (1)	25:1	
23:13,17	longer (1)	11:8		P
large (1)	23:14	Montgomery (2)	O	
16:18	look (2)	1:13;24:22		particular (1)
arger (1)	8:13;16:22	months (3)	objective (1)	21:19
19:3	looked (1)	11:19;18:22;20:16	14:4	parties (1)
ast (9)	17:3	moratorium (2)	obtained (1)	14:4
6:6;7:2;15:1,11;16:17;	looking (1)	23:22;24:3	16:5	passed (3)
17:13;18:9,15;19:18	20:14	more (2)	obviously (1)	6:21;22:3,6
aunch (1)	lost (1)	16:20;21:9	12:20	path (1)
24:23	21:15	morning (2)	occur (1)	8:14
aw (5)	lot (1)	3:6;5:12	20:6	penalties (1)
100 TT (U)		most (2)	off (1)	12:14
22.4 6.23.1 4 20	1 5.10		VII (I)	14.17
22:4,6;23:1,4,20	5:10 low (3)			noonlo (2)
laws (2)	low (3)	15:3,7	27:19	people (3)
22:4,6;23:1,4,20 laws (2) 9:22;10:5 lead (1)				people (3) 5:10;9:12;28:8 per (3)

Commission Meeting				June 15, 2012
16:23;17:2,15	12:13	22:1	regulated (1)	27:9
percent (5)	process (3)	Quite (3)	21:4	
6:13;7:2;16:6;18:17;	23:4,8;24:11	19:11;21:6;27:12	regulation (6)	right (7)
21:7	processes (2)	quorum (2)		3:8,12;12:16,17;
percentage (3)	23:7;25:5	3:5,14	17:4,9,17,22;23:4; 27:22	16:11;18:8;27:19
15:23;17:14;21:5	Program (10)	quote (1)	regulatory (1)	rightly (1) 9:12
performance (3)	7:5,8;10:12,13,15;	25:20	23:7	Robert (1)
11:22;12:10;14:5	12:19,23;13:6;24:19;	25.20	released (1)	3:21
performers (1)	27:13	R	6:13	Room (2)
13:18	programs (8)		reliable (1)	1:11;19:19
period (2)	11:23;13:9,11,23;	range (1)	15:7	rulemaking (3)
12:6;24:3	14:14,16;15:21;27:17	21:6	remainder (1)	21:1;22:23;24:10
permit (7)	Progress (2)	rank (1)	6:10	
14:21;16:2;20:9,16;	26:2,3	17:ÌÓ	remaining (4)	S
21:2,9,10	prohibits (1)	ranked (4)	6:13;8:10;11:4;20:15	
permits (7)	23:3	12:17,19;13:16;15:18	remains (1)	same (2)
9:21;10:10;20:5,8,11;	project (1)	ranking (4)	22:21	7:18;16:16
22:14;23:23	24:23	12:10;15:15;19:5,7	replacement (1)	scheduled (1)
permitting (1)	promoting (1)	rankings (1)	21:15	5:14
25:5	8:2	27:14	report (7)	scheme (1)
place (1)	proper (2)	ranks (2)	3:15;5:17,20;6:12;	9:7
10:7	9:17;14:9	13:8;16:7	11:18,21;12:8	Scott (1)
placed (1)	property (2)	rates (1)	reported (2)	3:5
23:14	23:15,20	12:11	13:21;24:13	Scrap (6)
plan (1)	proposed (2)	rather (4)	represent (2)	7:17,21;8:1,2,9,11
9:10	21:1,12	9:1;11:1;13:17;21:14	21:11,13	Second (3)
planning (1) 24:20	provided (11)	RCRA (1)	request (1) 21:20	9:15;11:5;25:10
please (3)	6:23;9:1,16;10:20,23; 11:2,6;14:19;17:8,10,20	10:2 reaching (1)	1	secretary (1)
11:7;18:5,13	provider (2)	20:2	required (5) 9:22;10:10,17,18;	3:18
pleased (1)	17:17;19:16	read (1)	23:18	secure (1) 7:9
27:6	providing (1)	14:11	requirement (1)	Senate (1)
point (1)	24:16	reasons (1)	22:16	23:2
28:17	provisions (1)	20:12	requirements (5)	serve (1)
policy (2)	23:20	receipt (1)	10:4;22:20;23:8,11;	27:4
10:22;27:22	public (4)	26:1	25:4	service (2)
portion (3)	24:1,5,17,21	receive (1)	requires (1)	9:16;11:6
14:20,22;21:11	published (1)	26:6	22:10	services (7)
possible (1)	11:19	receiving (2)	requiring (1)	8:21;9:15;10:17,18,
11:1	purchase (1)	9:1;26:7	22:13	19,23;26:8
potential (2)	7:23	recent (1)	Resource (1)	serving (1)
20:2;24:18	purchasers (1)	25:23	10:1	27:1
potentially (1)	23:19	recently (4)	resources (3)	session (4)
20:20	purpose (1)	6:1,18;21:15;25:15	7:11,12;10:8	6:2,18,19;22:5
practice (1)	8:1	recognized (2)	respect (1)	set (3)
23:13	pursuant (1)	25:10;26:17	27:13	3:16;16:9,11
prayers (1)	24:6	recommendations (1)	responsibilities (2)	seven (1)
4:3	put (2)	24:8	10:14;24:6	17:8
prepare (1) 9:3	3:18;28:1	Recovery (1)	responsibility (1) 20:6	several (1) 24:21
	puts (1) 27:22	10:1 Recyclable (1)	restrictive (1)	
present (1) 5:13	21.22	24:7	23:14	sharing (1) 25:13
presentation (2)	Q	red (3)	result (1)	shop (1)
11:13;25:17	~	11:14;13:3;14:19	6:7	9:21
presented (1)	qualified (1)	regarded (1)	reuse (1)	show (1)
25:19	14:3	14:1	8:2	17:23
presenting (1)	quality (4)	regarding (2)	revenue (1)	showing (2)
9:9	9:16;11:6;14:6;17:21	5:21;25:12	8:17	16:15;18:11
previous (4)	quartile (5)	region (6)	revert (1)	shown (3)
13:3;18:10,10;23:13	12:21;13:1,4,7,11	14:15;15:17;16:12;	10:15	14:18;16:16;19:7
previously (2)	quartiles (1)	19:1;20:10;25:3	review (3)	shows (5)
6:7;24:13	12:18	regular (1)	24:5,11,16	12:22;14:12;15:9,22;
priority (1)	quickly (1)	6:18	RICHARDSON (1)	18:1
			1	1

Commission Meeting				June 15, 201
side (1)	6:11;27:13	15:19	up (5)	11:1
18:8	state (35)	thanks (1)	8:1;18:20;19:23;	wherever (1)
signed (4)	4:20;5:1;6:20;8:12,20;	27:1	23:16;27:18	4:10
6:22;22:4,6;24:14	9:5,8;10:3,5,11,20,23;	them's (1)	update (1)	withdrawal (1)
significant (1)	11:1;12:17;14:18,20;	4:11	22:2	20:4
12:12	15:10,12;16:1,1,4,7,9;	therefore (1)	upon (1)	withdrawn (1)
similar (2)	17:2,5,8,10;18:15;20:1,	12:20	22:7	10:14
9:9;22:20	18;21:16,20;23:20;27:1,	third (4)	use (1)	withholds (1)
simply (1)	4	9:17;13:7;14:7,8	23:16	5:2
13:17	States (25)	three (6)	user (1)	within (2)
sister (1)	11:15;12:1,10;13:9,	13:11;14:17;15:2;	20:15	6:10;8:12
19:1	10,12,16;14:15,17;15:4,	17:13,19;27:17	uses (1)	without (2)
site (1)	5,6,15,18,19;16:12,12,	throughout (1)	8:12	19:11;23:4
24:23	19,20;18:18;19:1,4,21;	20:17	using (2)	work (3)
siting (1)	25:3;26:21	thus (1)	7:10;14:4	5:11;26:11;28:9
25:4	state's (2)	21:22	utilized (1)	worse (1)
situation (3)	15:14;20:4	times (1)	9:7	19:10
9:10;19:20;20:18	statutes (2)	9:13		wreck (2)
situations (2)	10:19,22	timing (1)	\mathbf{V}	3:5;4:1
3:23;9:9	steps (1)	20:8		
six (3)	20:13	Tire (6)	variations (1)	Y
5:13;11:19;18:9	storage (1)	7:17,21,22;8:1,9,11	16:18	
slide (10)	23:10	tires (1)	various (1)	year (22)
12:22;13:4,5;14:10,	strategic (1)	8:2	20:17	5:16,18,18;6:4,10,20;
12,18;15:22;16:17;18:1,	25:22	titled (1)	version (1)	7:2;8:6,7,14,18,22;9:2,5
7	striking (1)	16:23	4:15	15:12;18:21,21;19:5,9,
slides (9)	27:16	today (2)	Victoria (1)	11;20:23;25:11
11:3,10,12;15:2;	studies (1)	3:21;20:19	1:23	years (4)
17:13,19;18:10,10;19:7	13:19	top (6)	view (1)	18:7,15;19:18;28:9
slightly (1)	subheadings (1)	12:21;13:1,4,11,12;	16:19	year's (1)
17:7	16:23	28:1	violators (1)	6:6
solid (4)	subsequent (1)	total (9)	12:13	you-all's (1)
22:18;24:1,7,19	23:19	14:12;15:9,17,19,23;	virtually (1)	28:5
soon (1)	subsequently (1)	16:6,10;17:14,15	18:18	
24:23	6:22	toward (1)	vision (1)	
source (2)	substantial (1)	18:8	25:22	
19:23;20:15	21:6	transferred (1)	vote (2)	
sources (6)	sufficient (1)	7:16	3:17;28:19	
14:17;15:20;16:1,1,4,	7:8	treatment (1)		-
7	summary (1)	22:12	W	
south (1)	5:23	try (1)		-
4:12	support (2)	27:6	Washington (1)	
southeastern (1)	24:17;26:9	turns (1)	28:2	
14:14	survive (1)	5:2	waste (4)	
special (3)	4:22	two (3)	22:18;24:1,7,19	
6:19;7:2,22		13:10;27:17,20	wastewater (1)	
speech (1)	T		22:12	
5:8		U	water (7)	
spill (2)	take-away (2)		7:8;9:23;11:22;12:23;	
23:15,18	14:2;17:12	unable (2)	19:13;20:5,11	
spoken (1)	talking (1)	11:9;19:12	watermark (1)	
8:16	4:16	under (4)	18:14	
spread (1)	tanks (1)	16:14,22;23:20;28:4	Web (1)	
21:4	23:10	undertake (2)	24:23	
staff (1)	target (1)	22:23;24:9	welcome (1)	
27:15	6:9	Uniform (1)	5:12	
stakeholders (2)	tax (1)	23:11	well- (1)	
20:17,21	21:23	United (1)	18:17	
stand (1)	technical (1)	11:15	west (1)	
06.15	0415	I Indianamaita (1)	4:12	1
26:17	24:17	University (1)	1	
standards (2)	ten (4)	24:15	what's (1)	
			1	

Part B



AGENDA* MEETING OF THE

ALABAMA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

DATE: June 15, 2012 TIME: 11:00 a.m.

LOCATION: Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) Building Alabama Room (Main Conference Room) 1400 Coliseum Boulevard

Montgomery, Alabama 36110-2400

	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.	Consideration of minutes of meeting held on April 20, 2012**	2
2.	Report from the Director	2
3.	Report from the Commission Chair	2
4.	Consideration of adoption of proposed amendments to ADEM Admin. Code Division 335-7, Water Supply Program Regulations	2
5.	Other business	2
6.	Future business session	2

^{*} The Agenda for this meeting will be available on the ADEM website, www.adem.alabama.gov, under Environmental Management Commission.

^{**} The Minutes for this meeting will be available on the ADEM website under Environmental Management Commission.

EMC Meeting Agenda Page 2

- 1. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON APRIL 20, 2012
- 2. REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR
- 3. REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIR
- 4. CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ADEM ADMIN. CODE DIVISION 335-7, WATER SUPPLY PROGRAM REGULATIONS

The Commission will consider the adoption of proposed amendments to ADEM Admin. Code Division 335-7, Water Supply Program Regulations. The Department is proposing to amend Chapters 335-7-2; 335-7-4; 335-7-5; 335-7-6; 335-7-7; 335-7-10; 335-7-11; and 335-7-14 to make administrative and technical clarifying changes. The Department held a public hearing on the proposed amendments on May 2, 2012.

- 5. OTHER BUSINESS
- 6. FUTURE BUSINESS SESSION