





NEVADA  
**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL  
 COMMISSION**

**FINAL  
 MINUTES**

**Regulatory Meeting**

 <b>TIME</b>	 <b>LOCATION</b>
<p>Tuesday, January 22, 2026            9:00 am</p>	<p>Bryan Building            901 South Stewart Street            Bonnie B. Bryan Room, First Floor            Carson City, NV</p> <p>Video Conference            375 East Warm Springs Road, Suite 200            Las Vegas, NV</p>

**SEC members present:**

- Tom Porta, Chairman
- Jason King, Vice Chairman
- Rob Ghiglieri
- J.J. Goicoechea
- Katheryn Landreth
- Tina Mudd
- Fred Reeder
- Alan Jenne
- Chris Thorson

**SEC members absent:**

- Kacey KC

**SEC staff present:**

- Stephanie N. Itkin-Goodman, SEC/DAG
- Sheryl Fontaine, Executive Secretary
- Nancy Padilla, Recording Secretary

**Nevada Division of Environmental  
 Protection staff present:**

- Danilo Dragoni
- Nathan Rash
- Jeff Kinder
- Jennifer Schumacher
- Jennifer Carr
- Misti Gower
- Chad Myers
- Chris Flores
- Dan Morgan
- Destiney Fitch
- Emma Lintz
- Jovani Valdivia
- Krista Alvitre
- Matthew Livingston
- Nick Schlafer
- Ricky Hensley
- Scott Kuykendall
- Hanna Bingham
- Tanya Soleta

Ken McIntyre  
Shantell Davis  
Chung Je  
Nate Carasco  
Seth Alm  
Relinda Hawxhurst  
Shannon Miller  
Jordyn Dashiell  
Michelle Grover

Andrew Tucker

**Public present:**

Nate Johnston  
Christopher Rose

---

**Table of Contents:**

- [Call to order, roll call, establish quorum](#)
- [Public comments](#)
- [Approval of September 9, 2025, meeting minutes](#)
- [Staker and Parsons Companies – NOAV 3189](#)
- [Permanent Regulation R123-24P: Bureau of Administrative Services](#)
- [Administrator’s briefing to the Commission](#)
- [Public comments](#)

---

## Begin Summary Minutes

### 1) Call to order, roll call, establish quorum (Discussion)

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am by State Environmental Commission (SEC) Chairman Tom Porta. Ms. Sheryl Fontaine, the Executive Secretary, confirmed that the hearing was properly noticed, and a quorum was present. She asked if there was a member from the Attorney General’s office. Stephanie Itkin-Goodman, Deputy Attorney General, identified herself. Ms. Fontaine then proceeded with the housekeeping rules for the meeting. Chairman Porta inquired if there were any changes to the posted agenda. Ms. Fontaine responded in the affirmative, indicating that the variance request, agenda item #5, was pulled at the request of the facility, who asked that it be added to the agenda for the next SEC meeting. Chairman Porta announced to those participating in the meeting that the variance request from 21<sup>st</sup> Century Environmental Management of Nevada would not be heard at this meeting.

### 2) Public comment

Chairman Porta called for public comment on non-agendized items. There were no public comments.

---

3) **Approval of September 9, 2025, meeting minutes** (Action item)

Chairman Porta requested comments from the Commission regarding the September 9, 2025, meeting minutes. Hearing none, Chairman Porta called for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Rob Ghiglieri made a motion to approve the minutes, Vice Chairman Jason King seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

---

## **Air Penalties**

4) **Staker and Parsons Companies – NOAV No. 3189** (For Possible Action)

Andrew Tucker, Chief of the Bureau of Air Quality Planning (BAQP) with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), introduced himself to Chairman Porta and members of the Commission, as well as Michelle Grover, the supervisor of the Enforcement Branch.

Mr. Tucker introduced the recommended penalty for Staker and Parsons Companies in the amount of \$10,000 for Notice of Alleged Violation (NOAV) No. 3189, which was issued because Staker and Parsons did not conduct source compliance testing within the timeframe required by their permit. He noted that the Division had begun discussing the option of a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) with facilities in lieu of a penalty prior to bringing penalty recommendations before the Commission. He commented that this facility was not interested in completing a SEP and was ready to pay the penalty.

Ms. Grover detailed the specifics of NOAV 3189 and the calculation of the recommended penalty. She stated that the company held a Class 2 permit for its aggregate asphalt plant near Elko, NV, which was last revised on September 22, 2025. This permit allowed the operation of a hot mix asphalt plant, aggregate crushing and washing, and a concrete plant. NOAV 3189 was issued because the facility did not complete the required source testing on time. On June 25, 2024, compliance staff inspected the facility and found that water sprays were missing on several emission units and that renewal testing for System 25, the drum mix asphalt plant and drum dryer, had not been performed. The renewal testing for particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM10), PM2.5, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, volatile organic compounds, and opacity, was due by November 22, 2022, but the facility did not complete it until July 23, 2024. Ms. Grover explained that source testing for Class 2 permits to measure air pollution and evaluate emission controls is required every five years. She then reviewed the penalty calculation using the penalty matrix, stating that the facility had no other violations within the previous five years and that there were no other mitigating factors to consider. She provided a draft Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law

for the Commission's consideration and asked if the commissioners had any questions. There were none.

Chairman Porta asked if anyone from the public had questions for Division staff; there were no comments. He then brought the matter back to the Commission and asked if anyone from Staker and Parsons wished to speak. Nate Johnston, the General Manager, and Christopher Rose, Environmental Specialists, both introduced themselves.

Mr. Rose reviewed their timeline of events regarding compliance. The Elko facility completed a stack test in September 2017, which was validated and passed. The next stack test was due in late 2022 but was not performed. When Mr. Rose assumed his role in May 2024, he discovered that Elko's stack test had not yet been completed. On May 14, 2024, he contacted Jens Christiansen with NDEP's Bureau of Air Pollution Control regarding achieving compliance.

Mr. Johnston explained that two weeks after starting his role, Mr. Christiansen arrived for a five-year inspection. At that time, the facility was experiencing multiple equipment issues, including a power outage and downtime for the crusher and asphalt plant. Mr. Christiansen informed them that the stack test had not been performed since 2022. Mr. Christiansen also pointed out the missing spray nozzles at the crusher, which were fixed within a few days. Mr. Johnston confirmed this and said they self-reported the issue when it was discovered.

Staker and Parsons completed the stack test on July 23, 2024, less than a month after the inspection, and it passed. They received a letter of alleged findings on August 4, 2024, attended an enforcement conference on August 19, 2024, and then received an official notice of violation on October 1, 2024, with the recommended penalty. Mr. Johnston stated they would not appeal the penalty and emphasized their commitment to compliance. He highlighted improvements in staffing, praised Mr. Rose's efforts, and assured the Commission that they were moving forward with strong compliance practices.

Mr. Rose went on to explain that they usually perform regular stack testing on hot plants in Nevada and Utah as required. He noted that scheduling a stack test during the busy season often requires three to four months, and can take up to six months, due to coordination with paving crews and testing companies. To expedite the process, they paid a higher cost for the testing company to prioritize their test, which allowed them to complete it less than four weeks after Mr. Christiansen's inspection.

Mr. Rose also mentioned that their latest permit renewal was in November 2025, correcting a fuel type error from the previously mentioned September 2025 permit. They have made several updates to their Air Quality Operating permit to ensure accuracy and compliance, and they actively update their Class 2 permit as needed.

Chairman Porta asked if the commissioners had any questions for Mr. Rose or Mr. Johnston. Commissioner Tina Mudd disclosed that she had previously worked with Mr. Johnston and offered to abstain from voting if necessary. Chairman Porta left the decision to her, and Commissioner Mudd stated that she did not feel there was a conflict. Mr. Johnston added that the Staker and Parsons legal representative was participating virtually through Teams.

Chairman Porta asked if there were any additional questions from the Commission. Commissioner Fred Reeder noted that this was the second time a stack test issue had come before the Commission recently and asked for an explanation of a stack test.

Mr. Johnston and Mr. Rose provided a brief description of the process.

Commissioner Reeder, Vice Chairman King, and the Staker and Parsons staff discussed the number of test runs, testing requirements, facility operations during testing, and the cost of testing.

Chairman Porta asked if there were other questions from the commissioners.

Commissioner Mudd thanked Staker and Parsons Companies for self-reporting and attending the meeting, noting that it demonstrated their willingness to take ownership of the problem. She commented on the challenges that smaller plants face in achieving the tonnage needed for stack tests, especially in remote areas. She also expressed appreciation to NDEP for working with these smaller plants and thanked Staker and Parsons for their quick response in completing the test.

Chairman Porta noted that smaller plants often struggle with meeting permitted limits compared to their actual production. He explained that permits are set at maximum capacity to allow for large jobs, but most projects are much smaller. This issue has come before the Commission multiple times. He added that while lowering permit limits could be considered, doing so would bind plants to those reduced limits.

Chairman Porta asked if there were any additional questions from the commissioners; there were none. He then opened the floor for public comments on the agenda item, but no members of the public spoke. He closed the public comment period, brought the matter back to the commission for discussion, and, seeing no discussion, asked for a motion.

**Motion:** Vice Chairman King moved to approve the \$10,000 fine for NOAV 3189 pursuant to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Commissioner Mudd seconded the motion. Chairman Porta asked for discussion. Commissioner Ghiglieri mentioned that he considered suggesting a reduction to the fine to reflect the date the company self-reported but noted the penalty had already reached the cap and included a \$2,000 reduction. He expressed appreciation for the company's self-reporting and quick corrective actions. With no further discussion, Chairman Porta called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

## Regulatory Petitions

### 6) Permanent Regulation R123-24P: Bureau of Administrative Services – Office of Financial Assistance – Clean Water State Revolving Fund Regulations (For Possible Action)

Ms. Sheryl Fontaine, Chief of the Bureau of Administrative Services for NDEP, introduced herself and stated that for this agenda item, she was representing NDEP rather than the SEC and thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present the proposed regulatory amendments in R123-24.

Ms. Fontaine provided an overview of R123-24P, introducing two long-standing programs for water infrastructure financing in Nevada: (1) the U.S. EPA State Revolving Fund Programs, administered by NDEP; and (2) Nevada's Capital Improvements Grant Program, administered by the Board for Financing Water Projects and staffed by NDEP.

Ms. Fontaine explained that these programs have a long history of working together to provide affordable funding for water infrastructure projects that improve public health, protect Nevada's environment, and secure water resources for long-term sustainability. She noted that funds have also benefited Nevada's disadvantaged communities, helping them become more sustainable.

Ms. Fontaine explained the two State Revolving Fund Programs: the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). The CWSRF was established in 1987 to help water systems meet the health protection goals of the Clean Water Act, while the DWSRF was created in 1996 for similar purposes under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Both programs provide federal grants to states, which then loan funds to water systems for infrastructure projects. Loan repayments can be reloaned, thereby creating a sustainable source of funding for state water systems.

Ms. Fontaine explained that during the 82<sup>nd</sup> legislative session in 2023, Assembly Bill (AB) 20 was adopted to expand the list of entities eligible for water infrastructure funding through NDEP's Office of Financial Assistance (OFA). AB20 allowed for more innovative projects to address Nevada's needs and updated state statutes that had become more restrictive than federal law. She noted that the Commission previously adopted R109-22 to update Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) sections governing the DWSRF program and stated that the proposed changes in R123-24 would serve the same purpose for the CWSRF.

In addition to changes resulting from AB20, the petition proposed further amendments, including defining affordability criteria, revising the State Environmental Review

process, updating administrative fees for CWSRF loans, aligning state regulations with amended federal regulations, and performing general housekeeping and clean-up.

Ms. Fontaine gave an overview of the proposed changes, explaining that sections 2–6 of the proposed amendments in R123-24 add definitions that expand program eligibility and the types of assistance available to loan recipients, and section 18 replaces “person” with “eligible recipient” to reflect the expanded eligibility. Several sections update terminology, changing “Department” to “Division” and “fund” to “account” for consistency with NRS and prior DWSRF changes. Section 21 further expands assistance options to include principal forgiveness and zero-interest loans.

She stated that R109-22 amended the NACs to expand eligibility for the DWSRF and redefined “disadvantaged community” to use additional metrics beyond Median Household Income. The proposed changes make similar changes to “affordability criteria” for the CWSRF. To avoid misalignment between federal and state requirements when federal changes occur, the SRF programs define these metrics in their annual Intended Use Plans (IUP), which are submitted to federal funders and include a public participation process. The proposed changes refer to the IUP in the NACs and align the CWSRF and DWSRF programs to improve transparency and clarity for borrowers and the public.

Ms. Fontaine continued, explaining that sections 2–6 add relevant definitions, and section 37 amends the IUP requirements to include those criteria.

As a condition of receiving federal grants, the EPA requires both the CWSRF and DWSRF programs to conduct a state environmental review process for all construction projects receiving SRF assistance, in place of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. NEPA changes in 2020 and 2024 aimed to make reviews more efficient, and although the 2024 changes were vacated in 2025, a state review remains mandatory. Previously, environmental review details were in the NAC, but R109-22 removed most of that language for the DWSRF and referenced Nevada’s State Environmental Review Process instead. The proposed changes in R123-24, sections 24–36 align the CWSRF review process with the DWSRF process, shift the environmental review responsibility from the Division to borrowers, accelerate review times for categorical exclusions, and allow the Division discretion in determining whether public or stakeholder comments are considered significant.

Ms. Fontaine noted that the SRF programs were originally intended to be self-sustaining, meaning federal grant funds would be loaned to Nevada water systems for infrastructure projects and, once repaid, become available for future loans. Nevada is working toward this sustainability goal. Currently, states can use a portion of each federal grant for administrative costs, but when federal grants end, those funds for administration will no longer be available. To address this, R109-22 added a fee to DWSRF loans, and the

proposed amendments in R123-24 add a similar fee for the CWSRF program to help achieve long-term program sustainability. Specifically, section 47 allows the Division Administrator to set a loan origination fee and a new annual service fee for CWSRF loans. The regulations also require the program to offer a hardship waiver if a borrower can demonstrate that the fee would cause significant financial hardship, and they set criteria for determining such hardship.

Ms. Fontaine described hypothetical revenue from annual service fees that would have been collected from loans initiated over the past six years if the fee had been implemented in FY21. She explained that, at least in the early years, projected fee revenue would not cover the legislatively approved administrative costs for the program. Ms. Fontaine also displayed the program's approved administrative budget for the same period for comparison.

Ms. Fontaine offered to review the numbers in more detail. Chairman Porta then asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners, and there were none.

Ms. Fontaine explained that recent amendments to the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) introduced programmatic changes to the CWSRF. The CWA only required projects for constructing treatment works to be ranked on a priority list. Since eligibility was being expanded to other entities and project types, section 38 clarifies which projects must appear on the priority list. Additionally, section 40 updates the ranking criteria to reflect current practices

Ms. Fontaine further explained that not all CWSRF projects are required to follow all federal grant conditions, a concept the Environmental Protection Agency refers to as "equivalency" (defined in 40 CFR 35.3105(f)). Sections 57 and 58 introduce this concept and clarify which projects must comply with federal grant conditions. This change provides flexibility and reduces the administrative burden for some borrowers without adding new conditions. NDEP is already applying the "equivalency" concept in the DWSRF program.

Ms. Fontaine added that further changes were to remove outdated or redundant language and further align the DWSRF and CWSRF regulations to improve efficiency. Notably, the CWSRF regulations did not previously include a dispute process; this was added to the CWSRF regulations. The amendments also clarify the required contents of a facility plan (without adding new requirements) and the timeline for submitting a Letter of Intent.

Ms. Fontaine noted that the Commission requested an annual update on the DWSRF fee program during the R109-22 hearing in December 2022, and that this update had not been provided. Ms. Fontaine continued, stating that the DWSRF program did not generate significant revenue from program fees until 2025, when it collected nearly \$300,000 in service fees. To date, none of these fees have been spent, partly due to program-level challenges, but expenditures are anticipated to begin this year, which should free up funds currently used for administration to support additional loans. She offered to

provide annual updates for the CWSRF fee program as well, if requested by the Commission.

In conclusion, Ms. Fontaine thanked the commissioners for their time and consideration and offered to answer any additional questions. Chairman Porta asked if there were any questions from the commissioners. Commissioner Mudd thanked Ms. Fontaine and appreciated the alignment with federal regulations and improvements to the process. She asked what projects the new fees would fund after covering administrative costs. Ms. Fontaine clarified that the service fees were intended solely to cover administrative costs. She explained that the program can currently use a percentage of the federal SRF grant funds for administration, which typically covers salaries, travel, and indirect costs. When the federal funds are no longer available, administrative costs will need to come from another revenue source. To ensure the program can continue to serve Nevada, the proposed regulations include service fees to cover future administrative costs.

Chairman Porta asked if there were additional questions from the commissioners.

Vice Chairman King asked about the public workshop held on January 7, 2026. Ms. Fontaine reported that approximately 20–30 people attended, and the workshop lasted about 11 minutes. There was one comment asking for clarification that the annual service fee is in addition to the loan origination fee. It was confirmed that both fees are 0.5% of the loan amount (the service fee is 0.75% if an entity takes out a bond) and that the 0.5% annual service fee is distributed over the loan term. Ms. Fontaine noted that no written comments were received.

Chairman Porta asked if there were other questions from the commissioners.

Commissioner Alan Jenne asked whether the environmental assessment preparation is a cost that could be included in the loan. Ms. Fontaine was unsure and stated that she would follow up with an answer.

Chairman Porta asked if there were any additional questions from the Commission. Seeing none, he opened the meeting for public comments on the regulation update. No public comments were received, and he closed the comment period, returning the discussion to the Commission. Chairman Porta expressed satisfaction that both the Clean Water and Drinking Water SRF programs are now aligned with federal requirements and consistent with each other, noting that this would ease the burden on municipalities that previously had to navigate two sets of rules. Ms. Fontaine credited Jason Cooper, the former program manager, with developing the updates. Seeing no further discussion Chairman Porta called for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Kathryn Landreth moved to approve proposed regulation LCB File R123-24. Commissioner Mudd seconded the motion. Chairman Porta asked if there was

any further discussion; seeing none, he called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

---

## **7) Administrator's briefing to the Commission (For Discussion only)**

Jennifer Carr, NDEP Administrator, introduced Andrew Tucker to provide details on the Clean Trucks and Buses Incentive Program.

Mr. Tucker explained that the Commission had approved regulations for the Clean Trucks and Buses Incentive Program (regulatory petition R144-24) during the SEC hearing on November 19, 2024, and that these regulations were adopted to implement the program established by Assembly Bill (AB) 184 of the 82<sup>nd</sup> legislative session, which provides voucher incentives for purchasing, upfitting, or retrofitting medium- and heavy-duty vehicles that produce zero tailpipe emissions. Mr. Tucker noted that, during the hearing, the Division had been asked to provide a program update after approximately one year. He explained that the update was delayed because there was no meeting at the end of 2025.

Mr. Tucker reported that the regulations had gone into effect after being approved by the Legislative Commission on December 19, 2024. He stated that AB184 directed a portion of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Carbon Reduction Program grant funds awarded to the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) to be used for the incentives. NDEP has been working with NDOT and the FHWA to overcome challenges in launching the program and recently achieved a major milestone by executing agreements for transferring funds from NDOT to NDEP and securing the FHWA's obligation of funds for incentives. Mr. Tucker noted that some challenges remained and additional outreach and engagement would be needed, but progress was being made toward implementation. He then asked if the Commission had any questions.

Ms. Carr added that she was relieved the carbon reduction funds were still available and noted that, to the best of her knowledge, Nevada is the only state using these funds for this type of program, demonstrating innovation. She commended Mr. Tucker and his staff for their hard work in creating and implementing the voucher system, as there were no existing models to follow.

Chairman Porta asked if there had been any participants so far. Mr. Tucker reported that they had received inquiries expressing interest in the program, but they were not yet ready to begin soliciting applications. He noted that they expected interested parties once the process started. Ms. Carr added that they anticipated moving forward with the program during calendar year 2026. Chairman Porta commented that the program isn't just for buses, and that communities with aging vehicles could replenish those as well.

Ms. Carr added that the pilot program is broken down into weight classes to include semi-trucks, local delivery trucks, school buses and public buses, and others. Mr. Tucker agreed that there is a variety of weight classes that can be eligible from Class 2B, where the lower end is gross vehicle weight rating of 8500 pounds up to the largest trucks and buses.

Commissioner Reeder asked how much funding would be provided for a semi-truck. Mr. Tucker explained that the amount depended on the vehicle's weight class rating. For larger vehicles, such as tractor trailers, funding could be up to \$175,000 per vehicle, but it was capped at the incremental cost between a conventional vehicle and an electric or hydrogen fuel cell vehicle.

Ms. Carr introduced Michelle Grover to discuss restructuring of the Air Penalty Matrix. Ms. Grover explained that this was the capstone project for the Certified Public Manager (CPM) program and shared general details about the project. She then described the key aspects of the project in more detail. Ms. Grover explained that the penalty matrix had not been updated since 2008 and explained that the capstone project would focus on the first phase of revising the matrix, including examination of base penalties, time period multipliers, and mitigation factors. She planned to review other states' processes, redesign the matrix, present the updates to stakeholders during public outreach, address any concerns, and then bring the final proposal back to the Commission for approval. The second phase, which would not be part of her CPM project, would examine how to assess economic benefit more accurately when determining final penalty recommendations. Her goal is to have the new penalty calculations approved by the Commission by the summer or fall 2026 meeting and have it operational by the last meeting of 2026. Ms. Grover asked how the Commission would like her to communicate milestones outside of regular meetings, thanked them for their support in revising penalty recommendations, and invited questions or comments, noting that details were limited since the project had not officially started.

Chairman Porta asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman King congratulated Ms. Grover on her CPM capstone project. Chairman Porta inquired whether the revised penalty matrix would include a reference to SEPs, noting prior discussions about addressing the possibility of a SEP at enforcement conferences. Ms. Grover stated that the new approach could address when the SEP option is offered and discussed. Chairman Porta agreed and suggested that discussing the SEP option with the facility before presenting penalties to the SEC would streamline the process. Ms. Grover confirmed they could work toward an agreement on this approach prior to SEC review.

Commissioner Ghiglieri encouraged Ms. Grover to reach out to commissioners for feedback when testing ideas. He also asked if the public was being included in the matrix development process. Ms. Grover responded that they planned to contact all air program facilities once a draft proposal was ready, to explain changes and gather input before seeking SEC approval.

Commissioner Mudd congratulated Ms. Grover and asked what she considered the most critical issue in the penalty matrix and what challenges she faced. Ms. Grover explained that penalties sometimes do not align with actual violations and that there is no effective way to account for mitigation factors. She also noted that record-keeping penalties could reach millions of dollars when getting into major violations and emphasized the need to align penalties with actual enforcement practices.

Chairman Porta asked for additional questions, and seeing none, congratulated Ms. Grover again and requested an update upon completion of her program.

Ms. Carr further explained that after recent meetings with facilities where SEPs were negotiated, it became clear that companies agreed to SEPs but did not fully understand the process until it was explained afterward. This led to efforts to change the process, so facilities are informed about SEP options before being brought to the SEC. She cited a recent case, where the company appreciated the SEP concept but lacked internal resources to implement a project, resulting in payment of the penalty instead. Ms. Carr noted that work is underway to streamline and formalize SEP integration for transparency.

Chairman Porta commented that directing funds toward community-benefiting projects via a SEP is preferable to a penalty and that a conversation should be incorporated early in the process. Ms. Carr added that SEP use has declined but is being revived across other NDEP programs as well.

Commissioner Mudd asked if regulations prohibited introducing SEPs earlier in the process or if they required Commission approval before they could be proposed. Chairman Porta explained that SEPs were not addressed in regulation and were instead based on Division policy. Ms. Carr confirmed this, noting that the process is based on federal EPA policy and functions as an out-of-court settlement, giving enforcement discretion to pursue SEPs using EPA as a model. Chairman Porta clarified that other bureaus negotiate their penalties through the court system, while air program fines must be approved by the Commission.

Ms. Carr added that if an out-of-court settlement cannot be reached for the other programs, cases proceed to District Court with maximum potential penalties, which can reach millions, and are then negotiated. Chairman Porta noted that this is why water violations do not come before the SEC.

Ms. Carr concluded her briefing by announcing the upcoming retirement of Andrea Seifert, Chief of NDEP's Bureau of Safe Drinking Water. Ms. Seifert served in this role for many years and previously worked as a supervisor when the program was part of the Health Division before moving to NDEP in 2005. She also worked in the Division of Water Resources. Ms. Carr praised Ms. Seifert's accomplishments and effectiveness over her 30 years of service. Recruitment efforts for her replacement were scheduled to begin in February. Ms. Carr also provided an update on the agenda item that was pulled from the schedule. She explained that after meeting with the company to discuss how the variance request would be

presented to the Commission, the company decided to rework some aspects of the proposal. Ms. Carr noted that further collaboration with the company was expected soon and that the item would be brought back to the Commission once revisions were complete.

Chairman Porta asked if there were any additional questions for Ms. Carr.

Commissioner Ghiglieri commended NDEP for its broad impact across industries and communities and expressed the SEC's appreciation for their work. He thanked Ms. Carr for her efforts. Chairman Porta asked Ms. Carr to extend his best wishes to Ms. Seifert and noted her instrumental role in transitioning the Drinking Water Program to NDEP.

Chairman Porta called for further questions, and there were none.

---

## **8) Public comments**

Chairman Porta inquired whether there were any public comments, either online or in person. There were none.

---

## **9) Adjournment**

Chairman Porta thanked participants and adjourned the meeting.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

**ATTACHMENT 1: Staker and Parsons Companies – NOAV No. 3189**

**ATTACHMENT 2: PowerPoint – Regulatory Petition R123-24P**