

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

~~{deleted text}~~ shows text that was in SB0282 but was deleted in SB0282S01.

inserted text shows text that was not in SB0282 but was inserted into SB0282S01.

DISCLAIMER: This document is provided to assist you in your comparison of the two bills. Sometimes this automated comparison will NOT be completely accurate. Therefore, you need to read the actual bills. This automatically generated document could contain inaccuracies caused by: limitations of the compare program; bad input data; or other causes.

Representative Keith Grover proposes the following substitute bill:

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE AMENDMENTS

2015 GENERAL SESSION

STATE OF UTAH

Chief Sponsor: Margaret Dayton

House Sponsor: ~~{_____}~~ Keith Grover

LONG TITLE

General Description:

This bill modifies provisions relating to permit review adjudicative proceedings.

Highlighted Provisions:

This bill:

- ▶ addresses the procedures governing an administrative review of an order relating to a permit issued by a director within the Department of Environmental Quality; and
- ▶ makes technical and conforming changes.

Money Appropriated in this Bill:

None

Other Special Clauses:

~~{None}~~ This bill provides a coordination clause to reconcile conflicts between this bill and other legislation.

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

Utah Code Sections Affected:

AMENDS:

19-1-301.5, as enacted by Laws of Utah 2012, Chapter 333 and last amended by Coordination Clause, Laws of Utah 2012, Chapter 360

Utah Code Sections Affected by Coordination Clause:

19-1-301.5, as enacted by Laws of Utah 2012, Chapter 333 and last amended by Coordination Clause, Laws of Utah 2012, Chapter 360

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the state of Utah:

Section 1. Section **19-1-301.5** is amended to read:

19-1-301.5. Permit review adjudicative proceedings.

(1) As used in this section:

(a) "Dispositive action" means a final agency action that:

- (i) the executive director takes as part of a permit review adjudicative proceeding; and
- (ii) is subject to judicial review, in accordance with Subsection [~~(14)~~] (15).

(b) "Dispositive motion" means a motion that is equivalent to:

- (i) a motion to dismiss under Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 12(b)(6);
- (ii) a motion for judgment on the pleadings under Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule

12(c); or

(iii) a motion for summary judgment under Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 56.

(c) "Party" means:

(i) the director who issued the permit order being challenged in the permit review adjudicative proceeding;

(ii) the permittee;

(iii) the person who applied for the permit, if the permit was denied; or

(iv) a person granted intervention by the administrative law judge.

(d) "Permit" means any of the following issued under this title:

(i) a permit;

(ii) a plan;

(iii) a license; ~~(4)~~

(iv) an approval order; or

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(v) another administrative authorization made by a director.

(e) (i) "Permit order" means an order issued by a director that:

(A) approves a permit;

(B) renews a permit;

(C) denies a permit;

(D) modifies or amends a permit; or

(E) revokes and reissues a permit.

(ii) "Permit order" does not include an order terminating a permit.

(f) "Permit review adjudicative proceeding" means a proceeding to resolve a challenge to a permit order.

(2) This section governs permit review adjudicative proceedings.

(3) Except as expressly provided in this section, the provisions of Title 63G, Chapter 4, Administrative Procedures Act, do not apply to a permit review adjudicative proceeding.

(4) If a public comment period was provided during the permit application process, a person who challenges a permit order, including the permit applicant, may only raise an issue or argument during the permit review adjudicative proceeding that:

(a) the person raised during the public comment period; and

(b) was supported with [sufficient] information or documentation [to enable] that is cited with reasonable specificity and sufficiently enables the director to fully consider the substance and significance of the issue.

(5) ~~[The]~~ (a) Upon request by a party, the executive director shall ~~[appoint]~~ issue a notice of appointment appointing an administrative law judge, in accordance with Subsections 19-1-301(5) and (6), to conduct a permit review adjudicative proceeding.

(b) The executive director shall issue a notice of appointment within 30 days after the day on which a party files a request.

(c) A notice of appointment shall include:

(i) the agency's file number or other reference number assigned to the permit review adjudicative proceeding;

(ii) the name of the permit review adjudicative proceeding; and

(iii) the administrative law judge's name, title, mailing address, email address, and telephone number.

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(6) (a) Only the following may file a ~~[request for agency action seeking]~~ petition for review of a permit order:

- (i) a party; or
- (ii) a person who is seeking to intervene under Subsection (7).

(b) A person who files a ~~[request for agency action seeking]~~ petition for review of a permit order shall file the ~~[request: (i)]~~ petition for review within 30 days after the day on which the permit order is issued~~[-and]~~.

~~[(ii) in accordance with Subsections 63G-4-201(3)(a) through (c).]~~

(c) The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules allowing the extension of the filing deadline described in Subsection (6)(b).

(d) A petition for review shall:

- (i) be served in accordance with department rule;
- (ii) include the name and address of each person to whom a copy of the petition for review is sent;

(iii) if known, include the agency's file number or other reference number assigned to the permit review adjudicative proceeding;

(iv) state the date on which the petition for review is served;

(v) include a statement of the petitioner's position, including:

(A) the legal authority under which the petition for review is requested;

(B) the legal authority under which the agency has jurisdiction to review the petition for review;

(C) each of the petitioner's arguments in support of the petitioner's requested relief;

(D) an explanation of how each argument described in Subsection (6)(d)(v)(C) was preserved;

(E) a detailed description of any permit condition to which the petitioner is objecting;

(F) any modification or addition to the permit that the petitioner is requesting;

(G) a demonstration that the agency's permit decision is based on a finding of fact or conclusion of law that is clearly erroneous;

(H) if the agency director addressed a finding of fact or conclusion of law described in Subsection (6)(d)(v)(G) in a response to public comment, a citation to the comment and

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

response that relates to the finding of fact or conclusion of law and an explanation of why the director's response was clearly erroneous or otherwise warrants review; and

(I) a claim for relief.

~~[(c)]~~ (e) A person may not raise an issue or argument in a ~~[request for agency action]~~ petition for review unless the issue or argument:

(i) was preserved in accordance with Subsection (4); or

(ii) was not reasonably ascertainable before or during the public comment period.

~~[(d) The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules allowing the extension of the filing deadline described in Subsection (6)(b)(i):]~~

(f) To demonstrate that an issue or argument was preserved in accordance with Subsection (4), a petitioner shall include the following in the petitioner's petition for review:

(i) a citation to where the petitioner raised the issue or argument during the public comment period; and

(ii) for each document upon which the petitioner relies in support of an issue or argument, a description that:

(A) states why the document is part of the administrative record; and

(B) demonstrates that the petitioner cited the document with reasonable specificity in accordance with Subsection (4)(b).

(7) (a) A person who is not a party may not participate in a permit review adjudicative proceeding unless the person is granted the right to intervene under this Subsection (7).

(b) A person who seeks to intervene in a permit review adjudicative proceeding under this section shall, within 30 days after the day on which the permit order being challenged was issued, file:

(i) a petition to intervene that:

(A) meets the requirements of Subsection 63G-4-207(1); and

(B) demonstrates that the person is entitled to intervention under Subsection (7)(c)(ii);

and

(ii) a timely ~~[request for agency action]~~ petition for review.

(c) The permittee is a party to a permit review adjudicative proceeding regardless of who files the petition for review and does not need to file a petition to intervene under

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

Subsection (7)(b).

~~[(c)]~~ (d) An administrative law judge shall grant a petition to intervene in a permit review adjudicative proceeding, if:

(i) the petition to intervene is timely filed; and

(ii) the petitioner:

(A) demonstrates that the petitioner's legal interests may be substantially affected by the permit review adjudicative proceeding;

(B) demonstrates that the interests of justice and the orderly and prompt conduct of the permit review adjudicative proceeding will not be materially impaired by allowing the intervention; and

(C) in the petitioner's ~~[request for agency action]~~ petition for review, raises issues or arguments that are preserved in accordance with Subsection (4).

~~[(d)]~~ (e) An administrative law judge:

(i) shall issue an order granting or denying a petition to intervene in accordance with Subsection 63G-4-207(3)(a); and

(ii) may impose conditions on intervenors as described in Subsections 63G-4-207(3)(b) and (c).

~~[(e)]~~ (f) The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules allowing the extension of the filing deadline described in Subsection (7)(b).

(8) (a) Unless the parties otherwise agree, the schedule for a permit review adjudicative proceeding is as follows:

(i) the director shall file and serve the administrative record within 40 days after the day on which the executive director issues a notice of appointment, unless otherwise ordered by the administrative law judge;

(ii) any dispositive motion shall be filed and served within 15 days after the day on which the administrative record is filed and served;

(iii) the petitioner shall file and serve an opening brief of no more than 30 pages:

(A) within 30 days after the day on which the director files and serves the administrative record; or

(B) if a party files and serves a dispositive motion, within 30 days after the day on

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

which the administrative law judge issues a decision on the dispositive motion, including a decision to defer the motion;

(iv) each party shall file and serve a response brief of no more than 15 pages within 15 days after the day on which the petitioner files and serves the opening brief;

(v) the petitioner may file and serve a reply brief of not more than 15 pages within 15 days after the day on which the response brief is filed and served; and

(vi) if the petitioner files and serves a reply brief, each party may file and serve a surreply brief of no more than five pages within five business days after the day on which the petitioner files and serves the reply brief.

(b) (i) A reply brief may not raise an issue that was not raised in the response brief; and

(ii) a surreply brief may not raise an issue that was not raised in the reply brief.

~~[(8)]~~ (9) (a) An administrative law judge shall conduct a permit review adjudicative proceeding based only on the administrative record and not as a trial de novo.

(b) To the extent relative to the issues and arguments raised in the [~~request for agency action~~] petition for review, the administrative record [~~shall consist~~] consists of the following items, if they exist:

(i) the permit application, draft permit, and final permit;

(ii) each statement of basis, fact sheet, engineering review, or other substantive explanation designated by the director as part of the basis for the decision relating to the permit order;

(iii) the notice and record of each public comment period;

(iv) the notice and record of each public hearing, including oral comments made during the public hearing;

(v) written comments submitted during the public comment period;

(vi) responses to comments that are designated by the director as part of the basis for the decision relating to the permit order;

(vii) any information that is:

(A) requested by and submitted to the director; and

(B) designated by the director as part of the basis for the decision relating to the permit order;

(viii) any additional information specified by rule;

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

- (ix) any additional documents agreed to by the parties; and
- (x) information supplementing the record under Subsection ~~[(8)]~~ (9)(c).

(c) (i) There is a rebuttable presumption against supplementing the record.

(ii) A party may move to supplement the record described in Subsection ~~[(8)]~~ (9)(b) with technical or factual information.

(iii) The administrative law judge may grant a motion to supplement the record described in Subsection ~~[(8)]~~ (9)(b) with technical or factual information if the moving party proves that:

- (A) good cause exists for supplementing the record;
- (B) supplementing the record is in the interest of justice; and
- (C) supplementing the record is necessary for resolution of the issues.

~~[(iv) The administrative law judge may supplement the record with technical or factual information on the administrative law judge's own motion if the administrative law judge determines that adequate grounds exist to supplement the record under Subsections (8)(c)(iii)(A) through (C).]~~

~~[(v) In supplementing the record with testimonial evidence, the administrative law judge may administer an oath or take testimony as necessary.]~~

~~[(vi) (iv) The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules permitting further supplementation of the record.~~

~~[(9)]~~ (10) (a) ~~[The]~~ Except as otherwise provided by this section, the administrative law judge shall review and respond to a [request for agency action] petition for review in accordance with Subsections 63G-4-201(3)(d) and (e), following the relevant procedures for formal adjudicative proceedings.

(b) The administrative law judge shall require the parties to file responsive ~~[pleadings]~~ briefs in accordance with ~~[Section 63G-4-204]~~ Subsection (8).

(c) If an administrative law judge enters an order of default against a party, the administrative law judge shall enter the order of default in accordance with Section 63G-4-209~~[, following the relevant procedures for formal adjudicative proceedings].~~

(d) The administrative law judge, in conducting a permit review adjudicative proceeding:

- (i) may not participate in an ex parte communication with a party to the permit review

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

adjudicative proceeding regarding the merits of the permit review adjudicative proceeding unless notice and an opportunity to be heard are afforded to all parties; and

(ii) shall, upon receiving an ex parte communication, place the communication in the public record of the proceeding and afford all parties an opportunity to comment on the information.

(e) In conducting a permit review adjudicative proceeding, the administrative law judge may take judicial notice of matters not in the administrative record, in accordance with Utah Rules of Evidence, Rule 201.

(f) An administrative law judge may take any action in a permit review adjudicative proceeding that is not a dispositive action.

~~[(10)]~~ (11) (a) A person who files a ~~[request for agency action]~~ petition for review has the burden of demonstrating that an issue or argument raised in the ~~[request for agency action]~~ petition for review has been preserved in accordance with Subsection (4).

(b) The administrative law judge shall dismiss, with prejudice, any issue or argument raised in a ~~[request for agency action]~~ petition for review that has not been preserved in accordance with Subsection (4).

~~[(11)]~~ (12) In response to a dispositive motion, within 45 days after the day on which oral argument takes place, or, if there is no oral argument, within 45 days after the day on which the reply brief on the dispositive motion is due, the administrative law judge ~~[may]~~ shall:

(a) submit a proposed dispositive action to the executive director recommending full or partial resolution of the permit review adjudicative proceeding, that includes:

~~[(a)]~~ (i) written findings of fact;

~~[(b)]~~ (ii) written conclusions of law; and

~~[(c)]~~ (iii) a recommended order~~[-];~~ or

(b) if the administrative law judge determines that a full or partial resolution of the permit review adjudicative proceeding is not appropriate, issue an order that explains the basis for the administrative law judge's determination.

~~[(12)]~~ (13) For each issue or argument that is not dismissed or otherwise resolved under Subsection ~~[(10)]~~ (11)(b) or ~~[(11)]~~ (12), the administrative law judge shall:

(a) provide the parties an opportunity for briefing and oral argument in accordance with this section;

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(b) conduct a review of the director's determination, based on the record described in Subsections ~~[(8)]~~ (9)(b), ~~[(8)]~~ (9)(c), and ~~[(9)]~~ (10)(e); and

(c) within 60 days after the day on which the reply brief on the dispositive motion is due, submit to the executive director a proposed dispositive action, that includes:

- (i) written findings of fact;
- (ii) written conclusions of law; and
- (iii) a recommended order.

~~[(13)]~~ (14) (a) When the administrative law judge submits a proposed dispositive action to the executive director, the executive director may:

- (i) adopt, adopt with modifications, or reject the proposed dispositive action; or
- (ii) return the proposed dispositive action to the administrative law judge for further action as directed.

(b) On review of a proposed dispositive action, the executive director shall uphold all factual, technical, and scientific agency determinations that are ~~[supported by substantial evidence taken from the record as a whole]~~ not clearly erroneous based on the petitioner's marshaling of the evidence.

~~[(c) (i) The executive director may not participate in an ex parte communication with a party to the permit review adjudicative proceeding regarding the merits of the permit review adjudicative proceeding unless notice and an opportunity to be heard are afforded to all parties.]~~

~~[(ii) Upon receiving an ex parte communication, the executive director shall place the communication in the public record of the proceeding and afford all parties an opportunity to comment on the information.]~~

~~[(d)]~~ (c) In reviewing a proposed dispositive action during a permit review adjudicative proceeding, the executive director may take judicial notice of matters not in the record, in accordance with Utah Rules of Evidence, Rule 201.

~~[(e)]~~ (d) The executive director may use the executive director's technical expertise in making a determination.

~~[(14)]~~ (15) (a) A party may seek judicial review in the Utah Court of Appeals of a dispositive action in a permit review adjudicative proceeding, in accordance with Sections 63G-4-401, 63G-4-403, and 63G-4-405.

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(b) An appellate court shall limit its review of a dispositive action of a permit review adjudicative proceeding to:

(i) the record described in Subsections ~~[(8)]~~ (9)(b), ~~[(8)]~~ (9)(c), ~~[(9)]~~ (10)(e), and ~~[(13)(d)]~~ (14)(c); and

(ii) the record made by the administrative law judge and the executive director during the permit review adjudicative proceeding.

(c) During judicial review of a dispositive action, the appellate court shall:

(i) review all agency determinations in accordance with Subsection 63G-4-403(4), recognizing that the agency has been granted substantial discretion to interpret its governing statutes and rules; and

(ii) uphold all factual, technical, and scientific agency determinations that are ~~[supported by substantial evidence viewed in light of the record as a whole]~~ not clearly erroneous based upon the petitioner's marshaling of the evidence.

~~[(15)]~~ (16) (a) The filing of a ~~[request for agency action]~~ petition for review does not stay a permit or delay the effective date of a permit.

(b) A permit may not be stayed or delayed unless a stay is granted under this Subsection ~~[(15)]~~ (16).

(c) The administrative law judge shall:

(i) consider a party's motion to stay a permit during a permit review adjudicative proceeding; and

(ii) within 45 days after the day on which the reply brief on the motion to stay is due, submit a proposed determination on the stay to the executive director.

(d) The administrative law judge may not recommend to the executive director a stay of a permit, or a portion of a permit, unless:

(i) all parties agree to the stay; or

(ii) the party seeking the stay demonstrates that:

(A) the party seeking the stay will suffer irreparable harm unless the stay is issued;

(B) the threatened injury to the party seeking the stay outweighs whatever damage the proposed stay is likely to cause the party restrained or enjoined;

(C) the stay, if issued, would not be adverse to the public interest; and

(D) there is a substantial likelihood that the party seeking the stay will prevail on the

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

merits of the underlying claim, or the case presents serious issues on the merits, which should be the subject of further adjudication.

(e) A party may appeal the executive director's decision regarding a stay of a permit to the Utah Court of Appeals, in accordance with Section 78A-4-103.

(17) (a) Subject to Subsection (17)(c), the administrative law judge shall issue a written response to a non-dispositive motion within 45 days after the day on which the reply brief on the non-dispositive motion is due or, if the administrative law judge grants oral argument on the non-dispositive motion, within 45 days after the day on which oral argument takes place.

(b) If the administrative law judge determines that the administrative law judge needs more time to issue a response to a non-dispositive motion, the administrative law judge may issue a response after the deadline described in Subsection (17)(a) if, before the deadline expires, the administrative law judge gives notice to the parties that includes:

- (i) the amount of additional time that the administrative law judge requires; and
- (ii) the reason the administrative law judge needs the additional time.

(c) If the administrative law judge grants oral argument on a non-dispositive motion, the administrative law judge shall hold the oral argument within 30 days after the day on which the reply brief on the non-dispositive motion is due.

f

Legislative Review Note

~~as of 2-27-15 10:32 AM~~

Section 2. Coordinating S.B. 282 with S.B. 173 -- Superseding, technical, and substantive amendments.

If this S.B. 282 and S.B. 173, Financial Assurance Determination Review Process, both pass and become law, it is the intent of the Legislature that the Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, in preparing the Utah Code database for publication, modify Section 19-1-301.5 to read as follows:

"19-1-301.5. Permit review and financial assurance determination special

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

adjudicative proceedings.

(1) As used in this section:

(a) "Dispositive action" means a final agency action that:

(i) the executive director takes as part of a ~~[permit review]~~ special adjudicative proceeding; and

(ii) is subject to judicial review, in accordance with Subsection ~~[(14)]~~ (15).

(b) "Dispositive motion" means a motion that is equivalent to:

(i) a motion to dismiss under Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 12(b)(6);

(ii) a motion for judgment on the pleadings under Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 12(c); or

(iii) a motion for summary judgment under Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 56.

(c) "Financial assurance determination" means a decision on whether a facility, site, plan, party, broker, owner, operator, generator, or permittee has met financial assurance or financial responsibility requirements as determined by the director of the:

(i) Division of Radiation Control under Subsection 19-3-104(12); or

(ii) Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste under Subsection 19-6-108(9)(c).

~~[(c)]~~ (d) "Party" means:

(i) the director who issued the permit order or financial assurance determination that is being challenged in the ~~[permit review]~~ special adjudicative proceeding under this section;

(ii) the permittee;

(iii) the person who applied for the permit, if the permit was denied; ~~[or]~~

(iv) the person who is subject to a financial assurance determination; or

~~[(iv)]~~ (v) a person granted intervention by the administrative law judge.

~~[(d)]~~ (e) "Permit" means any of the following issued under this title:

(i) a permit;

(ii) a plan;

(iii) a license;

(iv) an approval order; or

(v) another administrative authorization made by a director.

~~[(e)]~~ (f) (i) "Permit order" means an order issued by a director that:

(A) approves a permit;

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(B) renews a permit;

(C) denies a permit;

(D) modifies or amends a permit; or

(E) revokes and reissues a permit.

(ii) "Permit order" does not include an order terminating a permit.

[(f) "Permit review adjudicative proceeding" means a proceeding to resolve a challenge to a permit order.]

(g) "Special adjudicative proceeding" means a proceeding under this section to resolve a challenge to a:

(i) permit order; or

(ii) financial assurance determination.

(2) This section governs permit [review adjudicative] special proceedings.

(3) Except as expressly provided in this section, the provisions of Title 63G, Chapter 4, Administrative Procedures Act, do not apply to a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding under this section.

(4) If a public comment period was provided during the permit application process or the financial assurance determination process, a person who challenges [a permit order, including the permit applicant,] an order, application, or determination may only raise an issue or argument during the [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding that:

(a) the person raised during the public comment period; and

(b) was supported with [sufficient] information or documentation [to enable] that is cited with reasonable specificity and sufficiently enables the director to fully consider the substance and significance of the issue.

(5) [The] (a) Upon request by a party, the executive director shall [appoint] issue a notice of appointment appointing an administrative law judge, in accordance with Subsections 19-1-301(5) and (6), to conduct a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding under this section.

(b) The executive director shall issue a notice of appointment within 30 days after the day on which a party files a request.

(c) A notice of appointment shall include:

(i) the agency's file number or other reference number assigned to the special

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

adjudicative proceeding:

(ii) the name of the special adjudicative proceeding; and

(iii) the administrative law judge's name, title, mailing address, email address, and telephone number.

(6) (a) Only the following may file a [request for agency action seeking] petition for review of a permit order or financial assurance determination:

(i) a party; or

(ii) a person who is seeking to intervene under Subsection (7).

(b) A person who files a [request for agency action seeking] petition for review of a permit order or a financial assurance determination shall file the [request: (i)] petition for review within 30 days after the day on which the permit order or the financial assurance determination is issued[; and].

[(ii) in accordance with Subsections 63G-4-201(3)(a) through (c):]

(c) The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules allowing the extension of the filing deadline described in Subsection (6)(b).

(d) A petition for review shall:

(i) be served in accordance with department rule;

(ii) include the name and address of each person to whom a copy of the petition for review is sent;

(iii) if known, include the agency's file number or other reference number assigned to the special adjudicative proceeding;

(iv) state the date on which the petition for review is served;

(v) include a statement of the petitioner's position, including, as applicable:

(A) the legal authority under which the petition for review is requested;

(B) the legal authority under which the agency has jurisdiction to review the petition for review;

(C) each of the petitioner's arguments in support of the petitioner's requested relief;

(D) an explanation of how each argument described in Subsection (6)(d)(v)(C) was preserved;

(E) a detailed description of any permit condition to which the petitioner is objecting;

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(F) any modification or addition to a permit that the petitioner is requesting;

(G) a demonstration that the agency's permit decision is based on a finding of fact or conclusion of law that is clearly erroneous;

(H) if the agency director addressed a finding of fact or conclusion of law described in Subsection (6)(d)(v)(G) in a response to public comment, a citation to the comment and response that relates to the finding of fact or conclusion of law and an explanation of why the director's response was clearly erroneous or otherwise warrants review; and

(I) a claim for relief.

[~~(e)~~] (e) A person may not raise an issue or argument in a [request for agency action] petition for review unless the issue or argument:

(i) was preserved in accordance with Subsection (4); or

(ii) was not reasonably ascertainable before or during the public comment period.

[~~(d)~~] The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules allowing the extension of the filing deadline described in Subsection (6)(b)(i).]

(f) To demonstrate that an issue or argument was preserved in accordance with Subsection (4), a petitioner shall include the following in the petitioner's petition for review:

(i) a citation to where the petitioner raised the issue or argument during the public comment period; and

(ii) for each document upon which the petitioner relies in support of an issue or argument, a description that:

(A) states why the document is part of the administrative record; and

(B) demonstrates that the petitioner cited the document with reasonable specificity in accordance with Subsection (4)(b).

(7) (a) A person who is not a party may not participate in a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding under this section unless the person is granted the right to intervene under this Subsection (7).

(b) A person who seeks to intervene in a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding under this section shall, within 30 days after the day on which the permit order or the financial assurance determination being challenged was issued, file:

(i) a petition to intervene that:

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(A) meets the requirements of Subsection 63G-4-207(1); and

(B) demonstrates that the person is entitled to intervention under Subsection (7)(c)(ii);

and

(ii) a timely [request for agency action] petition for review.

(c) In a special adjudicative proceeding to review a permit order, the permittee is a party to the special adjudicative proceeding regardless of who files the petition for review and does not need to file a petition to intervene under Subsection (7)(b).

[~~(c)~~] (d) An administrative law judge shall grant a petition to intervene in a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding, if:

(i) the petition to intervene is timely filed; and

(ii) the petitioner:

(A) demonstrates that the petitioner's legal interests may be substantially affected by the [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding;

(B) demonstrates that the interests of justice and the orderly and prompt conduct of the [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding will not be materially impaired by allowing the intervention; and

(C) in the petitioner's [request for agency action] petition for review, raises issues or arguments that are preserved in accordance with Subsection (4).

[~~(d)~~] (e) An administrative law judge:

(i) shall issue an order granting or denying a petition to intervene in accordance with Subsection 63G-4-207(3)(a); and

(ii) may impose conditions on intervenors as described in Subsections 63G-4-207(3)(b) and (c).

[~~(e)~~] (f) The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules allowing the extension of the filing deadline described in Subsection (7)(b).

(8) (a) Unless the parties otherwise agree, the schedule for a special adjudicative proceeding is as follows:

(i) the director shall file and serve the administrative record within 40 days after the day on which the executive director issues a notice of appointment, unless otherwise ordered by the administrative law judge;

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(ii) any dispositive motion shall be filed and served within 15 days after the day on which the administrative record is filed and served;

(iii) the petitioner shall file and serve an opening brief of no more than 30 pages:

(A) within 30 days after the day on which the director files and serves the administrative record; or

(B) if a party files and serves a dispositive motion, within 30 days after the day on which the administrative law judge issues a decision on the dispositive motion, including a decision to defer the motion;

(iv) each party shall file and serve a response brief of no more than 15 pages within 15 days after the day on which the petitioner files and serves the opening brief;

(v) the petitioner may file and serve a reply brief of not more than 15 pages within 15 days after the day on which the response brief is filed and served; and

(vi) if the petitioner files and serves a reply brief, each party may file and serve a surreply brief of no more than five pages within five business days after the day on which the petitioner files and serves the reply brief.

(b) (i) A reply brief may not raise an issue that was not raised in the response brief.

(ii) A surreply brief may not raise an issue that was not raised in the reply brief.

[(8)] (9) (a) An administrative law judge shall conduct a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding based only on the administrative record and not as a trial de novo.

(b) To the extent relative to the issues and arguments raised in the [request for agency action] petition for review, the administrative record [shall consist] consists of the following items, if they exist:

(i) (A) for review of a permit order, the permit application, draft permit, and final permit; or

(B) for review of a financial assurance determination, the proposed financial assurance determination from the owner or operator of the facility, the draft financial assurance determination, and the final financial assurance determination;

(ii) each statement of basis, fact sheet, engineering review, or other substantive explanation designated by the director as part of the basis for the decision relating to the permit order or the financial assurance determination;

(iii) the notice and record of each public comment period;

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(iv) the notice and record of each public hearing, including oral comments made during the public hearing;

(v) written comments submitted during the public comment period;

(vi) responses to comments that are designated by the director as part of the basis for the decision relating to the permit order or the financial assurance determination;

(vii) any information that is:

(A) requested by and submitted to the director; and

(B) designated by the director as part of the basis for the decision relating to the permit order or the financial assurance determination;

(viii) any additional information specified by rule;

(ix) any additional documents agreed to by the parties; and

(x) information supplementing the record under Subsection ~~(8)~~ (9)(c).

(c) (i) There is a rebuttable presumption against supplementing the record.

(ii) A party may move to supplement the record described in Subsection ~~(8)~~ (9)(b) with technical or factual information.

(iii) The administrative law judge may grant a motion to supplement the record described in Subsection ~~(8)~~ (9)(b) with technical or factual information if the moving party proves that:

(A) good cause exists for supplementing the record;

(B) supplementing the record is in the interest of justice; and

(C) supplementing the record is necessary for resolution of the issues.

~~[(iv) The administrative law judge may supplement the record with technical or factual information on the administrative law judge's own motion if the administrative law judge determines that adequate grounds exist to supplement the record under Subsections ~~(8)~~(c)(iii)(A) through (C).]~~

~~[(v) In supplementing the record with testimonial evidence, the administrative law judge may administer an oath or take testimony as necessary.]~~

~~[(vi) (iv) The department may, in accordance with Title 63G, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, make rules permitting further supplementation of the record.~~

~~[(9) (10) (a) [The] Except as otherwise provided by this section, the administrative law judge shall review and respond to a [request for agency action] petition for review in~~

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

accordance with Subsections 63G-4-201(3)(d) and (e), following the relevant procedures for formal adjudicative proceedings.

(b) The administrative law judge shall require the parties to file responsive [pleadings] briefs in accordance with [Section 63G-4-204] Subsection (8).

(c) If an administrative law judge enters an order of default against a party, the administrative law judge shall enter the order of default in accordance with Section 63G-4-209[, following the relevant procedures for formal adjudicative proceedings].

(d) The administrative law judge, in conducting a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding:

(i) may not participate in an ex parte communication with a party to the [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding regarding the merits of the [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding unless notice and an opportunity to be heard are afforded to all parties; and

(ii) shall, upon receiving an ex parte communication, place the communication in the public record of the proceeding and afford all parties an opportunity to comment on the information.

(e) In conducting a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding, the administrative law judge may take judicial notice of matters not in the administrative record, in accordance with Utah Rules of Evidence, Rule 201.

(f) An administrative law judge may take any action in a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding that is not a dispositive action.

~~[(10)]~~ (11) (a) A person who files a [request for agency action] petition for review has the burden of demonstrating that an issue or argument raised in the [request for agency action] petition for review has been preserved in accordance with Subsection (4).

(b) The administrative law judge shall dismiss, with prejudice, any issue or argument raised in a [request for agency action] petition for review that has not been preserved in accordance with Subsection (4).

~~[(11)]~~ (12) In response to a dispositive motion, within 45 days after the day on which oral argument takes place, or, if there is no oral argument, within 45 days after the day on which the reply brief on the dispositive motion is due, the administrative law judge [may] shall:

(a) submit a proposed dispositive action to the executive director recommending full or

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

partial resolution of the [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding, that includes:

[(a)] (i) written findings of fact;

[(b)] (ii) written conclusions of law; and

[(c)] (iii) a recommended order[-]; or

(b) if the administrative law judge determines that a full or partial resolution of the special adjudicative proceeding is not appropriate, issue an order that explains the basis for the administrative law judge's determination.

[(12)] (13) For each issue or argument that is not dismissed or otherwise resolved under Subsection [(10)] (11)(b) or [(11)] (12), the administrative law judge shall:

(a) provide the parties an opportunity for briefing and oral argument in accordance with this section;

(b) conduct a review of the director's order or determination, based on the record described in Subsections [(8)] (9)(b), [(8)] (9)(c), and [(9)] (10)(e); and

(c) within 60 days after the day on which the reply brief on the dispositive motion is due, submit to the executive director a proposed dispositive action, that includes:

(i) written findings of fact;

(ii) written conclusions of law; and

(iii) a recommended order.

[(13)] (14) (a) When the administrative law judge submits a proposed dispositive action to the executive director, the executive director may:

(i) adopt, adopt with modifications, or reject the proposed dispositive action; or

(ii) return the proposed dispositive action to the administrative law judge for further action as directed.

(b) On review of a proposed dispositive action, the executive director shall uphold all factual, technical, and scientific agency determinations that are [supported by substantial evidence taken from the record as a whole] not clearly erroneous based on the petitioner's marshaling of the evidence.

[(c)] (i) The executive director may not participate in an ex parte communication with a party to the permit review adjudicative proceeding regarding the merits of the permit review adjudicative proceeding unless notice and an opportunity to be heard are afforded to all parties.]

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

~~[(ii)] Upon receiving an ex parte communication, the executive director shall place the communication in the public record of the proceeding and afford all parties an opportunity to comment on the information.~~

~~[(d)] (c) In reviewing a proposed dispositive action during a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding, the executive director may take judicial notice of matters not in the record, in accordance with Utah Rules of Evidence, Rule 201.~~

~~[(e)] (d) The executive director may use the executive director's technical expertise in making a determination.~~

~~[(14)] (15) (a) A party may seek judicial review in the Utah Court of Appeals of a dispositive action in a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding, in accordance with Sections 63G-4-401, 63G-4-403, and 63G-4-405.~~

~~(b) An appellate court shall limit its review of a dispositive action of a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding under this section to:~~

~~(i) the record described in Subsections ~~[(8)] (9)(b), [(8)] (9)(c), [(9)] (10)(e), and [(13)(d)] (14)(c); and~~~~

~~(ii) the record made by the administrative law judge and the executive director during the [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding.~~

~~(c) During judicial review of a dispositive action, the appellate court shall:~~

~~(i) review all agency determinations in accordance with Subsection 63G-4-403(4), recognizing that the agency has been granted substantial discretion to interpret its governing statutes and rules; and~~

~~(ii) uphold all factual, technical, and scientific agency determinations that are [supported by substantial evidence viewed in light of the record as a whole] not clearly erroneous based upon the petitioner's marshaling of the evidence.~~

~~[(15)] (16) (a) The filing of a [request for agency action] petition for review does not:~~

~~(i) stay a permit order or a financial assurance determination; or~~

~~(ii) delay the effective date of a permit order or a portion of a financial assurance determination.~~

~~(b) A permit order or a financial assurance determination may not be stayed or delayed unless a stay is granted under this Subsection ~~[(15)] (16).~~~~

~~(c) The administrative law judge shall:~~

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

(i) consider a party's motion to stay a permit order or a financial assurance determination during a [permit review] special adjudicative proceeding; and

(ii) within 45 days after the day on which the reply brief on the motion to stay is due, submit a proposed determination on the stay to the executive director.

(d) The administrative law judge may not recommend to the executive director a stay of a permit order or a financial assurance determination, or a portion of a permit order or a portion of a financial assurance determination, unless:

(i) all parties agree to the stay; or

(ii) the party seeking the stay demonstrates that:

(A) the party seeking the stay will suffer irreparable harm unless the stay is issued;

(B) the threatened injury to the party seeking the stay outweighs whatever damage the proposed stay is likely to cause the party restrained or enjoined;

(C) the stay, if issued, would not be adverse to the public interest; and

(D) there is a substantial likelihood that the party seeking the stay will prevail on the merits of the underlying claim, or the case presents serious issues on the merits, which should be the subject of further adjudication.

(e) A party may appeal the executive director's decision regarding a stay of a permit order or a financial assurance determination to the Utah Court of Appeals, in accordance with Section 78A-4-103.

(17) (a) Subject to Subsection (17)(c), the administrative law judge shall issue a written response to a non-dispositive motion within 45 days after the day on which the reply brief on the non-dispositive motion is due or, if the administrative law judge grants oral argument on the non-dispositive motion, within 45 days after the day on which oral argument takes place.

(b) If the administrative law judge determines that the administrative law judge needs more time to issue a response to a non-dispositive motion, the administrative law judge may issue a response after the deadline described in Subsection (17)(a) if, before the deadline expires, the administrative law judge gives notice to the parties that includes:

(i) the amount of additional time that the administrative law judge requires; and

(ii) the reason the administrative law judge needs the additional time.

(c) If the administrative law judge grants oral argument on a non-dispositive motion, the administrative law judge shall hold the oral argument within 30 days after the day on which

SB0282S01 compared with SB0282

the reply brief on the non-dispositive motion is due."