Waste Management and Radiation Control Board Meeting
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
195 North 1950 West (Conference Room #1015) SLC, Utah
May 12, 2016
1:30 p.m.

Board Members Present: Dwayne Woolley (Chair), Dennis Riding (Vice Chair), Richard Codell, Danielle Endres, Marc Franc, Jeremy Hawk, Alan Matheson, Brett Mickelson, Shawn Milne, Vern Rogers and Shane Whitney

Board Members Absent: Steve McIff

Staff Members Present: Scott Anderson, Brent Everett, Craig Anderson, Thomas Ball, Ralph Bohn, Arlene Lovato, Rusty Lundberg, Kimberly McEwan, Tina Mercer, Deborah Ng, Rick Page, Jerry Rogers, Elisa Smith, Don Verbica, David Wheeler, Otis Willoughby and Karen Wallner

Others Present: Tim Orton, Gary Merrell, Ashley Soltysiak, Kevin Murray, Mark Hooyn

I. Call to Order.

Dwayne Woolley (Chair) welcomed all in attendance and called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Steve McIff was excused from the meeting.

II. Approval of the Meeting Minutes for the April 14, 2016 Board Meeting **(Board Action Item)**.

It was moved by Shane Whitney and seconded by Dennis Riding and UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED to approve the April 14, 2016 Board Meeting minutes.

III. Underground Storage Tanks Update.

Brent Everett, Director of the Division of Environmental Response and Remediation (DERR), informed the Board that the cash balance of the Petroleum Storage Tank (PST) Trust Fund at the end of March 2016 was $16,375,040.00. The preliminary estimate for the cash balance of the PST Trust Fund for the end of April 2016 is $16,422,739.00. The cash balance of the PST Trust Fund is watched closely, particularly since the passage of House Bill (HB) 120 a few years ago, which increased the coverage under the PST Trust Fund from $990,000.00 to $1,990,000.00. There were no questions or comments on the PST Trust Fund balance.

IV. X-Ray Program.

A. Approval of Mammography Imaging Medical Physicists (MIMPs) in accordance with UCA 19-6-104(2)(b) **(Board Action Item)**.

Ralph Bohn, Planning and Technical Support Section Manager, distributed the list of the applicants requesting certification by the Board as qualified Mammography Imaging Medical Physicists (MIMPs). (The list of the 14 MIMP applicants is available with the meeting minutes).

Mr. Bohn informed the Board that physicists who perform radiation surveys and evaluate the quality control programs of the facilities in Utah providing mammography examinations are referred to as MIMPs. These individuals are required to submit an application for review of qualifications and receive certification from the Board on an annual basis.

In April 2016, thirteen individuals filed applications to be re-certified as MIMPs. One new application was received from Warren Scott Helms, M.S. Division staff reviewed all the applicants' qualifications and determined that all applicants meet the requirements specified in R313-28-140. 19-3-103.5(2)(f) of the Utah Code Annotated also requires the Board to review applicants' qualifications and issue certificates of approval to individuals who: (i) survey mammography equipment; or (ii) oversee quality assurance practices at mammography facilities. This statutory requirement was effective May 8, 2012.

Dwayne Woolley asked if the certification is limited to fourteen individuals. Mr. Bohn stated there is not a limit; however, only fourteen MIMPs applied. Individuals can apply throughout the year as there is not a specific timeframe for obtaining certification.

Alan Matheson asked about the qualifications for obtaining a certification and the review process. Mr. Bohn explained that the statute lists the specific requirements for certification. Rusty Lundberg, Deputy Director, Waste Management and Radiation Control, further stated that the MIMPs are also subject to standards and requirements that have been set by Federal Law, including the standards of the Mammography Quality Standards Act (Federal Law). This statute was established to ensure that imaging, particularly for mammography purposes, is done with the patient's dosage in mind, as well as the technician administering the x-ray and any attending physician's dosage. The aspect of safety and health standards is also included. The MIMPs are responsible to know what is required to ensure that images are of good quality without overdosing the patients.

Jeremy Hawk further added that the MIMPs' requirements include initial and ongoing certification including education, either in physics or medical physics or related field. (The applicants listed all have advanced degrees.) Mr. Hawk further stated that supervised experience (performing inspections of machines under the supervision of a previously approved MIMP) is also required. Other requirements include continual education requirements and continual experience requirements. Mr. Lundberg explained that this certification program is administered through the Federal Drug Administration (FDA), which has the primary responsibility of overseeing this certification process.

Mr. Woolley asked if the MIMPs are paid for their services. Mr. Bohn stated that the MIMPs contract with the individual hospitals, etc. for payment. Division staff also perform the same services so facilities can utilize whomever they choose. However, if MIMPs perform the inspections, the Division staff reviews their findings. The Division staff is also required to meet the same certification requirements as the other MIMPs, but they are certified by the FDA.

The MIMPs do not have to reside in Utah, as many on the list are from out of State. The certification is only for the State of Utah.

It was moved by Brett Mickelson and seconded by Vern Rogers and UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED to approve the fourteen Mammography Imaging Medical Physicists as identified on the list provided to the Board in accordance with UCA 19-6-104(2)(b) (Board Action Item). Jeremy Hawk abstained from voting.

V. Low Level Radioactive Waste Section.

A. Energy*Solutions*, LLC request for a site-specific treatment variance from the Hazardous Waste Management Rules. Energy*Solutions* seeks authorization to treat waste containing High Subcategory Mercury by stabilization rather than retort and recovery (Information Item Only).

Otis Willoughby, Environmental Scientist, Low Level Radioactive Waste Section, and Tim Orton, representative of Energy*Solutions*, reviewed Energy*Solutions*' request for a site-specific treatment variance from the Utah Hazardous Waste Management Rules to treat, by stabilization, waste containing High Subcategory Mercury. If the rules contemplated a renewal of a variance, this would be a renewal. However, variances are only good for one year, so a new variance request is required. Mr. Orton stated that he waited to request the variance until Energy*Solutions* received the waste for disposal.

Energy*Solutions* requests approval to receive and dispose of waste carrying the D009 or U151 High Mercury-Organic Subcategory and High Mercury-Inorganic Subcategory hazardous waste codes that has been treated using stabilization/amalgamation technologies.

Energy*Solutions* will perform the stabilization/amalgamation treatment on D009 and U151 High Mercury Subcategory waste streams that have not been treated prior to arrival at the Energy*Solutions* Clive facility. All actions will be performed in accordance with Energy*Solutions'* State-issued hazardous waste Permit.

The listed treatment technology in 40 CFR 268.40 for the D009 High Mercury-Organic Subcategory is either incineration (IMERC) or retorting/roasting for mercury recovery (RMERC). The listed treatment technology for the D009 High Mercury-Inorganic Subcategory and for U151 is RMERC.

The need and justification for this variance are as follows: The intent of the RMERC treatment process is to recover elemental mercury for recycling. However, radioactive mercury cannot be recycled and the RMERC process generates secondary waste (radioactive elemental mercury) which requires additional treatment by amalgamation (a stabilization technology) prior to disposal.

The IMERC technology is also intended to be a mercury recovery technology where the waste is incinerated and the mercury recovered in the ash or in a specific off-gas control system. For radioactive mercury, both the ash and the control equipment/media will require further treatment. Furthermore, IMERC involves an extra handling step for the radioactive residue. Successful chemical stabilization of High Mercury-Inorganic Subcategory wastes has been demonstrated to achieve a measure of performance equivalent to the required methods which require two treatment methods (RMERC and stabilization) with no detrimental effect to human health or the environment. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) has issued a Determination of Equivalent Treatment (DET) for these High Mercury Subcategory wastes that were chemically stabilized. EPA determined that, for waste streams

that are radioactive and contain mercury, the recovery portion of RMERC may not be appropriate and that alternative treatment processes should be pursued.

The US EPA has reviewed the treatment of mercury-bearing waste in a Federal Register Notice (68 FR 4481). In this notice, the US EPA concluded that treatment of mercury waste is possible and suggested that stakeholders use the site specific treatment variance process to obtain approval for the treatment of high subcategory mercury wastes. The notice specifically designates an example of when this would be appropriate as the case of a high mercury subcategory waste that is also radioactive.

This variance request deals with waste that may be shipped to Energy*Solutions* over the next year. To date, Energy*Solutions* has disposed of approximately 10,560 cubic feet of treated High Mercury Subcategory waste. From knowledge of the current market of High Mercury Subcategory Waste requiring treatment or disposal and from past experience receiving this type of waste, Energy*Solutions* anticipates up to approximately 500 cubic feet of additional High Mercury Subcategory waste for disposal in the next year under this treatment variance.

A notice for public comment was published in the Salt Lake Tribune, the Deseret News and the Tooele County Transcript Bulletin on May 3, 2016. The comment period began May 3, 2016 and will end June 3, 2016. This is an informational item before the Board. The Director will provide a recommendation at the next Board meeting.

Dwayne Woolley asked if the technology to treat this type of waste has changed since the last variance approval. Tim Orton stated there are not any other options to treat the waste, besides the retorting process, which cannot be done because the mercury would still be radioactive. Richard Codell asked if there are any radioactive elements in the waste that are also volatile that would be driven off in the retorting process. Mr. Orton stated that he does not believe so, as this waste is not being retorted. This specific waste stream contains uranium, which is not volatile. Mr. Orton clarified that this variance request is for this specific type of waste stream that Energy*Solutions* will received throughout the year. The waste will not be retorted.

B. Energy*Solutions*, LLC request for a site-specific treatment variance from the Hazardous Waste Management Rules. Energy*Solutions* seeks authorization to treat waste containing hazardous contaminants and PCBs (Information Item Only).

Otis Willoughby and Tim Orton reviewed Energy*Solutions*' request for a site-specific treatment variance from the Utah Hazardous Waste Management Rules to dispose of waste containing hazardous constituents and PCBs as an Underlying Hazardous Constituents.

Mr. Willoughby explained that if the PCB waste did not carry RCRA hazardous waste codes, but contained the same PCB concentrations, it could be disposed in the landfill without additional treatment.

This variance is being requested for up to approximately 5 tons of waste generated at the Clive Mixed Waste Facility (site-generated waste) that may be contaminated with PCBs from operations at the site. Examples of site-generated wastes include baghouse dust, sump clean-out material and decontamination sludges. Site activities involving PCBs include, but are not limited to, repackaging waste containers and shredding PCB capacitors.

Analysis of site-generated waste over the last year has detected PCB concentrations up to 268 ppm (mg/kg). The UTS concentration for PCBs is 10 mg/kg. Over the past several years, approximately 13 tons of this type of waste were generated and treated at the Clive Facility. Analytical data demonstrated that all contaminants, except PCBs, met treatment standards in these treatment runs. Energy*Solutions* has many years of data demonstrating that the treatment formulas developed for site-generated waste has successfully treated the waste.

PCB waste generated at the site which is greater than 50 ppm is regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as PCB remediation waste. The EPA has clarified the disposal of PCB remediation waste with a concentration greater than 50 ppm PCBs in 40 CFR 761.61 (a)(5)(i)(B)(2)(iii) as follows:

"Bulk PCB remediation wastes with a PCB concentration >50 ppm shall be disposed of in a hazardous waste landfill permitted by EPA under section 3004 of RCRA or by a State authorized under section 3006 of RCRA"

Therefore, treatment of the PCBs within this waste stream is technically inappropriate and not required for final disposal of the waste form.

A notice for public comment was published in the Salt Lake Tribune, the Deseret News and the Tooele County Transcript Bulletin on May 3, 2016. The comment period began May 3, 2016 and will end June 3, 2016. This is an informational item before the Board. The Director will provide a recommendation at the next Board meeting.

Tim Orton stated that he waited to request the variance until Energy*Solutions* received the waste for disposal.

Dennis Riding noted that many variances have been requested over the years and asked if public comment is ever received. Mr. Willoughby stated that very rarely are public comments received. Mr. Woolley asked the average tons of waste generated each year. Mr. Orton stated that Energy*Solutions* usually generates one drum (approximately 500 lbs.) every three months, equaling about one ton per year.

VI. Hazardous Waste Section.

A. Proposed Stipulation and Consent Order between the Board and Heckmann Woods Cross (**Board Action Item**).

Scott Anderson reviewed a proposed Stipulation and Consent Order to resolve the failure of Heckmann Woods Cross to fully implement the facility closure plan required by its Used Oil Processing Permit (UOP-0068). Deborah Ng, Hazardous Waste Section Manager, David Wheeler, Environmental Scientist, Hazardous Waste Section, and Kimberly McEwan, Attorney General's Office, also provided information.

The site at issue is a parcel of property in Woods Cross located at 1700 West 2600 South (Davis County). Over many years, the site has been utilized for various activities including petroleum refining

and asphalt manufacturing. Also, a small portion of this property has been utilized for used oil activities.

In the 1950's - 1960's, Black Oil Company used the site for fuel blending and storage. That infrastructure was dismantled by Chevron in the late 1960's. Shortly after that, Cowboy Oil constructed and operated a small oil refinery on the site. Cowboy Oil is no longer in business.

During the 1980's, other companies utilized this site including Morrison Petroleum, Westec Petroleum, Jardine Petroleum, Crysen Refining, Basin Western, Crown Asphalt and Foreland Refining. All these companies' activities included refining crude into product, asphalt operations and used oil operations. In 1981, the refining activities ceased, but the facility continued to be used for fuel blending and storage of fuel and asphalt.

In 1991, an Investigation and Corrective Action Plan was prepared by Wasatch Environmental, on behalf of Cowboy Refinery. The report documented soil and groundwater contamination. In 1992, a groundwater remediation system was installed at the property. Contaminated water was treated and discharged through the South Davis County Sewer Improvement District.

In 1995, Genesis Petroleum conducted a Phase II Investigation on the property and identified significant contamination. Notwithstanding the contamination, Genesis leased a portion of the property and began operating a used oil business under the conditions of a used oil permit.

In 1998, Thermo Fluids acquired Genesis Petroleum's Used Oil Permit and continued the same used oil activities allowed by the permit. Thermo Fluids also conducted a Phase I and a Phase II Investigation to document "pre-lease" conditions at the property relative to the existing contamination, and to confirm what the previous reports had indicated, which is that the property was significantly contaminated with the types of hydrocarbons expected to be found at the types of facilities that had operated over the years at the site. Thermo Fluids also developed a closure plan as required by the permit.

In 2004, Idaho Asphalt Supply conducted another investigation at the property. The Investigation Report was obtained by the Division in 2015 and noted the same kind of contamination previously identified on the property.

In 2004, Thermo Fluids notified the Division of its desire to terminate the lease at this location, close the facility and relocate operations to Salt Lake City. As Thermo Fluids began the closure process, it conducted another Phase II to document "post-lease" contamination conditions. The Phase II Report also noted the same kind of contamination previously identified at the property. At that point it became evident to Thermo Fluids that implementing the Closure Plan as written and approved was not possible. The Closure Plan was very broad and required Thermo Fluids to remove "any" contamination. Based on the operations and the contamination that occurred at this property over the years; the closure plan requirements were impossible to achieve.

Thermo Fluids, in discussions with Division staff, made a business decision to keep its Used Oil Permit "active" and maintain the required financial assurance. Thermo Fluids discontinued used oil activities on the property. Thermo Fluids also concluded that, since the contamination was so extensive across the property, and because most of the contamination existed up-gradient from the used oil activities portion

of the facility, it would make no sense to cleanup a small portion of the property, only to have the up-gradient contamination move back and re-contaminate the cleaned portion of the property. Also, it was not possible for Thermo Fluids to get access to other facilities on the property and go under existing tanks and pads to remove contamination not likely caused by Thermo Fluids.

From 2008 to 2013, no used oil processing activities occurred at the property and no further closure activities were pursued. In 2013, additional tanks were removed from the property, cleaned and sent to Thermo Fluids' Salt Lake City location.

In 2014, Heckmann, a subsidiary of Nuverra Environmental Solutions, contacted the Division with a request to obtain Thermo Fluids' Used Oil Permit. Heckmann established financial assurance and on June 17, 2014, the Director of the Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste approved the transfer of Thermo Fluids' Used Oil Processor Permit (UOP-0068) to Heckmann Woods Cross. As the new Permittee, Heckmann was required to implement closure of the facility in accordance with the approved closure plan. However, after reviewing the various site investigation reports, Heckmann concluded it would not be able to implement the closure plan.

In the interim, Division staff members conducted an investigation at the property, reviewed all the contamination reports provided, and agreed with the conclusion that it was highly unlikely that any of the used oil activities conducted at the property contributed any significant contamination that did not already exist and that it was impossible for Heckmann to implement closure.

In July 2015, Heckmann formally notified the Director that it was not possible to fully implement the approved closure plan at the facility. Heckmann's concern was that it had to maintain financial assurance for a closure plan that could not implemented. Because the expense of maintaining financial assurance was significant, Heckmann proposed a settlement which is embodied in a Stipulation and Consent Order (SCO). (A copy of the SCO was emailed to Board members and is available in the meeting minutes). The SCO includes a penalty of $75,000. The Permit will be terminated after all terms of the SCO have been completed, releasing Heckmann from its obligation to maintain financial assurance.

Mr. Anderson informed the Board that a Notice of Violation is not associated with this matter. Rather the SCO is the mechanism to address Heckmann's failure to implement the closure plan and when executed, will resolve that specific issue.

Mr. Anderson further explained that the Board is not being asked to approve the SCO at this time. Rather, the Board is being asked to approve the release of the SCO for a 30-day public comment period. Normally, settlements resolving enforcement actions are brought to the Board after public comment. However, because of the unique nature of this matter, Mr. Anderson felt the Board should be informed of the difficult technical and regulatory issues before the SCO went out for public comment.

Marc Franc asked if termination of the permit would relieve Heckmann of any liabilities associated with the contamination. Mr. Anderson explained that the SCO only relieves Heckmann of its obligation to maintain financial assurance. The SCO does not address future liabilities.

Kimberly McEwan, Attorney General's Office, stated that other identified parties responsible for the contamination would still be considered "responsible parties" for cleanup of the contamination at the property and confirmed that the SCO does not relieve Heckmann of any responsibility in this regard.

Mr. Franc asked how the site would be cleaned up and who would do it if there is no financial assurance on which to draw. Ms. McEwan clarified that the contamination was contributed from many companies, but the only matter being addressed today deals with a very small portion of the property that was utilized for used oil activities and the regulatory authority from the Division is only for the portion of the property relating to used oil activities. The Division does not have the regulatory authority over anything else that contributed to the contamination at the property.

Mr. Franc asked if there might be additional financial assurance required of other parties at the site that could be used to address contamination in general. Mr. Anderson explained that financial assurance requirements may have been imposed on the current owners of the property by city ordinances, etc.

Dennis Riding expressed concerns regarding the underlying contamination problem and asked if the contaminants are mobile. Deborah Ng noted that the reports identified vinyl chloride (not part of used oil processing) which could be a concern.

Mr. Woolley noted that property transfer documents usually spell out who is responsible for previous contamination.

Mr. Anderson clarified that when the permit was transferred to Thermo Fluids, it knew what was on the property and made the business decision to proceed. In doing so, Thermo Fluids assumed all assets and liabilities associated with the property and became subject to all the requirements in the permit. The Division is not aware of the arrangement/agreements between Genesis and Thermo Fluids. It is anticipated those issues were dealt with between the two companies. If the question is, did Thermo Fluids know about what it was getting; the answer is yes.

Mr. Woolley asked if Thermo Fluids still involved. Mr. Anderson stated that Thermo Fluids is not involved as Heckmann is now the permittee of record. Mr. Woolley asked if Heckmann assumed that same responsibility. Mr. Woolley stated he does not have a concern with the issue, but questioned if the $75,000 figure was anywhere close to what would be required; because the Board is forgiving that responsibility by this settlement.

Kevin Murray, Holland and Hart Law Firm, representing Heckmann Woods Cross further clarified that in regards to the $75,000, Heckmann understood that the property was contaminated at the time it assumed the lease but did not assume any historic liability because the reports have demonstrated that Heckmann did not cause further problems at the property. Heckmann understand the property was contaminated and posted the financial assurance to ensure against any damages it may have caused. Mr. Murray felt the offer of $75,000 is very fair because the money is being offered to the State to use for a problem that Heckmann did not cause at all. While financial assurance is to assure against any damages that Heckmann may cause from its operations, he believes the evidence and the studies show that Heckman did not cause anything, but because of the uncertainty associated with that, the $75,000 has been offered to the State, in order to terminate the permit.

The reason for terminating the permit is because Heckmann is no longer in business and the financial assurance responsibility is becoming a financial burden, especially since Heckmann did not cause any of the contamination.

Vern Rogers asked why Heckmann would be expected to implement a closure plan that had previously been found by Thermo Fluids to be unfeasible to implement. Mr. Anderson explained that when the permit was transferred, the Division had a regulatory obligation to transfer all requirements, notwithstanding the conditions of the site.

Mr. Murray informed the Board that most of the closure plan was implemented, except for the requirement to destroy a concrete pad. That could not be done, because the existing operators had placed new equipment on top of the concrete pad. Mr. Murray reiterated that the reason he believes this is a fair settlement is because substantial materials have been submitted that demonstrate that Heckmann did not contribute to the contamination at the property; as the site was contaminated when they started and when they ended.

Mr. Murray noted that often in the business world when you come onto a site and assume a permit, you assume the liability and you may receive some type of market adjustment for that, etc. but that is not the case in this matter; this was a market lease on a known property that had a forty-year history of contamination problems.

Dennis Riding asked what percentage of the closure plan was actually implemented. Ben Machlis of Holland and Hart stated there were six elements to the closure plan and five of them were implemented. Most of the aspects of the closure plan dealt with cleaning and removing tanks from the site. The portion of the closure plan not implemented included tanks and concrete pads that were not owned by Thermo Fluids. However, documentation has been submitted that the equipment was cleaned and turned over to the new owner in suitable condition. The last condition of the closure plan, which was breaking up the concrete pads and dealing with soil contamination caused by Thermo Fluids, was the portion of the closure plan that was never implemented. Deborah Ng added that the professional engineer's certification of closure was not provided.

Dennis Riding asked if any of the closure plan activities included cleanup of any of the contamination. Mr. Machlis stated that the records he obtained from that cleanup during that timeframe indicate the cleanup was tanks only.

Shane Whitney if other businesses currently operate on the site. David Wheeler explained that Peak Asphalt and Foreland Asphalt perform various asphalt activities on the property and the majority of the remaining equipment at the site is a series of large tanks.

Danielle Endres asked if current operations at the site preclude cleanup and remediation. Ms. Ng explained that only groundwater monitoring activities are currently being conducted. Mr. Wheeler noted that the system of monitoring wells is connected with a trenching system which is located on the peripheral area downgradient of the site and is designed to prevent any contamination from moving off-site.

Mr. Woolley noted that the $75,000 is more of a penalty to the permittee, relieving Heckmann of the obligation to maintain financial assurance, but it does not relieve them of civil liabilities in the future on the cleanup required at the site.

Ms. McEwan agreed. The $75,000 is a penalty for not completing the requirements outlined in the closure plan.

Mr. Woolley stated he is satisfied that, notwithstanding the known contamination and the question of responsibility, it is not up to the Board to decide who is responsible; it is up to the Board to decide if the Permit still needs to be maintained or not.

Mr. Murray agreed and stated that all the SCO does is terminate the permit; it does not resolve any liability.

(Scott Anderson reviewed the information in the SCO and informed the Board that they will be provided a copy of the SCO via an email).

It was moved by Mark Franc and seconded by Dennis Riding and UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED to approve a 30-day public comment period for the Proposed Stipulation and Consent Order between the Board and Heckmann Woods Cross.

VII. Other Business.

A. Misc. Information Items. – None to report.

B. Scheduling of next Board Meeting.

The next Board meeting is scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on June 9, 2016 at the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, 195 North 1950 West, SLC.

VIII. Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair.

Mr. Woolley informed the Board that each year a board chairman and vice-chairman must be elected. Mr. Woolley then conducted the election.

Shane Whitney nominated Brett Mickelson to serve as the Board Chairman, Vern Rogers seconded the motion. Shawn Milne moved to close the nomination and accept Brent Mickelson by acclamation.

It was moved by Shane Whitney and seconded by Vern Rogers and UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED that Brett Mickelson be elected to serve as the Board Chairman.

Mr. Woolley nominated Dennis Riding to serve as the Board Vice-Chairman, Brett Mickelson seconded the motion. Shawn Milne moved to close the nomination and accept Dennis Riding by acclamation.

It was moved by Dwayne Woolley and seconded by Brett Mickelson and UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED that Dennis Riding be elected to serve as the Board Vice-Chairman.

IX. Recognition of Dwayne Woolley (Retiring).

Scott Anderson expressed his appreciation to Dwayne Woolley for his service on the Board. Mr. Anderson thanked Mr. Woolley for his many years of commitment to the Division and Department and his willingness to take time out of his professional and personal life to serve. Mr. Woolley was also thanked for studying the issues, consistently reviewing the meeting minutes for accuracy and always being involved and engaged with all actions before the Board. Mr. Woolley previously served on the SHW Control Board beginning in 2011.

Mr. Woolley thanked the Board and stated he has been glad to be of service on the Board. A plaque was presented to Mr. Woolley. Light refreshments were served.

X. Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 2:32 pm.