Pac	r 👝	7
Fac	10	

## BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:	)
	)
WATER QUALITY STANDARDS AND	)
EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS FOR THE	) R08-9
CHICAGO AREA WATERWAY SYSTEM AND	) (Rulemaking-
THE LOWER DES PLAINES RIVER:	) Water)
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO 35 Ill.	)
Adm. Code Parts 301, 302, 303,	)
and 304	)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the above-entitled cause before HEARING OFFICER MARIE TIPSORD, called by the Illinois Pollution Control Board, pursuant to notice, taken before MARGARET R. BEDDARD, a Notary Public within and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand Reporter of said state, at Room N-505, 160 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, on the 3rd day of March, A.D. 2009, at 10:00 a.m.

	Page 2
1	PRESENT:
2	MS. MARIE TIPSORD, Hearing Officer MR. G. TANNER GIRARD, Chairman
3	MR. THOMAS JOHNSON, Member MR. ANAND RAO, Member
4	MS. ALISA LIU, Member DR. SHUNDAR LIN, Member
5	MR. GARY BLANKENSHIP, Member
6 7	Appearing on behalf of the Illinois Pollution Control Board
/	
8	ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276
9	Springfield, Illinois 62794 BY: MS. DEBORAH WILLIAMS
10	MS. STEPHANIE DIERS MR. ROBERT SULSKI
11	MR. SCOTT TWAIT
12	BARNES & THORNBURG One North Wacker Drive, Suite 4400
13	Chicago, Illinois 60606 BY: MR. FREDRIC P. ANDES
14	
15	Appeared on behalf of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District
16	
17	REPORTED BY MARGARET R. BEDDARD, CSR.
18	
19	
20	
22	
23	
4 <b>T</b>	

- 1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Good morning,
- everyone. My name is Marie Tipsord. I've been
- appointed by the Board to serve as hearing officer in
- 4 this proceeding entitled Water Quality Standard and
- 5 Effluent Limitations for the Chicago Area Waterway
- 6 System and the Lower Des Plaines River: Proposed
- 7 Amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code Parts 301, 302, 303,
- 8 and 304. The docket number is RO8-9.
- 9 With me this morning, to my immediate left,
- is Acting Chairman G. Tanner Girard, presiding board
- 11 member. To his immediate left is Board member
- 12 Shundar Lin. To my very far right is Board member
- 13 Thomas Johnson. To his left is Board member Gary
- 14 Blankenship. To my immediate right is Anand Rao, and
- to his right is Alisa Liu from our technical staff.
- And I believe that's it for today.
- This is our tenth set of hearings to be
- held in this proceeding. I think, as near as I can
- 19 remember, this is actually our 24th day of hearing --
- 20 25th? I've been corrected. It's our 25th day of
- 21 hearing. The purpose of today's hearing is to
- 22 continue hearing testimony from the participants
- other than the proponent, the Illinois Environmental
- 24 Protection Agency.

- 1 At the close of the February 17, 2009,
- hearing, we had finished with 26 of the witnesses --
- or 26 pieces of testimony from the Metropolitan Water
- 4 Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. We will
- 5 continue with the District today starting with Steve
- 6 McGowan, David Zenz, John Mastracchio, Jennifer
- 7 Wasik, and Thomas Granato. We will generally take
- 8 the testimony, as if read, mark it as an exhibit.
- 9 Mr. Granato was the subject of a previous motion to
- be able to read his testimony. I granted it
- previously, and I will grant it again today. So
- 12 Mr. Granato will read his testimony into the record.
- 13 After we've marked the pre-filed testimony
- as an exhibit, we will then proceed to guestions for
- the testifier beginning with the pre-filed questions,
- which came to the Illinois Environmental Protection
- 17 Agency and the Environmental Law & Policy Center.
- Anyone may ask a follow-up question. You
- 19 need not wait until your turn to ask a question. I
- do ask that you raise your hand and wait for me to
- 21 acknowledge you. After I have acknowledged you,
- 22 please state your name and whom you represent before
- you begin your questions. Please speak one at a
- time. If you are speaking over each other, the court

- 1 reporter will not be able to get your questions on
- 2 the record.
- Please note that any questions asked by a
- 4 Board member or staff are intended to help build a
- 5 complete record for the Board's decision and not to
- express any preconceived notion or bias.
- 7 I plan to take about an hour for lunch
- 8 today and go until around 5:00. Then, if we have to
- 9 start again tomorrow, we'll start at 9:00 a.m.
- 10 Dr. Girard?
- DR. GIRARD: Good morning. On behalf of the
- 12 Board, I welcome everyone to another day of hearing
- in this rulemaking. The Board is extremely grateful
- for all the hard work everyone's putting into this.
- We have over 200 exhibits and a couple dozen days of
- 16 hearing. We have a very substantial record. The
- 17 Board is grateful for that hard work. It will help
- us to make a better decision. We look forward to the
- 19 testimony and questions today. Thank you.
- HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.
- With that, Mr. Andes, would you like to
- 22 begin?
- MR. ANDES: Here is Mr. McGowan's testimony.
- HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: All right. Let's have

- 1 Mr. McGowan sworn in.
- MR. ANDES: Was he already sworn in?
- 3 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yeah. We'll swear him
- 4 in again just to be on the safe side.
- 5 MR. ANDES: Okay.
- 6 (WHEREUPON, the witness was duly
- 7 sworn.)
- 8 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: It's been so long ago.
- 9 We can swear him in again.
- MR. ANDES: That's fine.
- We will need this.
- 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I have been handed
- pre-filed testimony of Steven McGowan. If there's no
- objection, we'll mark this as Exhibit 211.
- Seeing none, it's Exhibit 211.
- 16 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- 17 Exhibit No. 211, for identification,
- 18 as of 3-3-09.)
- MR. ANDES: Before we get started on the
- questions, I did want to mention that there were
- questions raised when Dr. McGowan previously
- testified concerning the sources of electrical power.
- 23 That was raised in the disinfection testimony. The
- issue also applies to the dissolved oxygen testimony.

- 1 Dr. McGowan's done some additional analysis to track
- down the information that was requested and to see
- 3 how it affects his conclusions. We have some
- 4 additional information to present. We can do that
- 5 first just to show that information.
- 6 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yeah. Let's begin
- 7 with that.
- 8 MR. ANDES: Okay. Great.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: By the way, happy
- 10 square root day.
- DR. McGOWAN: 3-3-09.
- 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Go ahead.
- MR. ANDES: Dr. McGowan, let me ask you to
- 14 explain. There were questions raised last hearing
- that you testified at concerning what the District's
- sources of electrical power were, coal, nuclear,
- et cetera, and how that would affect your analysis.
- 18 You had done analysis based on regional information,
- 19 so the question was whether you had been able to find
- 20 specific information for the District that would
- 21 change your conclusions.
- Do you want to go from there and explain
- what you've done since then?
- DR. McGOWAN: Yes. There were questions. We

- 1 used the regional approach, which was recommended by
- EPA, which was an eGRID system.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Excuse me. I would like you to
- 4 clarify which EPA, for the record.
- DR. McGOWAN: United States.
- And some questions were raised is there
- 7 something that's more specific, specifically could we
- 8 look at their bills and see where the source of power
- g came from. We were able to do some investigation
- 10 based on information that was collected through --
- 11 from an energy supplier, Integrys. They buy energy
- 12 from two sources, PJM, and MISO. And we've got
- information to hand out that explains the background
- and the acronyms of those. And, in short, we were
- able to do a blend of where the two energy sources
- came from from the two suppliers and come up with
- another emission factor, if you will, which is what
- we did the first time around.
- MR. ANDES: So why don't we start with the
- information you used that's specific to the District.
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: I'll give you a copy of that.
- I'll add that as an exhibit. This is a
- document from Integrys, I-n-t-e-g-r-y-s, entitled

- 1 Electricity Sources and Emissions.
- 2 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If there's no
- objection, we will mark the document from Integrys,
- 4 Electricity Sources and Emissions, Average Amount of
- 5 Emissions and Amount of Nuclear Waste, we will mark
- 6 that as Exhibit 212.
- 7 MS. WILLIAMS: I would like a second to review
- 8 before I decide if I have an objection.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: There's an additional
- couple of copies up here if someone didn't get them.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I have no objection.
- 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Seeing no objection,
- we'll mark this as Exhibit 212.
- 14 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 212, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- 17 DR. McGOWAN: As you can note on the second page
- of the handout, there is something that's known as --
- 19 that's referred to as unknown sources on the second
- 20 page in the table. It says unknown approximately
- 21 29 percent. And what we were able to do was
- 22 determine that that is from what's called the MISO
- pool. Although we weren't able to get absolute
- specific information, we were able to go to the MISO

- website, and they gave a general breakdown of where
- their power supply is from. So we were able to get a
- blended percentage, if you will, of where we thought
- 4 the power supply was coming from. I believe you have
- 5 the handout for that.
- 6 MR. ANDES: So then for this time period, the
- 7 12 months ending September 30, 2008, there
- 8 were 40 percent -- am I right -- 40 percent
- 9 coal-fired power, 24 percent nuclear, a few other
- 10 percentages, and then 29 percent that you needed to
- 11 investigate?
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: And further investigation was with
- the MISO pool?
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: And we have a document that's
- entitled Midwest ISO, Energizing the Heartland,
- 18 Corporate Information. It's a two-page document.
- 19 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If there's no
- objection, we'll mark this as Exhibit 213.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I'd like a minute to review it.
- I have no objection to this exhibit.
- HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Seeing no objection,
- we'll mark it Midwest ISO, Energizing the Heartland,

- 1 Corporate Information, as Exhibit 213.
- 2 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 213, for identification,
- 4 as of 3-3-09.)
- DR. McGOWAN: So then, based on this information
- 6 that we looked at -- do you have the table -- we put
- 7 a table together that presented our original
- 8 calculation using the eGRID system versus what we
- 9 recalculated with the new blend of energy supply.
- MR. ANDES: We have that as a poster and copies.
- 11 It's titled Sources of Electricity Supply.
- HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If there's no
- objection, we'll mark this as Exhibit 214.
- Seeing none, it's Exhibit 214.
- 15 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 214, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- DR. McGOWAN: So essentially what this did was
- this indicated a bit of a different mix of the energy
- supply. I'll just go down because I don't know if
- everybody has a copy or can see the board. But the
- percentage of coal-based supply went from 72.8
- 23 percent to 55.3.
- MR. ANDES: So the initial numbers -- The eGRID

- 1 numbers are the ones in your testimony --
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: -- based on a regional mix of power
- 4 sources?
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- 6 MR. ANDES: And then the new numbers -- The new
- 7 numbers are based on the more District-specific
- 8 information that you gathered?
- 9 DR. McGOWAN: Yes. The first column would be
- what was originally submitted in the testimony, and
- the second column is recalculated based on the PJM
- and MISO pool that we just discussed.
- MR. ANDES: So can you explain how the mix of
- 14 sources changed?
- DR. McGOWAN: There was a slight decrease --
- 16 There was a decrease in coal. There were increases
- in gas and oil. Nuclear had a slight increase. And
- then other relative minor increases. So what we were
- able to do was, using these percentages of power
- supply, we were able to recalculate emission factors
- 21 and then recalculate essentially the emissions -- the
- 22 carbon dioxide emissions and greenhouse gas emissions
- as CO2. We were able to recalculate those.
- HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: For the record, when

- 1 you were speaking about the eGRID numbers, you're
- 2 talking about the testimony you gave that was entered
- as Exhibit 133 and not the testimony from today?
- 4 DR. McGOWAN: No. It would be the testimony
- 5 today. The testimony I gave previously was specific
- 6 to the disinfection piece.
- 7 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Okay. I was double
- 8 checking.
- 9 MR. ANDES: But the sources of power were the
- same for both pieces of testimony?
- DR. McGOWAN: Yes.
- 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.
- MR. ANDES: So then, based on this adjusting mix
- of sources of electric power, you recalculated the
- 15 emission estimates?
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: And we'll talk through what those
- 18 estimates are. I have another exhibit titled
- 19 Comparison of GHG Emission Estimates Based on
- Original and Updated Emission Factors. We have that
- on a poster as well.
- 22 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If there's no
- objection, we'll mark this as Exhibit 215.
- Seeing none, it's Exhibit 215.

- 1 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 215, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- 4 MR. ANDES: And actually this is not a poster.
- 5 Why don't you explain your recalculations,
- 6 Mr. McGowan? And you did these for the disinfection
- 7 as well as for --
- 8 DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- 9 So, if you recall from the previous
- testimony, what we did was we were able to calculate
- tons of CO2 per year and then greenhouse gas
- emissions as tons of CO2 per year equivalence, and we
- were able to convert those for tons of CO2 into
- equivalent number of trees that might be required to
- absorb that CO2. Or, in the case of the greenhouse
- gas emissions, we were able to convert that into an
- equivalent number of cars per year that would emit
- that amount of greenhouse gas on this table.
- The bottom line for all of this is it's
- about 13 to 14 percent less than our original
- estimates if we went with the Integrys/PJM/MISO pool,
- the recalculation of where the energy sources came
- from, as opposed to our original calculations done
- 24 from the eGRID sources.

- MR. ANDES: So, for example, in terms of
- equivalent in cars per year for UV, the emissions
- were the equivalent initially of 16,400 cars and the
- 4 updated was number 14,200 cars; is that correct?
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- 6 MR. ANDES: So then this shows higher estimates,
- both in terms of CO2 emissions in tons per year and
- 8 trees planted per year, and your GHG emissions in
- 9 terms of cars per year changed by a 13 to 14 percent
- amount when you've gone the District-specific mix?
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: So now we have an updated chart
- specifically on DO, which is titled Summary of
- 14 Electrical Consumption and Air Emissions for Resolved
- 15 Oxygen Aeration.
- DR. RAO: Mr. McGowan, I had a question. In the
- table that you just handed in as Exhibit 215, could
- 18 you explain why there's no change in the percent
- increase or base line?
- DR. McGOWAN: Excuse me. Which?
- DR. RAO: Exhibit 215. It's the comparison
- 22 of --
- DR. McGOWAN: Yes. Why there is no percent
- increase in base line?

- DR. RAO: Yeah.
- DR. McGOWAN: We're showing a percent increase
- over the base line of, for UV, 33 percent. There is
- 4 an increase.
- DR. RAO: No, no. What I'm saying is, with
- updated numbers, there's no change in that?
- 7 MR. ANDES: Their base line changed, too, right?
- B DR. McGOWAN: Oh, I'm sorry. This would
- 9 be the -- This is an amount of energy use -- the
- percent increase of energy use, so the energy use
- 11 stayed the same. What changed was the mix of the
- sources. The amount of energy stayed the same.
- 13 Those percentages were based on the amount of energy.
- DR. RAO: Okay. Thanks.
- 15 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If there's no
- objection, we will mark Summary of Electrical
- 17 Consumption and Air Emissions for Dissolved Oxygen
- 18 Aeration as Exhibit 216.
- Seeing none, it's Exhibit 216.
- 20 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 216, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- MR. ANDES: So, as I understand it, this chart
- shows the information, from your testimony, based on

- the eGRID sources and then changes based on the more
- 2 site specific -- more specific to the District mix.
- And can you summarize the new numbers?
- DR. McGOWAN: Yes. Essentially, the first
- 5 column under eGRID Sources are the numbers that were
- 6 submitted as part of the pre-filed testimony that was
- 7 submitted, I guess, today. And we wanted to show how
- 8 that would compare.
- 9 So, Mr. Rao, you can see here the increase
- in electric use, getting to your question, stays the
- same at 74,200,000, as does the equivalent energy use
- 12 for the number of homes. So the energy consumption
- hasn't changed. That's why the percent increase over
- base line doesn't change.
- However, the increase in CO2 emissions, the
- 16 first way we calculated it, would be 57,700 tons per
- year versus now 49,800. The equivalent number of
- trees would go from 8.9 million down to 7.7 million,
- the greenhouse gas emissions from 57,900 tons of CO2
- equivalence per year to 50,100, and the greenhouse
- gas emissions -- the number of equivalent cars would
- 22 go from 9600 to 8300.
- DR. RAO: Thank you.
- MS. DEXTER: Can I ask a couple of questions to

- 1 clarify something? Jessica Dexter with the ELPC.
- Does MWRD currently have a contract with --
- an area contract with Integrys? Is that why you
- 4 chose Integrys as --
- DR. McGOWAN: Yeah. The District sent us --
- 6 This came from the District, so this, I believe, is
- where their energy sources come from. I don't know
- 8 about all the contractual relationships.
- 9 MS. DEXTER: Do you know whether or not they
- 10 have other contractual options available to them?
- 11 DR. McGOWAN: I am -- I'm not aware of what
- those would be.
- MS. DEXTER: So I understand, you've said a
- 14 number of times that you've got a blend of PJM and
- MISO power, but I wasn't sure if I understood you to
- say that you filled in all of the unknown resources
- 17 with MISO?
- DR. McGOWAN: Correct. If you look at the
- 19 footnote on the first page of that handout,
- 20 Footnote 1 under the table --
- 21 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: That's Exhibit 212.
- DR. McGOWAN: -- 71 percent of the energy --
- 23 Integrys energy service that was purchased originated
- from PJM and 29 percent of the energy purchased

- originated from the MISO pool. PJM pool attributes
- are from the PJM system, and the MISO attributes are
- 3 currently unknown. So that's the 29 percent.
- So that's when we went and said, "Well, it
- 5 wouldn't be good to just say we don't know where that
- 6 is. We'd like to at least, if we don't know exactly
- 7 where it's coming from, get as best information as
- 8 we could." We went to the MISO website. They showed
- 9 how they had a typical breakdown -- what their
- 10 typical breakdown was.
- MS. DEXTER: And one more question.
- On Exhibit 213, the appropriate information
- for MISO, on the map on the right-hand side of the
- 14 first page, the one that shows the market footprint,
- is there any significance to the fact that this does
- not show the Chicagoland area as being part of the
- 17 MISO market?
- DR. McGOWAN: I don't know about that. We did
- 19 not investigate where all of their supply is because
- 20 it may be that they supply it through Integrys and
- don't supply it directly. But I don't know.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Can I ask a related follow-up?
- MS. DEXTER: Yeah.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. McGowan, did you contact MISO

- directly, or did you just rely on the information you
- found on their website?
- DR. McGOWAN: We relied on the information from
- 4 their website.
- 5 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
- 6 MS. DEXTER: That's all I have for now.
- 7 MS. WILLIAMS: I have one last follow-up.
- 8 Mr. McGowan, last time I asked you whether
- 9 you had calculated these air emission impacts on a
- per-customer or per-gallon-of-water-treated basis,
- and I believe you answered no; is that correct?
- DR. McGOWAN: I believe that's correct.
- MS. WILLIAMS: When you went back and
- 14 recalculated these figures as far as how many trees
- and how many cars, did you consider adding per gallon
- of water treated or per customer to that calculation?
- DR. McGOWAN: No. We did not do those
- 18 calculations.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Why not?
- DR. McGOWAN: We didn't think it was
- 21 appropriate.
- MS. WILLIAMS: At this time, Fred --
- I'm first, right?
- 24 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yes.

- MS. WILLIAMS: I believe most of my remaining
- questions for this witness would probably be more
- 3 appropriate for Dr. Zenz. I think last time a lot of
- 4 the questions I had drafted he deferred to Dr. Zenz.
- 5 So I don't really have a preference of whether I go
- 6 through them and we swear in Dr. Zenz or whether I
- sort of reserve the ones that I think are better for
- 8 Dr. Zenz. It's really up to you.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If it's okay with you
- and Mr. McGowan doesn't mind staying up, we can go
- ahead and put Dr. Zenz in as a witness, and they can
- 12 help each other out answering questions.
- MR. ANDES: Sure. Dr Zenz is right here.
- 14 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Let's swear Dr. Zenz
- in again. I know he's been previously sworn, but
- it's been a while.
- 17 (WHEREUPON, the witness was duly
- sworn.)
- 19 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Will we have some
- 20 additional testimony entered?
- MR. ANDES: Yes.
- 22 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If there's no
- objection, we will enter the pre-filed testimony of
- David R. Zenz, Dissolved Oxygen Enhancement Study, as

- 1 Exhibit 217.
- Seeing none, it's Exhibit 217.
- (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- 4 Exhibit No. 217, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.
- 6 MS. WILLIAMS: I believe I did not ask --
- 7 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Ms. Williams, you're
- going to have to speak up. We have some noise back
- 9 here.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I'm going to start with my
- 11 pre-filed question number 17 that I reserved last
- 12 time. That is, when did the District ask CTE to
- develop an integrated approach for meeting dissolved
- 14 oxygen standards?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, the best way to describe that
- is to give you the date for the notice to proceed,
- which is the time when the District allows us to
- begin work on a project. That was October 1, 2007.
- Once the notice to proceed is given, we have to take
- care of certain contractual issues. We did not have,
- what we call, a kick-off meeting until November 8,
- 22 2007. That's the actual start of actually work on
- the project itself.
- MS. WILLIAMS: It's okay with me if you look at

- 1 the Board.
- 2 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: This is not going to
- work. If the witnesses are going to turn and face,
- we may have to move Ms. Williams up.
- 5 DR. ZENZ: All right.
- 6 MS. WILLIAMS: You can continue. Are you done?
- 7 DR. ZENZ: I'm done.
- 8 MS. WILLIAMS: And explain why the study will
- 9 take until mid 2009 to complete.
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I think part of your question
- is the fact that CTE previously did a study of
- dissolved oxygen enhancement. It produced a cost
- estimate. But I just want to remind the Board that
- those cost estimates, which are contained in the
- 15 EPA's proposal to the Board, only included the North
- 16 Shore Channel, north and south branches of the
- 17 Chicago River, and Bubbly Creek. So we did not
- 18 prepare previously any cost estimates for the
- 19 Sanitary and Ship Canal or for the Calumet Water
- 20 System, including the Cal-Sag Channel.
- Also, in that study, because of the way
- that IEPA wanted to see the information, we didn't
- look at it in an integrated way. For example, on
- Bubbly Creek, we looked at Bubbly Creek solely by

- 1 itself assuming no other dissolved oxygen enhancement
- systems were in operation except those that were in
- 3 existence at the time. You can sort of understand
- 4 that, if we were going to be looking at this study in
- 5 an integrated way, we would assume that stations in
- 6 place meeting dissolved oxygen concentrations up in
- 7 the northern section, and that would influence and
- 8 impact the size and the location of stations, for
- 9 example, on Bubbly Creek or, for that matter, further
- downstream. So this study is -- that we're doing now
- is integrated, so we're going to be looking not only
- 12 at places we already looked at, but places we didn't
- 13 look at.
- Also, in our previous study, we were using
- a version of the Marquette model which we felt and
- 16 Marquette felt needed to be improved or enacted upon.
- 17 There were issues with the way he handled SOD. There
- were issues with the way he handled CSO's and on and
- on. The study includes not only our cost estimating
- process, but also there was time needed for Marquette
- University to go ahead and refine and update its
- 22 model. There was a similar amount of effort on the
- part of them to do that. So that part of the study
- 24 was built into it.

- Secondly, previously -- in our previous
- cost estimates, we didn't do any really specific cost
- 3 estimates for the individual sites. We didn't look
- 4 at the sites. We didn't look at their topography,
- 5 whether we had to fill or back fill. None of that
- 6 was done.
- Also, our cost estimating procedures were,
- 8 what I would call, rough. We just really didn't have
- 9 the scope of work or the budget to do a regular cost
- 10 estimation. In this case we do. We will do actual
- field investigations of all these individual sites.
- 12 And you'll notice in our rough cost estimation, which
- we did present to the Board, we felt that, even
- though we were in the midst of our study, we should
- 15 give you some idea of what the cost would be. That's
- been presented in my testimony before you. We still
- felt that we needed to look at the sites, determine
- 18 what their characteristics are, and so forth. So
- that's all built into the study. And we're going to
- do a more rigorous cost estimate, and we'll have a
- 21 little bit narrower limits on it then the ones we
- 22 presented to the Board.
- And at this point, based on our schedule, I
- 24 know in my testimony I indicated that we would

- 1 probably be done in mid 2009. It looks like right
- 2 now the runs are taking much longer than what we
- originally anticipated for Marquette University. We
- 4 probably won't be done until the fall.
- Just to give you some idea of what's
- involved in these runs, it takes -- just to make one
- 7 run, it takes two hours of computer time. Then you
- 8 have to investigate it. This is all being done, by
- 9 the way, by Marquette University. Marquette
- 10 University, you must understand, is not a
- 11 subcontractor to CTE. They are a direct
- 12 subcontractor to the District. So CTE does not have
- any managerial control over what Marquette University
- is doing. They're not a subcontractor. They work
- directly for the District. And then the service is
- provided back to CTE. We do not participate in the
- improvements, developments, or the running of the
- 18 model
- MS. WILLIAMS: I have a couple of follow-ups
- 20 from that, Dr. Zenz.
- The first one is you described the rough
- cost estimates, and I believe last time we spent
- 23 quite a bit of time talking about the Level 3 and
- Level 4 cost estimate. Is it accurate to say you did

- a Level 5 cost estimate for the dissolved oxygen
- 2 technology in your testimony?
- DR. ZENZ: Yes. As indicated in my testimony,
- 4 we call it a rough cost estimate with a variability
- of minus 30 percent to plus 50 percent. I would say
- 6 that that does qualify it as a Level 5 cost estimate
- 7 MS. WILLIAMS: And --
- 8 DR. ZENZ: Could I just follow up a little bit
- 9 more -- on that question a little bit more?
- I think the cost estimate is probably more
- 11 plus than it's minus. I'm going to give you a few
- examples. We did not include any supplemental
- aeration for the Chicago River. I can explain that
- in other detail if there's going to be a follow-up
- question on that. For reasons of expediency and
- 16 complexity for the Chicago River, there is no -- in
- our cost estimate, there is no supplemental aeration
- 18 for the Chicago River.
- 19 Also, we assumed in our cost estimate that
- all the existing aeration stations are operating at
- 21 full capacity. We know, from discussions with the
- District, that those stations, in order to operate at
- full capacity, would require some improvements. We
- did not include any cost for improvements to those

- aeration stations. That would be additional.
- We also think that it's going to be
- necessary -- If we're going to meet the standards
- 4 100 percent of the time -- We've got 18 stations --
- 5 new proposed stations possibly. That's just an
- 6 estimate on our part at this point. We've got also
- five SEPA stations, two Devon stations on Devon and
- 8 Webster Avenue. There would have to be some kind of
- 9 integrated control approach. We did not include any
- 10 cost for that because we simply could not do that in
- the time frame we had. Remember we were doing these
- 12 cost estimates back in July.
- MR. ANDES: If I can stop you there, Dr. Zenz,
- for a minute. So the Board has an idea of what we're
- talking about, I'd like for you -- We have some maps
- which illustrate the stations you're speaking of.
- DR. ZENZ: Sure.
- MR. ANDES: The first one is titled CAWS
- 19 Aeration Station Locations Overview of Waterway
- 20 System. And I'll put up a poster.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I have no objection to this
- 22 exhibit or anything like that. I just feel like
- maybe we're getting a little more off into the
- questions related specifically to Dr. Zenz's

- 1 testimony rather than the questions that came out of
- Dr. McGowan's testimony, but he relied on Dr. Zenz.
- 3 Are you sure this is going to be a good way to
- 4 present information?
- 5 MR. ANDES: I think, in discussing his cost
- estimates, it's important to have the perspective.
- 7 You're talking about 18 stations, et cetera. I think
- 8 this will make that clear to everyone.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I'm going to admit
- this as Exhibit 218 if there's no objection.
- 11 CAWS Aeration Station Locations Overview of
- the Waterway System Map is Exhibit 218 seeing no
- objection.
- 14 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 218, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- MR. ANDES: We have more detail we can get into
- when we have Dr. Zenz's direct.
- 19 DR. ZENZ: It's a simple map showing the
- locations of the stations. The red ones are the ones
- we felt that would have to be added in order to get
- 22 100 percent compliance with the DO standards. To
- make it clear, from the modeling that was done by
- 24 Marquette University to come up with the sizing and

- 1 locations of these stations, we plugged in
- 2 100 percent compliance with the EPA's proposed
- 3 standards, the A standard, which is the 3 1/2 to
- 4 4 milligram per liter standard, and the B standard,
- which is the 3 1/2 milligram per liter standard year
- 6 round. So that's the basis --
- 7 MR. ANDES: To give further detail so people can
- see sort of where these all are, we have a table
- 9 which is from the attachment to Dr. Zinn's testimony.
- 10 So this is already admitted. This is Table 4 from
- the attachment to Dr. Zenz's testimony entitled
- 12 Locations of Proposed New Aeration Stations in the
- 13 Chicago Area Waterway System. So that gives the
- 14 actual mileage points for each of the stations
- Dr. Zenz is talking about here.
- 16 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Do you know what? I
- 17 know it's already in the record. Since it goes a
- 18 little bit with Exhibit 218, I'm going to go ahead
- 19 and admit this as an exhibit as well. If there's no
- objection, I'll mark this as Exhibit 219.
- 21 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 219, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I was in the process of trying

- 1 to explain why I thought my cost estimate was
- 2 probably low and probably would be higher. I was
- 3 trying to explain why it might be as much as
- 4 50 percent higher.
- 5 You'll notice that there are no stations on
- 6 the Chicago River, which I already mentioned. One of
- 7 the issues why we really felt we really couldn't come
- 8 to grips with the cost was, well, what is -- if we
- 9 have to condemn land and buy land, what is the cost
- of that land? Frankly, back in July we weren't in --
- we weren't comfortable that we could come up with a
- land cost that would be appropriate for the Chicago
- area, not to mention what would be required for
- demolition of whatever properties we would acquire.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Dr. Zenz, what on earth makes you
- think there would be a need for a station on the
- 17 Chicago River?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, we know from modeling that was
- done by Dr. Melching, that the Chicago River is only
- about 90 percent compliance with the proposed
- standards, so there's going to have to be -- Either
- the standard's 100 percent compliance or it's not.
- We're assuming it is. Then we're going to have to
- have some kind of system of aeration on that

- 1 waterway.
- 2 Another issue with the waterway is it has a
- stagnant condition, and that causes some of the
- 4 problems of how we would go about establishing
- 5 supplemental aeration stations when the river is
- stagnant. We can't get any transfer of oxygen
- 7 downstream as the water moves, so that necessitates
- 8 the possibility of doing something with possible flow
- 9 augmentation. Then the issue is where does the water
- 10 come from? Where are we going to get it? This is an
- issue which we're grappling with now at our
- integrated strategy, but we were not in a position to
- grapple with when we did our original cost estimate.
- MS. WILLIAMS: What did you look at with regard
- to compliance of the Chicago River with dissolved
- 16 oxygen standards?
- DR. ZENZ: This was something that Dr. Melching
- did using his model.
- 19 MS. WILLIAMS: You looked at a model. So are
- you aware of any measured violations of dissolved
- oxygen standards in the Chicago River?
- 22 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I think you need to
- 23 clarify. Measured under the current standard or the
- 24 proposed standard?

- 1 MS. WILLIAMS: Are you aware of what standard is
  - currently applicable to the Chicago River, Dr. Zenz?
- 3 Is it a general use stream?
- 4 DR. ZENZ: Yeah. You're delving into an area
- 5 which requires a little bit of memory on my part. I
- 6 can't really answer your question. I really don't
- 7 know.
- 8 MR. ANDES: Let me clarify.
- 9 Your analysis was all premised on what it
- would take to meet the proposed standards?
- DR. ZENZ: Correct.
- MS. WILLIAMS: And your analysis does not
- include any measured violation of either the proposed
- or the current standards, correct?
- DR. ZENZ: Correct
- MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
- MR. ANDES: So, Dr. Zenz, if I understand,
- 18 you're saying that all the costs you projected and
- 19 all these 18 aeration stations -- you're saying that
- there would probably be additional costs required to
- deal with the issue on the Chicago River? You
- haven't done that yet, but your report that you're
- doing by the fall will assess that issue and the
- 24 additional cost?

- DR. ZENZ: That's correct.
- MS. WILLIAMS: And what level of cost estimate
- will that report be considered under your analysis?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, since we haven't done the cost
- 5 estimate, I'm not in a position to --
- 6 MS. WILLIAMS: You have to wait until you know
- 7 how much information you have to classify it?
- 8 DR. ZENZ: That's correct
- MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Great. Thanks.
- Do you have anything, Fred? Do you want me
- 11 to move on?
- MR. ANDES: Go ahead.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Pre-filed question 18 for
- 14 Mr. McGowan.
- DR. McGOWAN: I think that one I deferred as
- well last time you asked. It was asking about the
- model, and we did not do --
- MS. WILLIAMS: I didn't ask this question last
- 19 time, but I was expecting that you would defer this
- 20 to Dr. Zenz as well.
- The question is, what is the time frame of,
- quote, historical data you are referring to on page 2
- of your dissolved oxygen testimony? I'll just -- I
- think it would be good if I just read the sentence

- that I'm quoting from on page 2. It says, "Based on
- the modeling simulations and the historical DO data,
- the following supplemental aeration was recommended
- 4 by CTE to meet the proposed DO standard." Does that
- 5 help, Dr. Zenz?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I read that same sentence
- myself. We do talk to each other. I think what he
- 8 was referring to is the data that is in the model
- 9 itself. Obviously, if you know anything about
- 10 mathematical modeling, you will realize that it has
- to be calibrated and verified based upon actual
- sampling of the river itself. That whole exercise
- was done by Dr. Melching. This question really
- 14 should be addressed to him, not to me. I'm not
- familiar with what information he used to calibrate
- 16 and verify
- 17 MS. WILLIAMS: So the modeling simulations
- that's referred to in that sentence are the Marquette
- 19 modeling?
- DR. ZENZ: That's what I would assume
- MS. WILLIAMS: And can you just sort of explain
- for us -- We heard testimony last time from
- 23 Dr. Garcia. Can you explain -- about the modeling
- work that he is doing with the University of

- 1 Illinois. Can you explain why you are relying on the
- 2 Marguette modeling rather than the U of I modeling?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I'll refer back to my testimony
- 4 here a little bit. Give me a second.
- 5 MR. ANDES: I guess one question I have -- My
- 6 understanding was the University of Illinois modeling
- 7 isn't done yet.
- 8 MS. WILLIAMS: Neither is the Marquette
- 9 modeling, as Dr. Zenz has explained to us. He needs
- 10 to rely on additional modeling from Marquette.
- Isn't that what you testified, Dr. Zenz?
- DR. ZENZ: The study includes an updating and
- refinement of the Marquette model, that's correct.
- We will be using that model for developing the sizing
- 15 and location of our aeration stations. And that --
- MR. ANDES: But there was a set of completed
- modeling done by Marquette that you relied on,
- 18 correct?
- DR. ZENZ: For the rough cost estimate, that's
- 20 correct. Yes.
- MR. ANDES: Okay.
- DR. ZENZ: And I would say -- I'm trying to
- characterize the model. He was in the process of
- trying to refine his model at the time we did our

- 1 rough cost estimate. So he had made some refinements
- to it, but not all of the ones that we expect the
- model to have when we're doing our runs for the
- 4 integrated strategy. So it's different than the
- 5 model that was used for the so-called UIA studies
- 6 that were presented to the Board. But it also -- The
- 7 model we'll be using for our integrated strategy will
- 8 be different than that model.
- 9 MR. ANDES: It will be refined further?
- DR. ZENZ: More refined.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I just want to understand because
- 12 I thought -- You know, I think we all got a good
- 13 class lesson almost from Dr. Garcia about the
- modeling work that needs to be done to really
- understand this system, and I'm trying to understand
- why you're relying on different modeling than the
- three-dimensional modeling that's being developed by
- 18 Dr. Garcia?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, again, I'll refer to my
- testimony. I state in my testimony we feel, in
- 21 discussions with Marquette, and we think this updated
- 22 Marquette model provides a sufficient level of detail
- for the studies that we're going to give you cost
- 24 statements for. We think it's sufficient for that

- 1 purpose.
- By the way, Dr. Garcia agreed with that.
- We had discussions with him. He said the Marquette
- 4 model is sufficient for CTE's purposes to come up
- 5 with a cost estimate for -- being that IEPA's
- 6 proposed standard's 100 percent of the time.
- 7 MR. ANDES: If I can clarify, is it accurate to
- 8 say that you had to do this rough cost estimate in
- 9 order to provide testimony under the deadlines
- 10 established in this proceeding?
- DR. ZENZ: That's correct.
- MR. ANDES: So the information available at that
- time was Dr. Melching's?
- DR. ZENZ: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: Thank you.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I quess what I'm sort of getting
- 17 at, I understand the cost estimate is an estimate and
- 18 you're using the available information. That is not
- really what I'm trying to get at. I'm just trying to
- understand, with regard to development of an
- integrated -- what I think has been called an
- integrated strategy for meeting dissolved oxygen,
- would you recommend relying on the Marquette model as
- being -- would you recommend that the Marquette

- model's sufficient for developing that strategy?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I'll refer back to my testimony
- 3 again. We said, "This one-dimensional model" -- and
- 4 what I was referring to, of course, is
- 5 Dr. Melching's one-dimensional model -- "may not
- 6 describe the complex conditions that can exist in
- 7 some segments of the CAWS" -- Dr. Garcia has made
- 8 that pretty -- "including" -- For the court reporter,
- 9 let me repeat myself. "This one-dimensional model
- may not describe complex conditions that can exist in
- 11 some segments of the CAWS, including impacts due to
- density currents, sediment resuspension, and mixing
- zone effects. Therefore, before proceeding to design
- of a CAWS DO enhancement system, consideration should
- be given to a more detailed modeling approach to
- produce a final aeration system sizing and location."
- To put it in words simple and
- 18 straightforward, for our purposes, to come up with a
- 19 cost estimate and a more -- shall we say a more
- refined cost estimate, this is fine. If we're going
- 21 to design a system in the future, perhaps a model --
- Dr. Garcia's model, some other model, or a refined
- 23 Marguette model, it would be a good idea to look
- into. We're not prepared to say what that model is.

- 1 We haven't investigated it. But, based on our
- discussions with Dr. Garcia and our discussions with
- 3 Dr. Melching, it's a very complex waterway.
- 4 You can see the District is very interested
- 5 in doing a better job through multi-dimensional
- 6 modeling of the system, and we think that that should
- 7 be definitely given consideration before a system
- 8 design takes place. Our project is -- We're not
- 9 designing. We're just trying to come up with a
- reasonable set of aeration stations, sizing,
- location, come up with a better cost estimate.
- MS. WILLIAMS: So your contract does not include
- design of a system?
- DR. ZENZ: No
- MS. WILLIAMS: Question 19, with regard to
- supplemental aeration, is there -- if there is a
- 17 change in the design assumptions regarding the
- 18 frequency and duration the aeration stations would be
- in operation or how many stations would be needed,
- how would that change your energy consumption and air
- emission figures?
- DR. McGOWAN: Yes. If there are changes in the
- design assumptions and frequency in duration change
- for the operation of these, there would certainly be

- some changes in the air emissions. Ballpark, it's
- 2 fairly linear. There are some minor things that
- 3 change. More horsepower, more greenhouse gasses.
- 4 Let's horsepower, less kilowatt hours, less. And
- 5 it's generally a linear relationship.
- 6 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
- 7 Question 20, have any dissolved oxygen
- 8 treatment technologies been considered that would not
- 9 have a long-term energy demand?
- DR. McGOWAN: That one I would -- did not get
- into the evaluation of technology, so I'd like to
- 12 defer that to Dr. Zenz.
- DR. ZENZ: Well, yes, we have considered
- technologies which would not have a long-term energy
- demand. In particular, there was a self-contained
- solar-powered device which we became aware of when
- 17 the District asked us to take a look at it. This was
- part of our long list/short list evaluation as part
- of our integrated strategy. And this was a very,
- very small device. The solar panel is probably only
- about this big. It's used for small ponds and so
- forth. After some investigation and discussion,
- including a fairly long discussion at a workshop with
- the District, we decided that it wouldn't have any

- 1 practical application to the District, so we rejected
- 2 it. That's the only type of system like that that we
- 3 have looked at.
- 4 MS. WILLIAMS: I'll start with question 22. You
- may have just answered the first part of that.
- 6 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Excuse me,
- 7 Ms. Williams.
- B Dr. Zenz, you indicated, in your testimony,
- 9 that it was this big. I need an explanation of that,
- 10 for the record.
- DR. ZENZ: I think it was about three feet by
- three feet. It was a relatively small panel. You
- 13 could pick it up. And I'm just approximating. I
- don't have the actual figures in front of me.
- 15 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.
- Go ahead.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Question 22, what energy
- 18 efficiency options were considered to reduce energy
- 19 consumption from disinfection and dissolved oxygen
- 20 enhancement? You described one example of a solar --
- DR. ZENZ: Okay. I'm going to field that
- 22 question.
- DR. McGOWAN: I would defer -- This is my list.
- 24 Again, we weren't involved in those.

- DR. ZENZ: So far in our investigations, we
- 2 have not come across anything that would result in a
- 3 substantial large reduction in energy consumption.
- 4 Having said that, we will -- In our cost estimate
- 5 process, we will be looking at variable speed drives,
- 6 energy efficient blowers, and things like that to try
- 7 to cut down on the energy consumption as much as
- 8 possible.
- 9 But, quite frankly, a lot of these issues
- with regard to energy reduction really are more
- 11 geared towards the design phase where the engineer
- begins his process of actually selecting equipment
- and, you know, coming up with the plans and
- specifications needed to come up with the equipment.
- But we will make every effort to base our cost
- estimate on the most energy efficient systems that we
- can readily determine, and that will be reflected in
- the operation and maintenance cost of our final cost
- 19 estimate.
- MR. ANDES: You're speaking of the report you
- would be writing in the fall on the integrated study?
- DR. ZENZ: That's correct.
- MR. ANDES: Thank you.
- MS. WILLIAMS: And would you agree that only in

- that phase will you have accurate estimates of energy
- 2 consumption?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, it will be more accurate than
- 4 we have now. There's no doubt about it.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Those are all the questions I had
- for the McGowan portion. I mean, I can ask the Zenz
- 7 portion, or we can move on to other questioners.
- 8 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Did anyone else have
- 9 any questions for Mr. McGowan?
- MS. DEXTER: I have two, I believe. Let me just
- 11 review this for a second to make sure I know who they
- should be directed to. I actually have four of my
- pre-filed questions that I'll still ask. I'm going
- to start with pre-filed question two from the
- pre-filed Environmental Law & Policy Center
- 16 questions.
- To your knowledge, has the District ever
- done an environmental assessment like the ones you
- did regarding DO enhancement and disinfection for any
- of its other operations or for operations?
- 21 DR. McGOWAN: I'm not familiar with other
- 22 projects that they may or may not have done.
- MS. DEXTER: Do you know whether such an
- assessment was done with regard to any phase or

- 1 portion of TARP?
- DR. McGOWAN: I am unaware of anything regarding
- 3 TARP. I wasn't involved in any of the TARP
- 4 facilities at all.
- MS. DEXTER: Have you or, to your knowledge, has
- anyone else ever attempted to calculate any favorable
- 9 environmental effects on land, air, energy use, or
- 8 other portion of the environment that might result
- 9 from enhanced dissolved oxygen levels in any portion
- 10 of the CAWS?
- DR. McGOWAN: This was originally asked for the
- 12 UV. When we did our analysis for UV, we found some
- 13 stormwater reduction. At this point in time for the
- dissolved oxygen, since we didn't know what the
- 15 facilities were -- we stated that in our testimony --
- we didn't look at stormwater or any of the other
- aspects. All we were able to get our hands around
- was the energy consumption at this point in time.
- 19 There were no physical buildings, structures, or
- anything, so there wasn't a comprehensive analysis.
- 21 At this point in time, all we did look at was the
- 22 energy consumption -- the environmental impact of
- energy consumption for dissolved oxygen.
- MR. ANDES: If I can follow up on that.

- 1 Mr. McGowan, on disinfection, the one
- decrease in stormwater runoff, as I recall, was
- 3 because some chlorine contact tanks would be removed?
- 4 DR. McGOWAN: Correct.
- 5 MR. ANDES: So that would create some pervious
- 6 area where previously it was impervious?
- 7 DR. McGOWAN: Correct. It would shrink the
- 8 footprint of the impervious areas, correct.
- 9 MR. ANDES: In fact, here, with construction of
- 10 18 new aeration stations and not removing anything,
- 11 as far as we know, no such change would be taking
- 12 place based on the current system as Dr. Zenz has
- described?
- DR. McGOWAN: Yes. If they didn't replace
- anything, all there would be would be an increase of
- stormwater runoff.
- MS. DEXTER: And my last question is pre-filed
- question 6. Have you studied the effects of the work
- 19 necessary to meet existing dissolved oxygen
- requirements applicable to the CAWS?
- DR. McGOWAN: No. We essentially took the
- 22 studies that were done by others, used the energy,
- 23 and did an environmental analysis on power
- consumption and those types of things. So we were

- 1 not involved in the detailed analysis of the
- 2 dissolved oxygen in those waterways.
- MS. DEXTER: So all of your estimates are based
- 4 on meeting the proposed standards in this rulemaking,
- and none have been done for the new, but existing, DO
- 6 standards on these waterways?
- 7 DR. McGOWAN: We took information generated by
- 8 others on the team.
- 9 MS. DEXTER: Thanks.
- 10 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Okay. Anything else
- 11 for Mr. McGowan?
- 12 Thank you very much, Mr. McGowan.
- DR. McGOWAN: Thank you.
- 14 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And then we can go
- ahead and move to the pre-filed questions for
- 16 Dr. Zenz on dissolved oxygen.
- MS. WILLIAMS: We covered my first question.
- The second question, question three, why
- did you change the compliance target from 90 percent
- to 100 percent?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, when we were doing the first
- studies, the ones that were being done for the UIA,
- we did not know what the IEPA would propose in the
- 24 way of dissolved oxygen standards for the system, so

- we were in a position trying to figure out what it
- would be. At the time we had hopes -- perhaps that's
- the best way to describe it -- that IEPA would come
- 4 up with something less than 100 percent compliance.
- 5 We thought it would be probably something in the area
- of 5 milligrams per liter, so we came up with
- 7 90 percent compliance at 5 milligrams per liter.
- 8 Obviously, that was not what IEPA came up
- 9 with. They came up with a 100 percent compliance
- standard. Of course, if we're going to be of any
- value to you, you want a cost estimate for meeting
- the standard 100 percent of the time, so that's what
- we did. It's as simple as that.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Question four, how did the
- improvements related to the completion of TARP factor
- into your analysis of the amount of aeration and flow
- augmentation needed to achieve 100 percent
- 18 compliance?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, we had some discussions of this
- issue when the project began. The question was what
- 21 are we going to assume in the way of TARP? Are we
- going to assume that reservoirs are on line, or are
- we not? And we decided that the reservoir situation
- is a very long-term possible construction project and

- that the information that would be most useful to the
- 2 Board we thought would be assuming that the
- reservoirs were, in fact, not on line, but that all
- 4 the tunnels are on line. In fact, all the tunnels
- 5 are on line right now, as you probably know. So that
- is the assumption that is made in the modeling and in
- 7 the sizing and location of the stations.
- 8 MS. WILLIAMS: When you say long term, when will
- 9 the reservoirs be completed?
- DR. ZENZ: I have no idea.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Do you know if it's going to be
- before or after the time line outlined in your
- testimony for these projects?
- DR. ZENZ: I have no idea.
- MR. ANDES: I think there's been prior testimony
- by Mr. Lanyon in terms of the approximately 15-year
- time frame for that, but we can refer back to his
- 18 testimony. And you can certainly ask Dr. Granato.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I think we've already addressed
- 20 Question 5.
- 21 Question 6, have you calculated these
- costs, meaning the cost for dissolved oxygen
- compliance, on a unit basis such as cost per million
- 24 gallons treated or cost per household?

- DR. ZENZ: That's outside the scope of our
- 2 project. We have not been asked to make such
- 3 calculations.
- 4 MS. WILLIAMS: Question 7, why will it take
- 5 eight-and-a-half years to construct dissolved oxygen
- 6 enhancement in the CAWS?
- 7 DR. ZENZ: Well, I think the best way to answer
- 8 that question is to go over, at least in some detail,
- 9 the basis for the schedule that we presented in our
- 10 testimony.
- First, we said it would take two years to
- do pilot studies. Pilot studies were done as part of
- the SEPA construction. This is going to be a
- 14 construction project that's going to be at least
- 15 \$500 million. That's the cost estimate we presented
- to the Board. It's probably more, as I've said
- 17 before. If we are going to go forward with this --
- By the way, supplemental aeration is not
- done very much in the United States. We've got to
- really look hard to find places that practice this.
- 21 So pilot plan studies we think are absolutely
- necessary. They have to be planned. The pilots have
- to be perhaps constructed or rented or something.
- 24 Many have to be run. And the report has to be

- 1 compiled. I think that's going to take two years.
- The next part of our estimate, we said it's
- going to take three-and-a-half years to design it.
- 4 There's a possibility of 18 different sites. We've
- 5 got to do field investigation, soil sampling, look at
- 6 the ground water table.
- 7 Land acquisition, we cannot be sure that
- 8 any of these sites can be effectively located on
- 9 District property. The District does own a lot of
- property on the waterways, but there's also a lot of
- 11 property that they do not own. So land acquisition
- could be a very difficult and time-consuming process.
- The District has eminent domain. The
- 14 property owners have rights to protest offers that
- are made. Three-and-a-half years I don't think is
- unreasonable for the whole process to produce a
- useful set of plans for construction.
- We think it's going to take three years to
- construct 18 different sites. 500 or \$600 million.
- I think that's reasonable. I mean, I have no reason
- to change my mind over that schedule. I'll stick
- with it here. We, of course, will look at this again
- when we do our integrated strategy, but right now I
- have no reason to change it.

- MS. WILLIAMS: So the second question, would
- there be changes that could be made to speed up this
- process, is your answer no?
- DR. ZENZ: I have no information that would lead
- 5 me to believe that this could be speeded up.
- 6 MS. WILLIAMS: What options did you consider
- 7 that could have shortened the time frame?
- DR. ZENZ: There are no options that we think
- 9 could -- I mean, when I presented this construction
- 10 estimate, we took considerable time to think about
- it. There are no options -- no options that we think
- could be taken to shorten this process.
- MS. WILLIAMS: So does that mean that your
- answer to Question 8 is yes? Do you believe these
- construction schedules represent the earliest
- reasonable date MWRD could achieve compliance with
- 17 dissolved oxygen?
- MR. ANDES: Are we asking him from a legal
- 19 standpoint?
- MS. WILLIAMS: It's a technical question.
- MR. ANDES: So you're asking him as a technical
- 22 matter, not as a legal matter?
- DR. ZENZ: I honestly believe that my schedule
- is correct. When that construction would start, I

- don't know. But the time frame that I have outlined
- is the best we can come up with.
- MS. WILLIAMS: So, Dr. Zenz, can you explain --
- 4 What's hard for me to accept about your construction
- schedule here is that there is no efficiency in time
- from the disinfection schedule that you've provided
- for the plans, other than Stickney. So you are
- 8 confident that it will take as long to install
- 9 supplemental aeration as it will take to install
- 10 disinfection?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, it turns out that they are
- similar, but they were developed entirely
- independent. There's no -- There was no connection
- between the two. We didn't decide that both of those
- should somehow be similar.
- MS. WILLIAMS: We spent quite a bit of time when
- you were here last time talking about the need for
- pilot plans at all three facilities for disinfection.
- 19 I think I understood pretty well your take on that.
- But please explain to me why you don't think that the
- 21 pilot studies done for the SEPA stations would be
- sufficient for building additional aeration stations?
- DR. ZENZ: At this point in time, we don't know
- what technologies will come out of our integrated

- 1 strategy.
- MR. ANDES: If I can interrupt a moment. Can
- you explain what a SEPA station is relative to other
- 4 kinds of aeration stations? I'm not sure if people
- 5 understand that.
- 6 DR. ZENZ: Yeah. It's basically a waterfall
- 7 type of arrangement. It's not a cascade where you
- 8 have many, many steps as the water flows over this
- 9 cascade in sort of a sheet-like fashion. It's what
- they call a plunging pool type of design where the
- water comes over a weir and it plunges down five
- 12 feet. It's the typical drop into a pool of water
- below. It's actually plunging. It creates most of
- the aeration. It's not the fact that there's air on
- either side of the waterfall. It's the plunging and
- 16 the turbulence that creates -- that's what the SEPA
- 17 station relies on.
- Let me just say that one of the issues -- I
- 19 worked for the District at the time the SEPA stations
- were first proposed by the engineering department.
- 21 As we began the process of looking at whether or not
- you would proceed with the SEPA technology, we all
- 23 realized -- we spent time discussing this with the
- 24 Illinois Water Survey, that pilot studies were

- absolutely necessary.
- Now, you might think, well, it's just some
- water coming over a weir and it drops into a pool.
- 4 What's the big deal? Why can't you build it? The
- 5 answer is that the information available in the
- 6 literature for the aeration just simply wasn't
- 7 available. So the pilot studies were actually
- 8 conducted and run by the Illinois State Water Survey.
- 9 The District constructed the actual SEPA
- 10 station model. They tried, you know, 15-foot drops
- and five-foot drops, and all kinds of different
- 12 alternatives were tried. When you do these pilot
- 13 studies, you get a tremendous efficiency. You know
- exactly what you've got at the end. If you don't do
- them, you don't know what you're going to have at the
- 16 end.
- MR. ANDES: In terms of these new 18 stations, do
- 18 you expect those to be perfect replications of the
- 19 SEPA stations already there or something entirely
- 20 different?
- DR. ZENZ: We have gotten to the point where
- there's no doubt that some of the technologies and
- some of the stations will not be SEPA. They will not
- 24 be.

- 1 MR. ANDES: It will be --
- DR. ZENZ: Other types of aeration systems. I
- 3 can tell you that.
- 4 MS. WILLIAMS: Can you explain in a little more
- 5 detail, Dr. Zenz --
- 6 DR. ZENZ: Well, I think --
- 7 MS. WILLIAMS: -- why you conclude and which
- 8 ones?
- 9 DR. ZENZ: Well, when we do our evaluations and
- we have workshops, we try to look at the advantages
- and the disadvantages of the technologies as much as
- we can. We search the literature. We rely on
- assistance and information coming from the District.
- 14 And it just looks like right now that the only two
- places that SEPA would probably be a good fit would
- be Bubbly Creek and the Chicago River right now and
- that other technologies would be a better fit than
- 18 that.
- I don't really want to go much further into
- that because I don't want to start stating
- 21 conclusions before the Board. I'll just leave it at
- that. It's very, very likely that the final
- 23 cost estimate will be based upon other technologies
- than SEPA at least in part of the system.

- 1 MS. WILLIAMS: Did you mean main stem in the
- 2 Chicago River when you said that?
- 3 DR. ZENZ: I did. I did.
- 4 MS. WILLIAMS: Question 9, do you know how long
- 5 the existing SEPA stations took to construct?
- DR. ZENZ: I didn't know, but I asked the
- 7 District. They told us. Construction contracts for
- 8 SEPA Stations 1, 2, and 5 were awarded in 1990, and
- 9 the SEPA stations -- Those stations went into
- operation in 1994, so it took about four years to
- 11 construct from the time that construction was awarded
- to construct those three stations. For SEPA Stations
- 3 and 4, the contract was awarded in 1989. They went
- into operation in '92, so it took about three years.
- 15 And you'll notice that I estimated it would take
- three years to construct the 18 stations.
- 17 MR. ANDES: So that's just construction time?
- 18 You aren't talking in terms of planning time,
- 19 et cetera?
- DR. ZENZ: Oh, no.
- Bear in mind, the way municipalities
- construct projects, they get an engineer to produce a
- 23 set of plans and specifications. Then it has to be
- 24 bidded. There's opportunity for the -- You don't

- 1 just give a set of plans and specifications for a
- \$500 million project and say, "Give me your estimate
- 3 in one month." You have to give them 90 days. There
- 4 may be issues that will come up. So you can have --
- 5 A bid award might take six months from the time that
- 6 you actually have the design completed and ready to
- 7 go until you actually give a contract. I mean,
- 8 that's the way -- I mean, I've been in this business
- 9 for almost 40 years, and that's the way it goes.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I don't think I have any other
- 11 questions for this witness.
- 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Ms. Dexter?
- MS. DEXTER: Again, pre-filed questions for
- 14 the Environmental Law & Policy Center.
- 15 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Ms. Dexter, you need
- to speak up a little bit and slow down a little bit.
- MS. DEXTER: I will start with pre-filed
- 18 question number 1. Do you know -- Are the Chicago
- 19 area waterways currently and consistently meeting the
- 20 dissolved oxygen standards that are currently
- 21 applicable to them?
- DR. ZENZ: I do not.
- MS. DEXTER: Did you -- This is pre-filed
- question 4. Did you consider the cost of

- implementing controls necessary to meet the currently
- 2 applicable DO standards?
- DR. ZENZ: That's outside the scope of our
- 4 contract. We are only to look -- Our project calls
- 5 to look at meeting the IEPA's proposed standards, and
- 6 that's it. We have no charge to do anything else.
- 7 MS. DEXTER: You have no idea of the rough
- 8 comparison between the two standards?
- 9 DR. ZENZ: No.
- MS. DEXTER: How did the discharges from the
- 11 Calumet North Side or Stickney plants affect
- dissolved oxygen levels in the CAWS?
- DR. ZENZ: That is also not part of our study.
- 14 I think that question is best addressed to
- Dr. Melching. If he, in fact, has looked at that as
- part of his modeling approach, I don't know.
- MS. DEXTER: Okay.
- DR. ZENZ: But I can't answer that question.
- MS. DEXTER: I'm going to ask pre-filed question
- 20 6, but I will ask it a little differently than it's
- 21 written.
- DR. ZENZ: That's okay.
- MS. DEXTER: In Attachment 2 to your pre-filed
- testimony, there's Attachment A. On page 16 of

- 1 Attachment A of Attachment 2 to your testimony, there
- 2 is a figure labeled Figure 10. That's what this
- question will be directed toward.
- 4 Right above Figure 10 it says -- it
- 5 explains that this is about the new aeration stations
- 6 in the Chicago River mainstem. It says, "The effect
- of new aeration stations on DO concentrations in the
- 8 Chicago River mainstem is especially significant for
- 9 the period of October 2000 to May 2001. After May
- 10 2001, the effect of new aeration stations on DO in
- 11 the Chicago River mainstem diminishes." Can you
- 12 explain why that is?
- DR. ZENZ: I can't, but I know Dr. Melching can
- 14 because this question was directed to him. This
- 15 attachment that you're referring to was prepared by
- 16 him. The modeling work that is done to present these
- 17 figures was done by him. I'm not going to venture --
- 18 I have an idea why that happens, but I'm not sure of
- it, so I'm not going to say it. I think that's best
- 20 addressed to him.
- MS. DEXTER: Did you take any effect of
- 22 phosphorus or nitrogen pollution on dissolved oxygen
- levels into account in designing these studies?
- DR. ZENZ: All I can tell you is that I know,

- from discussions with Dr. Melching, that his model
- 2 includes taking into account the nitrogen species on
- dissolved oxygen content and phosphorus. The details
- 4 of how that's done in his modeling I cannot tell you.
- 5 He is best for that. The model does account for
- 6 nitrogen and phosphorus impacts upon dissolved
- oxygen. It does do that.
- 8 MS. DEXTER: Have you or CTI been involved in
- 9 the preparation of any studies designed to determine
- the cost to Illinois discharges of treating for
- 11 phosphorus and nitrogen?
- DR. ZENZ: Yes. In 2003, we prepared a report
- for the Illinois Association of Wastewater Agencies.
- 14 They gave us a small contract to try to estimate the
- cost of implementing a proposed -- Let me backtrack a
- 16 little bit.
- 17 This was because -- They asked us to
- determine the cost for improving/modifying existing
- municipal plants in order to meet nitrogen and
- 20 phosphorus standards. The reason they asked us to do
- this cost estimate was because a year or two prior to
- 22 that IEPA -- excuse me -- United States Environmental
- 23 Protection Agency came out with new national water
- 24 quality standards for nitrogen and phosphorus. Since

Page 63

- 1 they thought -- And IEPA is working on and continues
- to work on coming up with standards. Because of that
- national promulgation of nitrogen and phosphorus
- 4 standards, they thought that a cost estimate would be
- 5 helpful to IEPA, so they asked CTI to come up with
- 6 that cost estimate. That's a long answer.
- 7 MR. ANDES: And we have copies of that report on
- 8 disk, which we will provide. The report is titled
- 9 Technical Feasibility and Cost to Meet Nutrient
- 10 Standards in Illinois.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Is this relevant to this
- 12 rulemaking?
- MR. ANDES: She asked for it.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Did you ask for this study?
- MS. DEXTER: I asked about whether there were
- 16 studies.
- 17 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Since he's mentioned
- it, we're going to put it in the record. If there's
- 19 no objection, we'll mark this as Exhibit 220.
- Seeing none, the CD-ROM Technical
- 21 Feasibility and Cost to Meet Nutrient Standards in
- 22 Illinois, David Zenz, is marked as Exhibit 220.

23

- 1 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 220, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- 4 MS. DEXTER: We, at this point, don't have any
- idea how these two cost estimates might interrelate
- 6 with one another.
- 7 DR. ZENZ: I don't see how they do, to be
- 8 honest. I can't -- There's no correlation.
- 9 MR. ANDES: If I can clarify, that report is on
- 10 nutrient control.
- DR. ZENZ: Correct.
- MR. ANDES: The District's already provided some
- estimates of what it thinks the cause of nutrient
- 14 control would be in Mr. Kunetz' testimony specific to
- 15 this.
- MS. DEXTER: I'll move on to pre-filed
- 17 question 9.
- In calculating the capital costs of the
- work needed to meet the proposed dissolved oxygen
- standards, when is it assumed that construction would
- begin for each recommended project?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, we made no assumptions. We
- 23 presented our cost estimate in June 2008 dollars. We
- have no -- We have no information about when or if

- 1 construction --
- MS. DEXTER: So essentially all of the costs
- of -- the capital costs of this construction are
- 4 assumed to all take place basically instantaneously
- 5 with the --
- DR. ZENZ: I guess the best way to describe it
- 7 is that the capital costs are in June 2008 dollars.
- 8 Therefore, if a contract was awarded in June of 2008,
- 9 that's what we think the cost would be for capital
- 10 costs. The operation and maintenance costs are also
- in June 2008 dollars. For the year 2008-2009, that
- would be the cost of -- the operation and maintenance
- cost if the stations were operating in 2008-2009. So
- if you want to change to some other time period, you
- have to use an inflation factor to figure out what
- the dollars would be. Again, I don't know when the
- 17 construction contract would be awarded or if it would
- 18 be awarded.
- 19 MS. DEXTER: In these cost estimates, you
- 20 haven't used either an inflation factor or a
- 21 discounting factor in updating your present value?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I want to simplify. The
- 23 capital costs are what it would take for the
- concrete, steel, and all the rest of it to build it

- in June 2008 dollars. There's no interest rate
- assumed in that capital cost. The operation and
- 3 maintenance costs are also in June 2008 dollars.
- 4 There's no interest rate inflation factor, just what
- we think the labor and the electricity would be for
- 6 that particular point in time.
- Now, when we give you a present worth
- 8 factor, you know, I think that just causes more
- 9 confusion for the layperson that's trying to figure
- out what the hell is this present worth factor. It's
- really a somewhat fictitious number which we use to
- compare estimates because we might be looking at an
- estimate with a very high capital cost and a low
- 14 maintenance and operation cost. Another estimate
- might be a very low capital cost, but high operation
- and maintenance cost. We put those two numbers,
- capital cost and operation and maintenance cost, into
- one number, which we call present worth. That allows
- us to compare these various alternatives. And that
- 20 requires assuming an interest rate and an inflation
- 21 factor.
- When we tell you the capital cost, there's
- 23 no inflation factor. There's no interest rate.
- 24 That's the cost that it's going to cost you in June

- of 2008 to build it. When we give you the operation
- and maintenance cost, that's the cost that it's going
- 3 to cost at that point to run that, and it happens to
- 4 be the yearly cost. Then present worth is a
- 5 different story. I think sometimes we create more
- 6 confusion by present worth. Everybody always wants
- 7 to know the present worth. I hope I answered your
- 8 question.
- 9 MS. DEXTER: I think we did discuss this. I'm
- not going to ask anymore questions on that.
- Pre-filed question 10, are there other
- studies, calculations, or worksheets that support the
- estimates and calculations made in Attachments QQ,
- 14 PP, and OO of the IEPA initial filing?
- DR. ZENZ: No. We always make a very concerted
- effort in all our reports to include everything
- either in the body of the report or as attachments,
- all the spreadsheets for our cost estimates,
- everything. What is in the report is all. There's
- 20 nothing else. We didn't leave anything out. We
- tried to deliver everything to the client. It's all
- 22 there.
- MS. DEXTER: I have no further questions for
- 24 this witness.

- MS. WILLIAMS: I have one follow-up.
- Exhibit 220 on the disk here, can you
- 3 explain, for the record, the difference between
- 4 Exhibit 220 and Exhibit 164 entitled POTW Nutrient
- 5 Removal in Illinois, Illinois Association of
- 6 Wastewater Agencies, 2003?
- 7 DR. ZENZ: You're going to have to really help
- 8 me here with all these numbers.
- 9 MR. ANDES: I believe, not having Exhibit 164 in
- front of us, that was a power-point presentation
- 11 summarizing this report. I believe that's the case.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.
- HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Are there any other
- 14 questions for Dr. Zenz?
- MR. ANDES: I have a couple of follow-ups.
- 16 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Okay.
- MR. ANDES: Dr. Zenz, one question I have is
- about velocity at the aeration stations. As I
- understand it, the current stations operate around
- 20 30 grams --
- DR. ZENZ: Grams per second of oxygen, yeah.
- That's the oxygen that would be put -- It's in metric
- units. 30 grams per second is the amount of oxygen.
- 30 grams of oxygen per second has to be applied -- or

- is supplied by the particular aeration station. In
- fact, most of these stations, except for one, are all
- 3 80 grams per second.
- 4 MR. ANDES: So you think these stations would
- 5 mainly have to be run at 80 grams per second instead
- 6 of 30?
- 7 DR. ZENZ: That's correct.
- 8 MR. ANDES: What uncertainty does that
- 9 introduce? Can you just scale it up, or are there
- 10 other issues?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I mean, the model says that,
- except for one station, which is 70 grams per second,
- all the stations have to operate at 80 -- have to
- 14 provide 80 grams per second of oxygen to the waterway
- in order to meet IEPA's proposed standards
- 16 100 percent of the time. I should say that's for one
- 17 year worth of data between October 1, 2000, and
- 18 September 30, 2001.
- 19 For that year, Dr. Melching has looked at
- 20 all the DO results and said, I provide these 18
- stations, 17 of which are 80 grams per second of
- oxygen being supplied to the water, and one being 70.
- 23 Plus, we have flow augmentation of the upper North
- 24 Shore Channel included in the modeling. We've got

- 1 flow augmentation of Bubbly Creek and flow
- augmentation of that little stretch of the Calumet
- River from the O'Brien Lock and Dam downstream. So
- 4 it would bring water to that if you look at a cost
- 5 estimate.
- 6 MR. ANDES: So we're talking about bubbling a
- 7 lot more water? 80 grams a second --
- 8 DR. ZENZ: Yeah. The Devon Avenue station is
- 9 probably about 25. These are, like, three times
- bigger. They're pretty big. They're pretty big. If
- it's a diffused aeration system, they're going to
- cover a pretty big portion. There's going to be a
- 13 lot of bubbles.
- MR. ANDES: Well, that leads to another
- 15 question. I want to delve into that a little bit,
- particularly starting with the North Shore Channel,
- and I have another map. This is titled CAWS Aeration
- 18 Station Locations Upper North Shore Channel. I have
- 19 a poster of this.
- 20 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If there's no
- objection, we will mark this map as Exhibit 221.
- Seeing none, the CAWS Aeration Station
- 23 Locations Upper North Shore Channel map is marked as
- 24 Exhibit 221.

- 1 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- Exhibit No. 221, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- 4 MR. ANDES: Dr. Zenz, since I grew up in
- 5 Evanston and Skokie and my old house is on this map,
- 6 I have an unfair advantage. But let me ask you.
- 7 These are the three aeration locations that
- 8 would be proposed on the Upper North Shore Channel;
- 9 am I right?
- 10 DR. ZENZ: That is correct. These are three
- 11 stations, all of which are 80 grams per second.
- MR. ANDES: And the first one is near Simpson
- 13 Street near Dyche Stadium? The second one is --
- DR. ZENZ: I think that's Central Avenue.
- MR. ANDES: Central Avenue right by the stadium?
- DR. ZENZ: Yeah.
- 17 MR. ANDES: The second one is near Main Street?
- DR. ZENZ: Simpson.
- 19 MR. ANDES: The first one is Central? The
- second one is Simpson?
- DR. ZENZ: It's just a little bit north of
- 22 Simpson.
- MR. ANDES: Near the high school.
- DR. ZENZ: You know it better than I do.

- 1 MR. ANDES: Yeah, I do.
- 2 And the third one is just near Main Street,
- 3 correct?
- 4 DR. ZENZ: Right.
- 5 MR. ANDES: And the locations of these three in
- 6 river miles, as I see on the chart, Table 4, are
- 7 337.9, 339.2, and 340.2. If my math is right, that's
- 8 about 2.3 miles between these three stations?
- 9 DR. ZENZ: Well, actually the distance between
- the first one and the second one is only about a
- mile, and the next one is a little bit over a mile.
- 12 They're pretty close together.
- MR. ANDES: And you're talking pretty large
- 14 stations?
- DR. ZENZ: Yeah.
- MR. ANDES: Bubbling a lot of water?
- DR. ZENZ: They should be.
- MR. ANDES: And this is an area where we've
- 19 heard there's some recreational use?
- DR. ZENZ: That's my understanding.
- MR. ANDES: And can you tell us what your
- understanding is of the impact that the bubbling has
- in terms of the water quality?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, we know, from our experience

- with the Devon and Webster Avenue stations, that
- 2 boaters have a hard time getting past. In those
- 3 particular stations, you have a bore on shore. Then
- 4 you have a diffuser system in the bottom of the
- 5 river. You can probably intuitively understand that
- 6 the water level is just a little bit higher. You
- 7 have all this air. It creates a little bit of an
- 8 obstruction, and sometimes you have a hard time
- 9 getting past it. I've actually seen that. It
- creates a little bit of a dam effect, and they have a
- 11 little trouble. It can be done. It is a little bit
- of an obstruction. And aesthetically --
- MR. ANDES: Are there any safety issues?
- DR. ZENZ: Well, I don't know if it's an old
- wives' tale or what. I'm probably getting off into
- an area I should keep my big mouth shut. I know some
- people said, if you ever fell into the river there,
- 18 you wouldn't be as buoyant as you'd like.
- MR. ANDES: Buoyant in an area that's bubbling?
- DR. ZENZ: Yeah. There's an old saying, if you
- ever fall in an aeration tank, you'd sink real fast.
- 22 I don't know if that's true.
- MR. ANDES: Let me ask you the same kind of
- questions about the next exhibit, which is CAWS

- 1 Aeration Station Locations South Branch Chicago
- 2 River, Bubbly Creek, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal.
- 3 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Dr. Lin has a
- 4 follow-up question first.
- 5 DR. LIN: You assign station number -- I mean,
- 6 mark the station number?
- 7 DR. ZENZ: Yeah, we didn't. I guess we should
- 8 have done that, Fred, so it follows the table. I
- 9 understand what you're saying.
- 10 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: But can you do that
- 11 now? Can you tell us now which one is which?
- DR. ZENZ: Sure.
- MR. ANDES: Let's go back for a minute.
- On Upper North Shore Channel, are those
- 15 Stations 1, 2, and 3?
- DR. ZENZ: Stations 1, 2, and 3 starting at the
- 17 top.
- MR. ANDES: 1 is Central?
- 19 DR. ZENZ: Right
- MR. ANDES: 2 is Simpson?
- DR. ZENZ: Right.
- MR. ANDES: And 3 is Main?
- DR. ZENZ: That's correct.
- MR. ANDES: Thank you.

- DR. ZENZ: And I apologize. We probably should
- 2 have done that.
- HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And then the new map,
- 4 CAWS Aeration Station Locations South Branch Chicago
- 5 River, Bubbly Creek, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal,
- if there's no objection, we will mark that as
- 7 Exhibit 222. That's Exhibit 222.
- 8 (WHEREUPON, said document was marked
- 9 Exhibit No. 222, for identification,
- as of 3-3-09.)
- MR. ANDES: Dr. Zenz, why don't we walk through
- where these stations are and what numbers they are.
- DR. ZENZ: Well, the one that's the furthest
- 14 north just south of the junction of the Chicago River
- mainstem with the South Branch, that's Station 4.
- MR. TWAIT: I think Station 4 is on the North
- 17 Branch
- MR. ANDES: Actually that would be 5, right?
- 19 Station 4 is up on the North Branch
- DR. ZENZ: Yeah, you're right. I apologize.
- We just don't have it on the map.
- MR. ANDES: It's on the larger map of all the
- 23 aeration station locations, but here we're talking
- 24 about --

- DR. ZENZ: It's 5. I apologize.
- 2 MR. ANDES: So the first three on the South
- 3 Branch are 5, 6, and 7; am I right?
- DR. ZENZ: No, no. Up a little further.
- 5 That's 5.
- 6 MR. ANDES: So the three over on the right-hand
- 7 side of the map where -- for the transcript, are 5,
- 8 6, and 7?
- 9 DR. ZENZ: That's correct. As it says on the
- table, 5 is just downstream of the junction with the
- 11 North Branch of the Chicago River. So that's 5. And
- then 6 is the one -- oh, I don't know -- a mile or so
- 13 further downstream. And the last one on the South
- 14 Branch is 7.
- MR. ANDES: That's at Halsted Street?
- DR. ZENZ: Yes.
- MR. ANDES: And those three are how far apart
- 18 based on the river miles?
- 19 DR. ZENZ: Between 5 and 6 is about -- It's
- 20 1.3 miles
- MR. ANDES: And between 6 and 7?
- DR. ZENZ: Is 1.2 miles.
- MR. ANDES: So, again, we're talking about three
- stations and about a two-and-a-half mile distance?

- 1 DR. ZENZ: Yes.
- 2 MR. ANDES: So that --
- DR. ZENZ: There's a big sag there. That's why
- 4 they're so close together.
- 5 MR. ANDES: Okay.
- DR. ZENZ: Big oxygen demand in that area.
- 7 MR. ANDES: And then you have three stations on
- 8 Bubbly Creek?
- 9 DR. ZENZ: That's correct.
- MR. ANDES: And those are 8, 9, and 10, the
- 11 mouth, the mid point, and the head waters?
- DR. ZENZ: Yeah. Eight is right at -- almost on the
- 13 South Branch, 9 is halfway down Bubbly Creek, and 10
- 14 at the beginning of the head waters.
- MR. ANDES: And I know we don't have river miles
- 16 because Bubbly Creek is sort of different.
- DR. ZENZ: Those are less than a mile apart.
- 18 MR. ANDES: Less than a mile between those three
- 19 stations?
- DR. ZENZ: Yeah.
- MR. ANDES: Okay. And then --
- DR. ZENZ: In order of a half mile.
- 23 MR. ANDES: And then on the Sanitary and Ship
- 24 Canal, these are, I believe, Stations 11, 12, and 13

- 1 depicted?
- DR. ZENZ: That's correct.
- MR. ANDES: Because there are a couple more
- 4 stations farther south?
- DR. ZENZ: Yes, there is.
- 6 MR. ANDES: They just aren't on this map?
- 7 DR. ZENZ: No, they're not on this map.
- 8 MR. ANDES: So these three stations, 11, 12, and
- 9 13, are about three-and-a-half miles apart total?
- DR. ZENZ: Yeah. Eleven and 12 are exactly one mile
- 11 apart, and then between 12 and 13 about a mile and a
- 12 half. And the next one is a couple miles.
- MR. ANDES: Again, these are the
- 14 80-gram-a-second stations? You said fairly large
- 15 stations?
- DR. ZENZ: Yes.
- MR. ANDES: To the extent there are any
- 18 recreational uses, the same issues as we talked about
- 19 on the North Shore Channel?
- Okay. Thank you.
- 21 DR. ZENZ: And I'll just mention that, in our
- integrated strategy, we will not just look at one
- 23 year of data. We will look at two years of data. So
- these stations sizings could substantially increase

```
depending on what that situation is.
```

- 2 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Anything further,
- 3 Mr. Andes?
- 4 MR. ANDES: No.
- 5 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Anything else for
- 6 Dr. Zenz?
- 7 Dr. Zenz, thank you very much.
- DR. ZENZ: You're welcome.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: With that, we are
- going to go ahead and take lunch. Let's try and be
- 11 back -- I have about 20 till now. Let's try and be
- back right around 1:00 o'clock. Come back around
- 1:00. Thank you all.
- 14 (WHEREUPON, the hearing was adjourned
- until 1:00 p.m., this same day.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Page 80
 1
     STATE OF ILLINOIS
 2
                            SS:
     COUNTY OF K A N E
         I, MARGARET R. BEDDARD, a Certified Shorthand
     Reporter of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify
     that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had at
     the hearing aforesaid and that the foregoing is a
 9
     true, complete, and correct transcript of the
10
     proceedings of said hearing as appears from my
11
     stenographic notes so taken and transcribed by me.
         IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my hand at
12
     Chicago, Illinois, this \frac{24M}{1} day of March, 2009.
13
14
15
16
                              Murymet Bellen
17
18
                            Certified Shorthand Reporter
19
     CSR Certificate No. 84-3565.
20
21
22
23
24
```

	26.10.21.14	- <b>6</b> 4 <b>5</b> -12-21	40.16	07.2
A	26:10 31:14	after 5:13,21	49:16	anticipated 27:3
<b>able</b> 5:10 6:1	36:11 43:14	42:22 50:12	Anand 2:3 4:14	anymore 67:10
8:19 9:9,15	56:9	61:9	Andes 2:13 6:21	anyone 5:18
10:21,23,24	actually 4:19	again 5:11 6:9	6:23 7:2,5,10	45:8 46:6
11:2 13:19,20	15:4 23:22	7:4,9 22:15	7:19 8:8,13	anything 29:22
13:23 15:10,13	44:12 45:12	38:19 40:3	9:19,22 11:6	35:10 36:9
15:16 46:17	55:13 56:7	43:24 52:22	11:13,16 12:10	44:2 46:2,20
<b>about</b> 6:7 14:1,2	59:6,7 72:9	59:13 65:16	12:24 13:3,6	47:10,15 48:10
15:20 19:8	73:9 75:18	76:23 78:13	13:13 14:9,13	60:6 67:20
20:18 27:23	add 9:23	Agencies 62:13	14:17 15:4	79:2,5
29:15 30:7	added 30:21	68:6	16:1,6,12 17:7	apart 76:17
31:15 32:20	adding 21:15	Agency 2:7 4:24	17:23 22:13,21	77:17 78:9,11
33:4 35:16	additional 8:1,4	5:17 62:23	29:13,18 30:5	apologize 75:1
36:9,23 38:13	10:9 22:20	ago 7:8	30:17 31:7	75:20 76:1
42:21 43:11	29:1 34:20,24	agree 44:24	34:8,17 35:12	Appeared 2:14
45:4 53:10	37:10 54:22	agreed 39:2	37:5,16,21	Appearing 2:6
54:4,17 58:10	addressed 36:14	ahead 8:12	38:9 39:7,12	appears 80:10
58:14 61:5	50:19 60:14	22:11 25:21	39:15 44:20,23	applicable 34:2
63:15 64:24	61:20	31:18 35:12	46:24 47:5,9	47:20 59:21
68:18 70:6,9	adjourned 79:14	43:16 48:15	50:15 53:18,21	60:2
72:8,10 73:24	adjusting 14:13	79:10	55:2 56:17	application 43:1
75:24 76:19,23	<b>Adm</b> 1:5 4:7	air 16:14 17:17	57:1 58:17	applied 68:24
76:24 78:9,11	admit 30:9	21:9 41:20	63:7,13 64:9	applies 7:24
78:18 79:11	31:19	42:1 46:7	64:12 68:9,15	appointed 4:3
<b>above</b> 61:4	admitted 31:10	55:14 73:7	68:17 69:4,8	approach 9:1
above-entitled	advantage 71:6	<b>Alisa</b> 2:4 4:15	70:6,14 71:4	23:13 29:9
1:9	advantages	allows 23:17	71:12,15,17,19	40:15 60:16
absolute 10:23	57:10	66:18	71:23 72:1,5	appropriate
absolutely 51:21	aeration 16:15	almost 38:13	72:13,16,18,21	20:12 21:21
56:1	17:18 28:13,17	59:9 77:12	73:13,19,23	22:3 32:12
absorb 15:15	28:20 29:1,19	already 7:2	74:13,18,20,22	approximately
accept 54:4	30:11 31:12	25:12 31:10,17	74:24 75:11,18	10:20 50:16
account 61:23	32:24 33:5	32:6 50:19	75:22 76:2,6	approximating
62:2,5	34:19 36:3	56:19 64:12	76:15,17,21,23	43:13
accurate 27:24	37:15 40:16	alternatives	77:2,5,7,10,15	area 1:4 4:5 19:3
39:7 45:1,3	41:10,16,18	56:12 66:19	77:18,21,23	20:16 31:13
achieve 49:17	47:10 49:16	Although 10:23	78:3,6,8,13,17	32:13 34:4
53:16	51:18 54:9,22	always 67:6,15	79:3,4	47:6 49:5
acknowledge	55:4,14 56:6	Amendments	another 6:12	59:19 72:18
5:21	57:2 61:5,7,10	1:5 4:7	9:17 14:18	73:16,19 77:6
acknowledged	68:18 69:1	amount 10:4,5	33:2 64:6	areas 47:8
5:21	70:11,17,22	15:18 16:10	66:14 70:14,17	around 6:8 9:18
acquire 32:14	71:7 73:21	17:9,12,13	answer 34:6	46:17 68:19
acquisition 52:7	74:1 75:4,23	25:22 49:16	51:7 53:3,14	79:12,12
52:11	aesthetically	68:23	56:5 60:18	arrangement
acronyms 9:14	73:12	analysis 8:1,17	63:6	55:7
across 44:2	affect 8:17 60:11	8:18 34:9,12	answered 21:11	asked 6:3 21:8
Acting 4:10	affects 8:3	35:3 46:12,20	43:5 67:7	35:16 42:17
actual 23:22	aforesaid 80:8	47:23 48:1	answering 22:12	46:11 51:2
		•		

				I
58:6 62:17,20	B	48:22 69:22,22	26:13,22 29:14	15:23 21:18
63:5,13,15	<b>B</b> 3:1 31:4	believe 4:16	38:6 50:2	51:3 67:12,13
asking 35:16	back 21:13 23:8	11:4 19:6	51:16 57:21	calibrate 36:15
53:18,21	26:5 27:16	21:11,12 22:1	Board's 6:5	calibrated 36:11
aspects 46:17	29:12 32:10	23:6 27:22	boaters 73:2	call 23:21 26:8
assess 34:23	37:3 40:2	45:10 53:5,14	<b>body</b> 67:17	28:4 55:10
assessment	50:17 74:13	53:23 68:9,11	bore 73:3	66:18
45:18,24	79:11,12,12	77:24	<b>both</b> 14:10 16:7	called 1:10
assign 74:5	background	<b>below</b> 55:13	54:14	10:22 39:21
assistance 57:13	9:13	best 20:7 23:15	<b>bottom</b> 15:19	<b>calls</b> 60:4
Association	backtrack 62:15	49:3 51:7 54:2	73:4	Calumet 24:19
62:13 68:5	Ballpark 42:1	60:14 61:19	Box 2:8	60:11 70:2
assume 25:5	BARNES 2:12	62:5 65:6	Branch 74:1	Cal-Sag 24:20
36:20 49:21,22	base 16:19,24	better 6:18 22:7	75:4,15,17,19	came 5:16 9:9
assumed 28:19	17:3,7 18:14	41:5,11 57:17	76:3,11,14	9:16 15:22
64:20 65:4	44:15	71:24	77:13	19:6 30:1 49:6
66:2	based 8:18 9:10	between 54:14	branches 24:16	49:8,9 62:23
assuming 25:1	12:5 13:3,7,11	60:8 68:3	breakdown 11:1	Canal 24:19
32:23 50:2	14:13,19 17:13	69:17 72:8,9	20:9,10	74:2 75:5
66:20	17:24 18:1	76:19,21 77:18	bring 70:4	77:24
assumption 50:6	26:23 36:1,11	78:11	bubbles 70:13	capacity 28:21
assumptions	41:1 47:12	<b>bias</b> 6:6	bubbling 70:6	28:23
41:17,23 64:22	48:3 57:23	<b>bid</b> 59:5	72:16,22 73:19	capital 64:18
attachment 31:9	76:18	<b>bidded</b> 58:24	<b>Bubbly</b> 24:17,24	65:3,7,9,23
31:11 60:23,24	basically 55:6	<b>big</b> 42:21 43:9	24:24 25:9	66:2,13,15,17
61:1,1,15	65:4	56:4 70:10,10	57:16 70:1	66:22
attachments	basis 21:10 31:6	70:12 73:16	74:2 75:5 77:8	carbon 13:22
67:13,17	50:23 51:9	77:3,6	77:13,16	care 23:20
attempted 46:6	Bear 58:21	<b>bigger</b> 70:10	budget 26:9	cars 15:17 16:2
attributes 20:1,2	became 42:16	bills 9:8	<b>build</b> 6:4 56:4	16:3,4,9 18:21
augmentation	<b>BEDDARD</b> 1:12	bit 12:19 26:21	65:24 67:1	21:15
33:9 49:17	2:17 80:5	27:23 28:8,9	building 54:22	cascade 55:7,9
69:23 70:1,2	before 1:1,9,11	31:18 34:5	buildings 46:19	case 15:15 26:10
available 19:10	5:22 7:19 10:8	37:4 54:16	built 25:24	68:11
39:12,18 56:5	26:16 40:13	59:16,16 62:16	26:19	cause 1:9 64:13
56:7	41:7 50:12	70:15 71:21	buoyant 73:18	causes 33:3 66:8
Avenue 2:8 29:8	51:17 57:21	72:11 73:6,7	73:19	CAWS 29:18
70:8 71:14,15		73:10,11	business 59:8	30:11 40:7,11
73:1	<b>began</b> 49:20 55:21	Blankenship 2:5	buy 9:11 32:9	40:14 46:10
Average 10:4		4:14		47:20 51:6
award 59:5	<b>begin</b> 5:23 6:22 8:6 23:18	<b>blend</b> 9:15 12:9	С	60:12 70:17,22
awarded 58:8	64:21	19:14	calculate 15:10	73:24 75:4
58:11,13 65:8		blended 11:3	46:6	CD-ROM 63:20
65:17,18	<b>beginning</b> 5:15	blowers 44:6	calculated 18:16	Center 5:17
aware 19:11	77:14	board 1:1,11 2:6	21:9 50:21	45:15 59:14
33:20 34:1	begins 44:12	4:3,10,11,12	calculating	Central 71:14
42:16	behalf 2:6,14	4:13 6:4,12,13	64:18	71:15,19 74:18
<b>A.D</b> 1:16	6:11	6:17 12:21	calculation 12:8	certain 23:20
<b>a.m</b> 1:16 6:9	being 20:16 27:8	24:1,13,15	21:16	certainly 41:24
	38:17 39:5,24	2,10,10	calculations	

	1	1	1	I
50:18	chose 19:4	30:22 31:2	consumption	26:9,12,15,20
Certificate	<b>clarify</b> 9:4 19:1	32:20,22 33:15	16:14 17:17	27:22,24 28:1
80:19	33:23 34:8	48:19 49:4,7,9	18:12 41:20	28:4,6,10,17
Certified 1:13	39:7 64:9	49:18 50:23	43:19 44:3,7	28:19,24 29:10
80:5,18	class 38:13	53:16	45:2 46:18,22	29:12 30:5
certify 80:6	classify 35:7	comprehensive	46:23 47:24	32:1,8,9,12
cetera 8:17 30:7	clear 30:8,23	46:20	contact 20:24	33:13 34:24
58:19	<b>client</b> 67:21	computer 27:7	47:3	35:2,4 37:19
Chairman 2:2	close 5:1 72:12	concentrations	contained 24:14	38:1,23 39:5,8
4:10	77:4	25:6 61:7	content 62:3	39:17 40:19,20
change 8:21	coal 8:16 13:16	concerning 7:22	continue 4:22	41:11 44:4,15
16:18 17:6	coal-based	8:15	5:5 24:6	44:18,18 49:11
18:14 41:17,20	12:22	concerted 67:15	continues 63:1	50:22,23,24
41:23 42:3	coal-fired 11:9	conclude 57:7	contract 19:2,3	51:15 57:23
47:11 48:19	Code 1:5 4:7	conclusions 8:3	41:12 58:13	59:24 62:10,15
52:21,24 65:14	collected 9:10	8:21 57:21	59:7 60:4	62:18,21 63:4
changed 13:14	<b>column</b> 13:9,11	concrete 65:24	62:14 65:8,17	63:6,9,21 64:5
16:9 17:7,11	18:5	condemn 32:9	contracts 58:7	64:23 65:9,12
18:13	come 9:16 19:7	condition 33:3	contractual 19:8	65:13,19 66:2
changes 18:1	30:24 32:7,11	conditions 40:6	19:10 23:20	66:13,14,15,16
41:22 42:1	33:10 39:4	40:10	<b>control</b> 1:1,10	66:17,17,22,24
53:2	40:18 41:9,11	conducted 56:8	2:6 27:13 29:9	66:24 67:2,2,3
Channel 24:16	44:2,14 49:3	confident 54:8	64:10,14	67:4,18 70:4
24:20 69:24	54:2,24 59:4	confusion 66:9	controls 60:1	costs 34:18,20
70:16,18,23	63:5 79:12	67:6	convert 15:13	50:22 64:18
71:8 74:14	comes 55:11	connection	15:16	65:2,3,7,10,10
78:19	comfortable	54:13	<b>copies</b> 10:10	65:23 66:3
characteristics	32:11	consider 21:15	12:10 63:7	County 1:12
26:18	coming 11:4	53:6 59:24	<b>copy</b> 9:22 12:21	80:3
characterize	20:7 44:13	considerable	Corporate 11:18	couple 6:15
37:23	56:3 57:13	53:10	12:1	10:10 18:24
charge 60:6	63:2	consideration	correct 9:21	27:19 68:15
<b>chart</b> 16:12	compare 18:8	40:14 41:7	11:12,15 13:2	78:3,12
17:23 72:6	66:12,19	considered 35:3	13:5 14:16	course 40:4
checking 14:8	comparison	42:8,13 43:18	15:8 16:4,5,11	49:10 52:22
Chicago 1:4,15	14:19 16:21	consistently	19:18 21:11,12	court 5:24 40:8
2:13 4:5 5:4	60:8	59:19	34:11,14,15	<b>cover</b> 70:12
24:17 28:13,16	compiled 52:1	construct 51:5	35:1,8 37:13	covered 48:17
28:18 31:13	complete 6:5	52:19 58:5,11	37:18,20 39:11	CO2 13:23
32:6,12,17,19	24:9 80:9	58:12,16,22	39:14 44:22	15:11,12,13,15
33:15,21 34:2	completed 37:16	constructed	47:4,7,8 53:24	16:7 18:15,19
34:21 57:16	50:9 59:6	51:23 56:9	64:11 69:7	create 47:5 67:5
58:2 59:18	completion	construction	71:10 72:3	creates 55:13,16
61:6,8,11 74:1	49:15	47:9 49:24	74:23 76:9	73:7,10
74:2 75:4,5,14	complex 40:6,10	51:13,14 52:17	77:9 78:2 80:9	Creek 24:17,24
76:11 80:13	41:3	53:9,15,24	corrected 4:20	24:24 25:9
Chicagoland	complexity	54:4 58:7,11	correlation 64:8	57:16 70:1
20:16	28:16	58:17 64:20	cost 24:12,14,18	74:2 75:5 77:8
chlorine 47:3	compliance	65:1,3,17	25:19 26:2,2,7	77:13,16
LUCKS MARK TO ARROW SHOW COLD AND A STATE OF THE STATE OF	PAGE FOR A SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PAGE AND A SECTION OF THE PA			

	l	1	I	<u> </u>
CSO's 25:18	32:14	61:21 62:8	25:1,6 28:1	38:14 45:18,22
<b>CSR</b> 2:17 80:19	density 40:12	63:15 64:4,16	33:15,20 35:23	45:24 47:22
<b>CTE</b> 23:12	department	65:2,19 67:9	39:22 42:7	48:5,22 51:12
24:11 27:11,12	55:20	67:23	43:19 46:9,14	51:19 54:21
27:16 36:4	depending 79:1	<b>DIERS</b> 2:10	46:23 47:19	61:16,17 62:4
CTE's 39:4	depicted 78:1	difference 68:3	48:2,16,24	73:11 74:8
CTI 62:8 63:5	<b>Des</b> 1:4 4:6	different 12:19	50:22 51:5	75:2
current 33:23	describe 23:15	38:4,8,16 52:4	53:17 59:20	double 14:7
34:14 47:12	40:6,10 49:3	52:19 56:11,20	60:12 61:22	doubt 45:4
68:19	65:6	67:5 77:16	62:3,6 64:19	56:22
currently 19:2	described 27:21	differently	distance 72:9	down 8:2 12:20
20:3 34:2	43:20 47:13	60:20	76:24	18:18 44:7
59:19,20 60:1	design 40:13,21	difficult 52:12	<b>District</b> 2:15 5:4	55:11 59:16
currents 40:12	41:8,13,17,23	diffused 70:11	5:5 8:20 9:20	77:13
customer 21:16	44:11 52:3	diffuser 73:4	18:2 19:5,6	downstream
cut 44:7	55:10 59:6	diminishes	23:12,17 27:12	25:10 33:7
	designed 62:9	61:11	27:15 28:22	70:3 76:10,13
<u>D</u>	designing 41:9	dioxide 13:22	41:4 42:17,24	dozen 6:15
dam 70:3 73:10	61:23	direct 27:11	43:1 45:17	<b>Dr</b> 2:4 6:10,11
data 35:22 36:2	detail 28:14	30:18	52:9,9,13	7:21 8:1,11,13
36:8 69:17	30:17 31:7	directed 45:12	55:19 56:9	8:24 9:5,21
78:23,23	38:22 51:8	61:3,14	57:13 58:7	10:17 11:12,15
date 23:16 53:16	57:5	directly 20:21	District's 8:15	12:5,18 13:2,5
<b>David</b> 5:6 22:24	detailed 40:15	21:1 27:15	64:12	13:9,15 14:4
63:22	48:1	disadvantages	District-specific	14:11,16 15:8
day 1:15 4:19,20	details 62:3	57:11	13:7 16:10	16:5,11,16,20
6:12 8:10	determine 10:22	discharges	docket 4:8	16:21,23 17:1
79:15 80:13	26:17 44:17	60:10 62:10	document 7:16	17:2,5,8,14
days 6:15 59:3	62:9,18	discounting	9:24 10:3,14	18:4,23 19:5
deadlines 39:9	develop 23:13	65:21	11:16,18 12:2	19:11,18,22
deal 34:21 56:4	developed 38:17	discuss 67:9	12:15 15:1	20:18 21:3,12
DEBORAH 2:9	54:12	discussed 13:12	17:20 23:3	21:17,20 22:3
decide 10:8	developing	discussing 30:5	30:14 31:21	22:4,6,8,11,13
54:14	37:14 40:1	55:23	64:1 71:1 75:8	22:14 23:15
decided 42:24	development	discussion 42:22	<b>doing</b> 25:10	24:5,7,10
49:23	39:20	42:23	27:14 29:11	27:20 28:3,8
<b>decision</b> 6:5,18	developments	discussions	33:8 34:23	29:13,17,24
decrease 13:15	27:17	28:21 38:21	36:24 38:3	30:2,2,18,19
13:16 47:2	<b>device</b> 42:16,20	39:3 41:2,2	41:5 48:21	31:9,11,15,24
defer 35:19	<b>Devon</b> 29:7,7	49:19 62:1	dollars 64:23	32:15,18,19
42:12 43:23	70:8 73:1	disinfection	65:7,11,16	33:17,17 34:2
deferred 22:4	Dexter 18:24	7:23 14:6 15:6	66:1,3	34:4,11,15,17
35:15	19:1,9,13	43:19 45:19	domain 52:13	35:1,4,8,15,20
definitely 41:7	20:11,23 21:6	47:1 54:6,10	done 8:1,18,23	36:5,6,13,20
deliver 67:21	45:10,23 46:5	54:18	15:23 24:6,7	36:23 37:3,9
delve 70:15	47:17 48:3,9	disk 63:8 68:2	26:6 27:1,4,8	37:11,12,19,22
delving 34:4	59:12,13,15,17	dissolved 7:24	30:23 32:19	38:10,13,18,19
demand 42:9,15	59:23 60:7,10	17:17 22:24	34:22 35:4	39:2,11,13,14
77:6	60:17,19,23	23:13 24:12	36:13 37:7,17	40:2,5,7,22
demolition				
		•		

41.2 2 14 22	21.14.26.7	Engagiaina	aggantially 12.19	arramia 6.1.4
41:2,3,14,22	31:14 36:7 64:21	Energizing	essentially 12:18 13:21 18:4	everyone's 6:14
42:10,12,13		11:17,24	l	everything
43:8,11,21,23	earliest 53:15	energy 9:11,11 9:15 12:9,19	47:21 65:2	67:16,19,21
44:1,22 45:3	earth 32:15	,	established	exactly 20:6
45:21 46:2,11	East 2:8	15:22 17:9,10	39:10	56:14 78:10
47:4,7,12,14	effect 61:6,10,21	17:10,12,13	establishing	example 16:1
47:21 48:7,13	73:10	18:11,12 19:7	33:4	24:23 25:9
48:16,21 49:19	effectively 52:8	19:22,23,24	estimate 24:13	43:20
50:10,14,18	effects 40:13	41:20 42:9,14	26:20 27:24	examples 28:12
51:1,7 53:4,8	46:7 47:18	43:17,18 44:3	28:1,4,6,10,17	except 25:2 69:2
53:23 54:3,11	efficiency 43:18	44:6,7,10,16	28:19 29:6	69:12
54:23 55:6	54:5 56:13	45:1 46:7,18	32:1 33:13	excuse 9:3 16:20
56:21 57:2,5,6	efficient 44:6,16	46:22,23 47:22	35:2,5 37:19	43:6 62:22
57:9 58:3,6,20	<b>Effluent</b> 1:3 4:5	engineer 44:11	38:1 39:5,8,17	exercise 36:12
59:22 60:3,9	effort 25:22	58:22	39:17 40:19,20	exhibit 3:3 5:8
60:13,15,18,22	44:15 67:16	engineering	41:11 44:4,16	5:14 7:14,15
61:13,13,24	eGRID 9:2 12:8	55:20	44:19 49:11	7:17 9:23 10:6
62:1,12 64:7	12:24 14:1	enhanced 46:9	51:15 52:2	10:13,15 11:20
64:11,22 65:6	15:24 18:1,5	enhancement	53:10 57:23	11:22 12:1,3
65:22 67:15	<b>Eight</b> 77:12	22:24 24:12	59:2 62:14,21	12:13,14,16
68:7,14,17,21	eight-and-a-half	25:1 40:14	63:4,6 64:23	14:3,18,23,24
69:7,11,19	51:5	43:20 45:19	66:13,14 70:5	15:2 16:17,21
70:8 71:4,10	either 32:21	51:6	estimated 58:15	17:18,19,21
71:14,16,18,21	34:13 55:15	enter 22:23	estimates 14:15	19:21 20:12
71:24 72:4,9	65:20 67:17	entered 14:2	14:18,19 15:21	23:1,2,4 29:22
72:15,17,20,24	electric 14:14	22:20	16:6 24:14,18	30:10,12,15
73:14,20 74:3	18:10	entirely 54:12	26:2,3 27:22	31:18,19,20,22
74:5,7,12,16	electrical 7:22	56:19	29:12 30:6	63:19,22 64:2
74:19,21,23	8:16 16:14	<b>entitled</b> 4:4 9:24	45:1 48:3 64:5	68:2,4,4,9
75:1,11,13,20	17:16	11:17 31:11	64:13 65:19	70:21,24 71:2
76:1,4,9,16,19	electricity 10:1,4	68:4	66:12 67:13,18	73:24 75:7,7,9
76:22 77:1,3,6	12:11 66:5	environment	estimating 25:19	exhibits 6:15
77:9,12,17,20	Eleven 78:10	46:8	26:7	exist 40:6,10
77:22 78:2,5,7	<b>ELPC</b> 19:1	environmental	estimation 26:10	existence 25:3
78:10,16,21	eminent 52:13	2:7 4:23 5:16	26:12	existing 28:20
79:6,7,8	emission 9:17	5:17 45:15,18	et 8:17 30:7	47:19 48:5
drafted 22:4	13:20 14:15,19	46:7,22 47:23	58:19	58:5 62:18
Drive 2:12	14:20 21:9	59:14 62:22	evaluation 42:11	expect 38:2
drives 44:5	41:21	EPA 9:2,4	42:18	56:18
drop 55:12	emissions 10:1,4	EPA's 24:15	evaluations 57:9	expecting 35:19
drops 56:3,10,11	10:5 13:21,22	31:2	Evanston 71:5	expediency
due 40:11	13:22 15:12,16	equipment	even 26:13	28:15
duly 7:6 22:17	16:2,7,8,14	44:12,14	ever 45:17 46:6	experience
duration 41:18	17:17 18:15,19	equivalence	73:17,21	72:24
41:23	18:21-42:1	15:12 18:20	every 44:15	explain 8:14,22
<b>Dyche</b> 71:13	emit 15:17	equivalent 15:14	everybody 12:21	13:13 15:5
E	enacted 25:16	15:17 16:2,3	67:6	16:18 24:8
E 3:1 80:3	end 56:14,16	18:11,17,21	everyone 4:2	28:13 32:1,3
	ending 11:7	especially 61:8	6:12 30:8	36:21,23 37:1
each 5:24 22:12				

54.2.20.55.2	C 4:42	C 10	N 50.24	22 10 20 22
54:3,20 55:3	fictitious 66:11	forward 6:18	gallons 50:24	33:10 38:23
57:4 61:12	field 26:11 43:21	51:17	Garcia 36:23	40:20 43:21
68:3	52:5	found 21:2	38:13,18 39:2	45:13 49:10,21
explained 37:9	figure 49:1 61:2	46:12	40:7 41:2	49:22 50:11
explains 9:13	61:2,4 65:15	four 45:12 49:14	Garcia's 40:22	51:13,14,17
61:5	66:9	58:10	Gary 2:5 4:13	52:1,3,18
explanation	figures 21:14	frame 29:11	gas 13:17,22	56:15 60:19
43:9	41:21 43:14	35:21 50:17	15:11,16,18	61:17,19 63:18
express 6:6	61:17	53:7 54:1	18:19,21	66:24 67:2,10
extent 78:17	filing 67:14	frankly 32:10	gasses 42:3	68:7 70:11,12
extremely 6:13	fill 26:5,5	44:9	gathered 13:8	79:10
F	<b>filled</b> 19:16	Fred 21:22	gave 11:1 14:2,5	gone 16:10
face 24:3	final 40:16	35:10 74:8	62:14	good 4:1 6:11
1	44:18 57:22	FREDRIC 2:13	geared 44:11	20:5 30:3
<b>facilities</b> 46:4,15 54:18	find 8:19 51:20	frequency 41:18	general 11:1	35:24 38:12
fact 20:15 24:11	fine 7:10 40:20	41:23	34:3	40:23 57:15
	finished 5:2	from 4:15,22 5:3	generally 5:7	gotten 56:21
47:9 50:3,4 55:14 60:15	first 8:5 9:18	8:22 9:9,11,12	42:5	grams 68:20,21
	13:9 18:4,16	9:16,16,24	generated 48:7	68:23,24 69:3
69:2 <b>factor</b> 9:17	19:19 20:14	10:3,22 11:2,4	getting 18:10	69:5,12,14,21
	21:23 27:21	12:22 14:3	29:23 39:16	70:7 71:11
49:15 65:15,20	29:18 43:5	15:9,23,24	73:2,9,15	Granato 5:7,9
65:21 66:4,8	48:17,21 51:11	17:24 18:18,19	<b>GHG</b> 14:19 16:8	5:12 50:18
66:10,21,23	55:20 71:12,19	18:22 19:6,7	<b>Girard</b> 2:2 4:10	Grand 2:8
factors 13:20	72:10 74:4	19:24 20:1,2,7	6:10,11	grant 5:11
14:20	76:2	21:3 27:20	give 9:22 23:16	granted 5:10
fairly 42:2,23	fit 57:15,17	28:21 30:23	26:15 27:5	grapple 33:13
78:14 <b>fall</b> 27:4 34:23	five 29:7 55:11	31:9,10 32:18	28:11 31:7	grappling 33:11
	five-foot 56:11	33:10 36:1,22	37:4 38:23	grateful 6:13,17
44:21 73:21 <b>familiar</b> 36:15	flow 33:8 49:16	37:10 38:13	59:1,2,3,7 66:7	Great 8:8 35:9
	69:23 70:1,1	43:19 45:14	67:1	Greater 5:4
45:21 far 4:12 21:14	flows 55:8	46:9 48:19	given 23:19	greenhouse
	follow 28:8	53:18 54:6	40:15 41:7	13:22 15:11,15
44:1 47:11	46:24	57:13 58:11	gives 31:13	15:18 18:19,20
76:17	following 36:3	59:5 60:10	go 6:8 8:12,22	42:3
farther 78:4	follows 74:8	62:1 70:3	10:24 12:20	grew 71:4
<b>fashion</b> 55:9 <b>fast</b> 73:21	follow-up 5:18	72:24 80:10	18:18,22 22:5	grips 32:8
favorable 46:6	20:22 21:7	front 43:14	22:10 25:21	ground 52:6
	28:14 68:1	68:10	31:18 33:4	guess 18:7 37:5
<b>Feasibility</b> 63:9 63:21	74:4	full 28:21,23	35:12 43:16	39:16 65:6
	follow-ups	further 11:13	48:14 51:8,17	74:7
February 5:1 feel 29:22 38:20	27:19 68:15	25:9 31:7 38:9	57:19 59:7	H
1	footnote 19:19	57:19 67:23	74:13 79:10	H 3:1
<b>feet</b> 43:11,12 55:12	19:20	76:4,13 79:2	goes 31:17 59:9	1
	footprint 20:14	furthest 75:13	going 23:8,10	half 77:22 78:12
fell 73:17	47:8	future 40:21	24:2,3 25:4,11	halfway 77:13
felt 25:15,16	foregoing 80:8	G	26:19 28:11,14	Halsted 76:15
26:13,17 30:21	forth 26:18	****	29:2,3 30:3,9	hand 5:20 9:13
32:7	42:22	G 2:2 4:10	31:18 32:21,23	80:12
few 11:9 28:11		gallon 21:15		handed 7:12
Visit in the second sec				

	I	<u>l</u>	I	
16:17	32:4 73:6	40:11 62:6	56:5 57:13	59:4 69:10
handled 25:17	him 7:3,9 36:14	impervious 47:6	64:24	73:13 78:18
25:18	39:3 53:18,21	47:8	initial 12:24	I-n-t-e-g-r-y-s
handout 10:18	61:14,16,17,20	implementing	67:14	9:24
11:5 19:19	historical 35:22	60:1 62:15	initially 16:3	
hands 46:17	36:2	important 30:6	install 54:8,9	<u>J</u>
happens 61:18	homes 18:12	improved 25:16	instantaneously	Jennifer 5:6
67:3	honest 64:8	improvements	65:4	Jessica 19:1
happy 8:9	honestly 53:23	27:17 28:23,24	instead 69:5	<b>job</b> 41:5
<b>hard</b> 6:14,17	hope 67:7	49:15	integrated 23:13	<b>John</b> 5:6
51:20 54:4	hopes 49:2	improving/mo	24:23 25:5,11	Johnson 2:3
73:2,8	horsepower	62:18	29:9 33:12	4:13
having 44:4 68:9	42:3,4	include 28:12,24	38:4,7 39:21	<b>July</b> 29:12 32:10
head 77:11,14	<b>hour</b> 6:7	29:9 34:13	39:22 42:19	junction 75:14
heard 36:22	hours 27:7 42:4	41:12 67:16	44:21 52:23	76:10
72:19	house 71:5	included 24:15	54:24 78:22	<b>June</b> 64:23 65:7
<b>hearing</b> 1:9 2:2	household 50:24	69:24	<b>Integrys</b> 9:11,24	65:8,11 66:1,3
4:1,3,19,21,21		includes 25:19	10:3 19:3,4,23	66:24
4:22 5:2 6:12	<u> </u>	37:12 62:2	20:20	just 7:4 8:5
6:16,20,24 7:3	<b>ID</b> 3:3	including 24:20	Integrys/PJM/	12:20 13:12
7:8,12 8:6,9,12	idea 26:15 27:5	40:8,11 42:23	15:21	16:17 20:5
8:14 10:2,9,12	29:14 40:23	increase 13:17	intended 6:4	21:1 24:13
11:19,23 12:12	50:10,14 60:7	16:19,24 17:2	interest 66:1,4	26:8 27:5,6
13:24 14:7,12	61:18 64:5	17:4,10 18:9	66:20,23	28:8 29:5,22
14:22 17:15	identification	18:13,15 47:15	interested 41:4	35:23,24 36:21
19:21 21:24	7:17 10:15	78:24	interrelate 64:5	38:11 39:19
22:9,14,19,22	12:3,16 15:2	increases 13:16	interrupt 55:2	41:9 43:5,13
23:7 24:2 30:9	17:21 23:4	13:18	introduce 69:9	45:10 55:18
31:16 33:22	30:15 31:22	independent	intuitively 73:5	56:2,6 57:14
43:6,15 45:8	64:2 71:2 75:9	54:13	investigate	57:21 58:17
48:10,14 59:12	IEPA 24:22	indicated 12:19	11:11 20:19	59:1 66:4,8
59:15 63:17	48:23 49:3,8	26:24 28:3	27:8	69:9 71:21
68:13,16 70:20	62:22 63:1,5	43:8	investigated	72:2 73:6
74:3,10 75:3	67:14	individual 26:3	41:1	75:14,21 76:10
79:2,5,9,14	IEPA's 39:5	26:11	investigation 9:9	78:6,21,22
80:8,10	60:5 69:15	inflation 65:15	11:13 42:22	K
hearings 4:17	III 1:5 4:7	65:20 66:4,20	52:5	$\frac{\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{K}}$ 80:3
Heartland 11:17	Illinois 1:1,10	66:23	investigations	<b>Kane</b> 1:13
11:24	1:13,15 2:6,7,9	influence 25:7	26:11 44:1	keep 73:16
held 4:18	2:13 4:23 5:16	information 8:2	involved 27:6	kick-off 23:21
hell 66:10	37:1,6 55:24	8:4,5,18,20	43:24 46:3	kilowatt 42:4
help 6:4,17	56:8 62:10,13	9:10,13,20	48:1 62:8	kind 29:8 32:24
22:12 36:5	63:10,22 68:5	10:24 11:18	<b>ISO</b> 11:17,24	73:23
68:7	68:5 80:1,6,13	12:1,5 13:8	issue 7:24 33:2,9	kinds 55:4 56:11
helpful 63:5	illustrate 29:16	17:24 20:7,12	33:11 34:21,23	know 12:20 19:7
hereunto 80:12	<b>immediate</b> 4:9	21:1,3 24:22	49:20	19:9 20:5,6,18
high 66:13,15	4:11,14	30:4 35:7	issues 23:20	20:21 22:15
71:23	impact 25:8 46:22 72:22	36:15 39:12,18	25:17,18 32:7	26:24 28:21
higher 16:6 32:2		48:7 50:1 53:4	44:9 55:18	31:16,17 32:18
	impacts 21:9			31.10,1732.10
L				

	1	<u> </u>	1	
34:7 35:6 36:9	55:18 62:15	locations 29:19	67:2	mathematical
38:12 44:13	71:6 73:23	30:11,20 31:1	make 6:18 27:6	36:10
45:11,23 46:14	<b>Let's</b> 6:24 8:6	31:12 70:18,23	30:8,23 44:15	matter 1:2 25:9
47:11 48:23	22:14 42:4	71:7 72:5 74:1	45:11 51:2	53:22,22
50:5,11 54:1	74:13 79:10,11	75:4,23	67:15	may 5:18 20:20
54:23 56:10,13	level 27:23,24	<b>Lock</b> 70:3	makes 32:15	24:4 40:5,10
56:15 58:4,6	28:1,6 35:2	long 7:8 42:18	managerial	43:5 45:22,22
59:18 60:16	38:22 73:6	42:23 50:8	27:13	59:4 61:9,9
61:13,24 65:16	levels 46:9 60:12	54:8 58:4 63:6	many 21:14,15	<b>maybe</b> 29:23
66:8 67:7	61:23	longer 27:2	41:19 51:24	McGowan 5:6
71:24 72:24	like 6:21 9:3	long-term 42:9	55:8,8	7:1,13,21 8:11
73:14,16,22	10:7 11:21	42:14 49:24	map 20:13 30:12	8:13,24 9:5,21
76:12 77:15	20:6 27:1	look 6:18 9:8	30:19 70:17,21	10:17 11:12,15
knowledge	29:15,22,22	19:18 23:24	70:23 71:5	12:5,18 13:2,5
45:17 46:5	42:11 43:2	24:23 25:13	75:3,21,22	13:9,15 14:4
known 10:18	44:6 45:18	26:3,4,17	76:7 78:6,7	14:11,16 15:6
<b>Kunetz</b> 64:14	57:14 70:9	33:14 40:23	maps 29:15	15:8 16:5,11
	73:18	42:17 46:16,21	<b>March</b> 1:16	16:16,20,23
L	likely 57:22	51:20 52:5,22	80:13	17:2,8 18:4
labeled 61:2	Limitations 1:3	57:10 60:4,5	MARGARET	19:5,11,18,22
labor 66:5	4:5	70:4 78:22,23	1:11 2:17 80:5	20:18,24 21:3
land 32:9,9,10	limits 26:21	looked 12:6	<b>Marie</b> 1:9 2:2	21:8,12,17,20
32:12 46:7	<b>Lin</b> 2:4 4:12	24:24 25:12	4:2	22:10 35:14,15
52:7,11	74:3,5	33:19 43:3	mark 5:8 7:14	41:22 42:10
Lanyon 50:16	line 15:19 16:19	60:15 69:19	10:3,5,13	43:23 45:6,9
large 44:3 72:13	16:24 17:3,7	looking 25:4,11	11:20,24 12:13	45:21 46:2,11
78:14	18:14 49:22	44:5 55:21	14:23 17:16	47:1,4,7,14,21
larger 75:22	50:3,4,5,12	66:12	31:20 63:19	48:7,11,12,13
LaSalle 1:15	linear 42:2,5	looks 27:1 57:14	70:21 74:6	McGowan's
last 8:14 21:7,8	list 42:18 43:23	lot 22:3 44:9	75:6	6:23 8:1 30:2
22:3 23:11	list/short 42:18	52:9,10 70:7	marked 3:3 5:13	mean 45:6 52:20
27:22 35:16,18	liter 31:4,5 49:6	70:13 72:16	7:16 10:14	53:9,13 58:1
36:22 47:17	49:7	low 32:2 66:13	12:2,15 15:1	59:7,8 69:11
54:17 76:13	literature 56:6	66:15	17:20 23:3	74:5
Law 5:17 45:15	57:12	<b>Lower</b> 1:4 4:6	30:14 31:21	meaning 50:22
59:14	little 26:21 28:8	lunch 6:7 79:10	63:22 64:1	measured 33:20
layperson 66:9	28:9 29:23		70:23 71:1	33:23 34:13
lead 53:4	31:18 34:5	M	75:8	meet 29:3 34:10
leads 70:14	37:4 57:4	made 38:1 40:7	market 20:14,17	36:4 47:19
least 20:6 51:8	59:16,16 60:20	50:6 52:15	Marquette	60:1 62:19
51:14 57:24	62:16 70:2,15	53:2 64:22	25:15,16,20	63:9,21 64:19
leave 57:21	71:21 72:11	67:13	27:3,9,9,13	69:15
67:20	73:6,7,10,11	main 58:1 71:17	30:24 36:18	meeting 23:13
left 4:9,11,13	73:11 76:4	72:2 74:22	37:2,8,10,13	23:21 25:6
legal 53:18,22	Liu 2:4 4:15	mainly 69:5	37:17 38:21,22	39:22 48:4
less 15:20 42:4,4	located 52:8	mainstem 61:6,8	39:3,23,24	49:11 59:19
49:4 77:17,18	location 25:8	61:11 75:15	40:23	60:5
lesson 38:13	37:15 40:16	maintenance	Mastracchio 5:6	Melching 32:19
let 8:13 34:8	41:11 50:7	44:18 65:10,12	math 72:7	33:17 36:13
40:9 45:10		66:3,14,16,17		

				l
41:3 60:15	20:1,2,8,13,17	move 24:4 35:11	62:2,6,11,19	70:21 75:6
61:13 62:1	20:24	45:7 48:15	62:24 63:3	obstruction 73:8
69:19	mix 12:19 13:3	64:16	noise 23:8	73:12
Melching's	13:13 14:13	moves 33:7	none 7:15 12:14	Obviously 36:9
39:13 40:5	16:10 17:11	much 27:2 32:3	14:24 17:19	49:8
member 2:3,3,4	18:2	35:7 44:7	23:2 26:5 48:5	October 23:18
2:4,5 4:11,11	mixing 40:12	48:12 51:19	63:20 70:22	61:9 69:17
4:12,13 6:4	model 25:15,22	57:11,19 79:7	north 1:14 2:8	off 29:23 73:15
memory 34:5	27:18 33:18,19	multi-dimensi	2:12 24:15,16	offers 52:14
mention 7:20	35:17 36:8	41:5	60:11 69:23	<b>officer</b> 1:9 2:2
32:13 78:21	37:13,14,23,24	municipal 62:19	70:16,18,23	4:1,3 6:20,24
mentioned 32:6	38:3,5,7,8,22	municipalities	71:8,21 74:14	7:3,8,12 8:6,9
63:17	39:4,23 40:3,5	58:21	75:14,16,19	8:12 10:2,9,12
metric 68:22	40:9,21,22,22	must 27:10	76:11 78:19	11:19,23 12:12
Metropolitan	40:23,24 56:10	<b>MWRD</b> 19:2	northern 25:7	13:24 14:7,12
2:14 5:3	62:1,5 69:11	53:16	Notary 1:12	14:22 17:15
mid 24:9 27:1	modeling 30:23	myself 36:7 40:9	note 6:3 10:17	19:21 21:24
77:11	32:18 36:2,10		notes 80:11	22:9,14,19,22
midst 26:14	36:17,19,23	N	nothing 67:20	23:7 24:2 30:9
Midwest 11:17	37:2,2,6,9,10	N 80:3	notice 1:11	31:16 33:22
11:24	37:17 38:14,16	name 4:2 5:22	23:16,19 26:12	43:6,15 45:8
might 15:14	38:17 40:15	narrower 26:21	32:5 58:15	48:10,14 59:12
32:3 46:8 56:2	41:6 50:6	national 62:23	notion 6:6	59:15 63:17
59:5 64:5	60:16 61:16	63:3	November 23:21	68:13,16 70:20
66:12,15	62:4 69:24	near 4:18 71:12	nuclear 8:16	74:3,10 75:3
mile 72:11,11	model's 40:1	71:13,17,23	10:5 11:9	79:2,5,9
76:12,24 77:17	moment 55:2	72:2	13:17	<b>oh</b> 17:8 58:20
77:18,22 78:10	month 59:3	necessary 29:3	number 4:8	76:12
78:11	months 11:7	47:19 51:22	15:14,17 16:4	oil 13:17
mileage 31:14	59:5	56:1 60:1	18:12,17,21	okay 7:5 8:8
miles 72:6,8	more 9:7 13:7	necessitates 33:7	19:14 23:11	14:7 17:14
76:18,20,22	18:1,2 20:11	need 5:19 7:11	59:18 66:11,18	22:9 23:24
77:15 78:9,12	22:2 26:20	32:16 33:22	74:5,6	35:9 37:21
milligram 31:4,5	28:9,9,10	43:9 54:17	numbers 12:24	43:21 48:10
milligrams 49:6	29:23 30:17	59:15	13:1,6,7 14:1	60:17,22 68:12
49:7	38:10 40:15,19	needed 11:10	17:6 18:3,5	68:16 77:5,21
million 18:18,18	40:19 42:3,3	25:16,20 26:17	66:16 68:8	78:20
50:23 51:15	44:10 45:3	41:19 44:14	75:12	<b>old</b> 71:5 73:14
52:19 59:2	51:16 57:4	49:17 64:19	<b>nutrient</b> 63:9,21	73:20
mind 22:10	66:8 67:5 70:7	needs 37:9 38:14	64:10,13 68:4	<b>Once</b> 23:19
52:21 58:21	78:3	Neither 37:8	N-505 1:14	one 2:12 5:23
minor 13:18	morning 4:1,9	new 12:9 13:6,6		20:11,14 21:7
42:2	6:11	18:3 29:5	O	27:6,21 29:18
minus 28:5,11	most 22:1 44:16	31:12 47:10	objection 7:14	32:6 35:15
minute 11:21	50:1 55:13	48:5 56:17	10:3,8,11,12	37:5 42:10
29:14 74:13	69:2	61:5,7,10	11:20,22,23	43:20 47:1
<b>MISO</b> 9:12	motion 5:9	62:23 75:3	12:13 14:23	55:18 59:3
10:22,24 11:14	mouth 73:16	next 52:2 72:11	17:16 22:23	64:6 66:18
13:12 19:15,17	77:11	73:24 78:12	29:21 30:10,13	68:1,17 69:2
		nitrogen 61:22	31:20 63:19	ĺ
		1	1	1

	I	1		Ī
69:12,16,22	25:1 28:14	page 10:17,20	11:10 13:19	55:13,15
71:12,13,17,19	36:7 40:22	19:19 20:14	17:13	plus 28:5,11
71:20 72:2,10	45:7,20,21	35:22 36:1	perfect 56:18	69:23
72:10,11 74:11	46:8,16 54:7	60:24	perhaps 40:21	point 26:23 29:6
75:13 76:12,13	55:3 57:2,17	panel 42:20	49:2 51:23	46:13,18,21
78:10,12,22	57:23 59:10	43:12	<b>period</b> 11:6 61:9	54:23 56:21
ones 13:1 22:7	65:14 67:11	part 18:6 20:16	65:14	64:4 66:6 67:3
26:21 30:20,20	68:13 69:10	24:10 25:23,23	perspective 30:6	77:11
38:2 45:18	others 47:22	29:6 34:5	pervious 47:5	<b>points</b> 31:14
48:22 57:8	48:8	42:18,18 43:5	per-customer	Policy 5:17
one-dimensio	out 9:13 22:12	51:12 52:2	21:10	45:15 59:14
40:3,5,9	30:1 49:1	57:24 60:13,16	per-gallon-of	pollution 1:1,10
only 24:15 25:11	54:11,24 62:23	participants	21:10	2:6 61:22
25:19 32:19	65:15 66:10	4:22	phase 44:11	ponds 42:21
42:20 43:2	67:20	participate	45:1,24	<b>pool</b> 10:23 11:14
44:24 57:14	outlined 50:12	27:16	phosphorus	13:12 15:21
60:4 72:10	54:1	particular 42:15	61:22 62:3,6	20:1,1 55:10
<b>OO</b> 67:14	outside 51:1	66:6 69:1 73:3	62:11,20,24	55:12 56:3
operate 28:22	60:3	particularly	63:3	<b>portion</b> 45:6,7
68:19 69:13	over 5:24 6:15	70:16	physical 46:19	46:1,8,9 70:12
operating 28:20	17:3 18:13	<b>Parts</b> 1:5 4:7	pick 43:13	position 33:12
65:13	27:13 51:8	past 73:2,9	piece 14:6	35:5 49:1
operation 25:2	52:21 55:8,11	<b>people</b> 31:7 55:4	pieces 5:3 14:10	possibility 33:8
41:19,24 44:18	56:3 72:11	73:17	<b>pilot</b> 51:12,12,21	52:4
58:10,14 65:10	76:6	per 15:11,12,17	54:18,21 55:24	possible 33:8
65:12 66:2,14	Overview 29:19	16:2,7,8,9	56:7,12	44:8 49:24
66:15,17 67:1	30:11	18:16,20 21:15	pilots 51:22	possibly 29:5
operations	own 52:9,11	21:16 31:4,5	<b>PJM</b> 9:12 13:11	<b>poster</b> 12:10
45:20,20	owners 52:14	49:6,7 50:23	19:14,24 20:1	14:21 15:4
opportunity	oxygen 7:24	50:24 68:21,23	20:2	29:20 70:19
58:24	16:15 17:17	68:24 69:3,5	<b>place</b> 25:6 41:8	<b>POTW</b> 68:4
opposed 15:23	22:24 23:14	69:12,14,21	47:12 65:4	power 7:22 8:16
options 19:10	24:12 25:1,6	71:11	places 25:12,12	9:8 11:2,4,9
43:18 53:6,8	28:1 33:6,16	percent 10:21	51:20 57:15	13:3,19 14:9
53:11,11	33:21 35:23	11:8,8,9,10	<b>Plaines</b> 1:4 4:6	14:14 19:15
order 28:22	39:22 42:7	12:23 15:20	plan 6:7 51:21	47:23
30:21 39:9	43:19 46:9,14	16:9,18,23	planned 51:22	power-point
62:19 69:15	46:23 47:19	17:2,3,10	planning 58:18	68:10
77:22	48:2,16,24	18:13 19:22,24	plans 44:13	<b>PP</b> 67:14
original 12:7	50:22 51:5	20:3 28:5,5	52:17 54:7,18	practical 43:1
14:20 15:20,23	53:17 59:20	29:4 30:22	58:23 59:1	practice 51:20
33:13	60:12 61:22	31:2 32:4,20	planted 16:8	preconceived
originally 13:10	62:3,7 64:19	32:22 39:6	plants 60:11	6:6
27:3 46:11	68:21,22,23,24	48:19,20 49:4	62:19	preference 22:5
originated 19:23	69:14,22 77:6	49:7,9,12,17	please 5:22,23	premised 34:9
20:1	<b>O'Brien</b> 70:3	69:16	6:3 54:20	preparation
other 4:23 5:24	o'clock 79:12	percentage 11:3	plugged 31:1	62:9
11:9 13:18	P	12:22	plunges 55:11	prepare 24:18
19:10 22:12	P2:13	percentages	plunging 55:10	prepared 40:24
1				
militar and an altitude of the former and the form and the form and the form and the form and the contract of the form and	Notice to the Description of the National State of the Comment of			

	I		I	
61:15 62:12	process 25:20	29:20 40:17	22:24 80:5	13:24 31:17
present 2:1 8:4	31:24 37:23	63:18 66:16	raise 5:20	43:10 63:18
26:13 30:4	44:5,12 52:12	68:22	raised 7:21,23	68:3
61:16 65:21	52:16 53:3,12	putting 6:14	8:14 9:6	recreational
66:7,10,18	55:21	<b>p.m</b> 79:15	Rao 2:3 4:14	72:19 78:18
67:4,6,7	produce 40:16	<b>P.O</b> 2:8	16:16,21 17:1	red 30:20
presentation	52:16 58:22		17:5,14 18:9	reduce 43:18
68:10	produced 24:12	QQ	18:23	reduction 44:3
presented 12:7	project 23:18,23	<b>QQ</b> 67:13	rate 66:1,4,20	44:10 46:13
26:16,22 38:6	41:8 49:20,24	qualify 28:6	66:23	refer 37:3 38:19
51:9,15 53:9	51:2,14 59:2	quality 1:3 4:4	rather 30:1 37:2	40:2 50:17
64:23	60:4 64:21	62:24 72:23	read 5:8,10,12	referred 10:19
presiding 4:10	projected 34:18	<b>question</b> 5:18,19	35:24 36:6	36:18
pretty 40:8	projects 45:22	8:19 16:16	readily 44:17	referring 35:22
54:19 70:10,10	50:13 58:22	18:10 20:11	ready 59:6	36:8 40:4
70:12 72:12,13	promulgation	23:11 24:10	real 73:21	61:15
previous 5:9	63:3	28:9,15 34:6	realize 36:10	refine 25:21
15:9 25:14	properties 32:14	35:13,18,21	realized 55:23	37:24
26:1	property 52:9	36:13 37:5	really 22:5,8	refined 38:9,10
previously 5:11	52:10,11,14	41:15 42:7	26:2,8 32:7,7	40:20,22
7:21 14:5	proponent 4:23	43:4,17,22	34:6,6 36:13	refinement
22:15 24:11,18	proposal 24:15	45:14 47:17,18	38:14 39:19	37:13
26:1 47:6	propose 48:23	48:17,18,18	44:10 51:20	refinements
pre-filed 5:13,15	proposed 1:5	49:14,20 50:20	57:19 66:11	38:1
7:13 18:6	4:6 29:5 31:2	50:21 51:4,8	68:7	reflected 44:17
22:23 23:11	31:12 32:20	53:1,14,20	reason 52:20,24	regard 33:14
35:13 45:13,14	33:24 34:10,13	58:4 59:18,24	62:20	39:20 41:15
45:15 47:17	36:4 39:6 48:4	60:14,18,19	reasonable	44:10 45:24
48:15 59:13,17	55:20 60:5	61:3,14 64:17	41:10 52:20	regarding 41:17
59:23 60:19,23	62:15 64:19	67:8,11 68:17	53:16	45:19 46:2
64:16 67:11	69:15 71:8	70:15 74:4	reasons 28:15	regional 8:18
<b>prior</b> 50:15	Protection 2:7	questioners 45:7	recalculate	9:1 13:3
62:21	4:24 5:16	questions 5:14	13:20,21,23	regular 26:9
probably 22:2	62:23	5:15,23 6:1,3	recalculated	rejected 43:1
27:1,4 28:10	protest 52:14	6:19 7:20,21	12:9 13:11	related 20:22
32:2,2 34:20	provide 39:9	8:14,24 9:6	14:14 21:14	29:24 49:15
42:20 49:5	63:8 69:14,20	18:24 22:2,4	recalculation	relationship
50:5 51:16	provided 27:16	22:12 29:24	15:22	42:5
57:15 70:9	54:6 64:12	30:1 45:5,9,13	recalculations	relationships
73:5,15 75:1	provides 38:22	45:16 48:15	15:5	19:8
problems 33:4	Public 1:12	59:11,13 67:10	recall 15:9 47:2	relative 13:18
procedures 26:7	purchased 19:23	67:23 68:14	Reclamation	55:3
proceed 5:14	19:24	73:24	2:15 5:4	relatively 43:12
23:16,19 55:22	purpose 4:21	quite 27:23 44:9	recommend	relevant 63:11
proceeding 4:4	39:1	54:16	39:23,24	relied 21:3 30:2
4:18 39:10	purposes 39:4	quote 35:22	recommended	37:17
40:13	40:18	quoting 36:1	9:1 36:3 64:21	relies 55:17
proceedings 1:8	pursuant 1:11		record 5:12 6:2	rely 21:1 37:10
80:7,10	put 12:6 22:11	R	6:5,16 9:4	57:12
	r 12.0 -2.11	<b>R</b> 1:11 2:17		
		<u> </u>		1

	1	1		1
relying 37:1	right 4:12,14,15	17:11,12 18:11	selecting 44:12	20:15
38:16 39:23	6:24 11:8 17:7	36:6 73:23	self-contained	significant 61:8
remaining 22:1	21:23 22:13	78:18 79:15	42:15	similar 25:22
remember 4:19	24:5 27:1 50:5	sampling 36:12	sent 19:5	54:12,15
29:11	52:23 57:14,16	52:5	sentence 35:24	simple 30:19
remind 24:13	61:4 71:9,15	Sanitary 24:19	36:6,18	40:17 49:13
Removal 68:5	72:4,7 74:19	74:2 75:5	SEPA 29:7	simplify 65:22
removed 47:3	74:21 75:18,20	77:23	51:13 54:21	simply 29:10
removing 47:10	76:3 77:12	saying 17:5	55:3,16,19,22	56:6
rented 51:23	79:12	34:18,19 73:20	56:9,19,23	Simpson 71:12
repeat 40:9	rights 52:14	74:9	57:15,24 58:5	71:18,20,22
replace 47:14	right-hand	says 10:20 36:1	58:8,9,12	74:20
replications	20:13 76:6	61:4,6 69:11	September 11:7	simulations 36:2
56:18	rigorous 26:20	76:9 <sup>°</sup>	69:18	36:17
report 34:22	river 1:4 4:6	scale 69:9	serve 4:3	since 8:23 31:17
35:3 44:20	24:17 28:13,16	schedule 26:23	service 19:23	35:4 46:14
51:24 62:12	28:18 32:6,17	51:9 52:21	27:15	62:24 63:17
63:7,8 64:9	32:19 33:5,15	53:23 54:5,6	set 4:17 37:16	71:4
67:17,19 68:11	33:21 34:2,21	schedules 53:15	41:10 52:17	sink 73:21
reported 2:17	36:12 57:16	school 71:23	58:23 59:1	site 18:2
80:7	58:2 61:6,8,11	scope 26:9 51:1	80:12	sites 26:3,4,11
reporter 1:14	70:3 72:6 73:5	60:3	sheet-like 55:9	26:17 52:4,8
6:1 40:8 80:6	73:17 74:2	SCOTT 2:11	<b>Ship</b> 24:19 74:2	52:19
80:18	75:5,14 76:11	search 57:12	75:5 77:23	situation 49:23
reports 67:16	76:18 77:15	second 10:7,17	shore 24:16	79:1
represent 5:22	<b>ROBERT</b> 2:10	10:19 13:11	69:24 70:16,18	six 59:5
53:15	Room 1:14	37:4 45:11	70:23 71:8	size 25:8
requested 8:2	root 8:10	48:18 53:1	73:3 74:14	<b>sizing</b> 30:24
require 28:23	rough 26:8,12	68:21,23,24	78:19	37:14 40:16
required 15:14	27:21 28:4	69:3,5,12,14	short 9:14	41:10 50:7
32:13 34:20	37:19 38:1	69:21 70:7	shorten 53:12	sizings 78:24
requirements	39:8 60:7	71:11,13,17,20	shortened 53:7	Skokie 71:5
47:20	round 31:6	72:10	shorthand 1:13	slight 13:15,17
requires 34:5	<b>RO8-9</b> 4:8	Secondly 26:1	80:5,7,18	slow 59:16
66:20	rulemaking 1:4	section 25:7	show 8:5 18:7	small 42:20,21
reserve 22:7	6:13 48:4	sediment 40:12	20:16	43:12 62:14
reserved 23:11	63:12	see 8:2 9:8 12:21	showed 20:8	SOD 25:17
reservoir 49:23	run 27:7 51:24	18:9 24:22	showing 17:2	soil 52:5
reservoirs 49:22	56:8 67:3 69:5	31:8 41:4 64:7	30:19	solar 42:20
50:3,9	running 27:17	72:6	shows 16:6	43:20
Resolved 16:14	runoff 47:2,16	seeing 7:15	17:24 20:14	solar-powered
resources 19:16	runs 27:2,6 38:3	10:12 11:23	shrink 47:7	42:16
rest 65:24	<b>R08-9</b> 1:3	12:14 14:24	Shundar 2:4	solely 24:24
result 44:2 46:8		17:19 23:2	4:12	some 8:1,3 9:6,9
results 69:20	<u>S</u>	30:12 63:20	<b>shut</b> 73:16	22:19 23:8
resuspension	S 3:1	70:22	side 7:4 20:13	26:15 27:5
40:12	safe 7:4	seen 73:9	55:15 60:11	28:23 29:8,15
review 10:7	safety 73:13	segments 40:7	76:7	32:24 33:3
11:21 45:11	sag 77:3	40:11	significance	38:1 40:7,11
	same 14:10			
	I	I	ı	l .

and There .

40:22 42:1,2	<b>speed</b> 44:5 53:2	55:3,17 56:10	40:18	<b>supplied</b> 69:1,22
42:22 46:12	speeded 53:5	69:1,12 70:8	strategy 33:12	supplier 9:11
47:3,5 49:19	spent 27:22	70:18,22 74:1	38:4,7 39:22	suppliers 9:16
51:8 56:2,22	54:16 55:23	74:5,6 75:4,15	40:1 42:19	supply 11:2,4
56:23 64:12	spreadsheets	75:16,19,23	52:23 55:1	12:9,11,20,22
65:14 72:19	67:18	stations 25:5,8	78:22	13:20 20:19,20
73:16	Springfield 2:9	28:20,22 29:1	stream 34:3	20:21
somehow 54:15	square 8:10	29:4,5,7,7,16	Street 1:15	support 67:12
someone 10:10	SS 80:2	30:7,20 31:1	71:13,17 72:2	sure 19:15 22:13
something 9:7	stadium 71:13	31:12,14 32:5	76:15	29:17 30:3
10:18 19:1	71:15	33:5 34:19	stretch 70:2	45:11 52:7
33:8,17 49:4,5	staff 4:15 6:4	37:15 41:10,18	structures 46:19	55:4 61:18
51:23 56:19	stagnant 33:3,6	41:19 47:10	studied 47:18	74:12
sometimes 67:5	standard 4:4	50:7 54:21,22	studies 38:5,23	Survey 55:24
73:8	31:3,4,4,5	55:4,19 56:17	47:22 48:22	56:8
somewhat 66:11	33:23,24 34:1	56:19,23 58:5	51:12,12,21	swear 7:3,9 22:6
sorry 17:8	36:4 49:10,12	58:8,9,9,12,12	54:21 55:24	22:14
sort 22:7 25:3	standards 1:3	58:16 61:5,7	56:7,13 61:23	sworn 7:1,2,7
31:8 36:21	23:14 29:3	61:10 65:13	62:9 63:16	22:15,18
39:16 55:9	30:22 31:3	68:18,19 69:2	67:12	system 1:4 4:6
77:16	32:21 33:16,21	69:4,13,21	study 22:24 24:8	9:2 12:8 20:2
source 9:8	34:10,14 48:4	71:11 72:8,14	24:11,21 25:4	24:20 29:20
sources 7:22	48:6,24 59:20	73:1,3 74:15	25:10,14,19,23	30:12 31:13
8:16 9:12,15	60:2,5,8 62:20	74:16 75:12	26:14,19 37:12	32:24 38:15
10:1,4,19	62:24 63:2,4	76:24 77:7,19	44:21 60:13	40:14,16,21
12:11 13:4,14	63:10,21 64:20	77:24 78:4,8	63:14	41:6,7,13 43:2
14:9,14 15:22	69:15	78:14,15,24	subcontractor	47:12 48:24
15:24 17:12	standard's	stayed 17:11,12	27:11,12,14	57:24 70:11
18:1,5 19:7	32:22 39:6	staying 22:10	subject 5:9	73:4
south 24:16 74:1	standpoint	stays 18:10	submitted 13:10	systems 25:2
75:4,14,15	53:19	steel 65:24	18:6,7	44:16 57:2
76:2,13 77:13	start 6:9,9 9:19	stem 58:1	substantial 6:16	
78:4	23:10,22 43:4	stenographic	44:3	T
so-called 38:5	45:14 53:24	80:11	substantially	T 3:1
speak 5:23 23:8	57:20 59:17	STEPHANIE	78:24	table 10:20 12:6
59:16	started 7:19	2:10	sufficient 38:22	12:7 15:18
speaking 5:24	starting 5:5	steps 55:8	38:24 39:4	16:17 19:20
14:1 29:16	70:16 74:16	Steve 5:5	40:1 54:22	31:8,10 52:6
44:20	state 1:13,14	Steven 7:13	Suite 2:12	72:6 74:8
species 62:2	5:22 38:20	stick 52:21	SULSKI 2:10	76:10
specific 8:20 9:7	56:8 80:1,6	Stickney 54:7	summarize 18:3	take 5:7 6:7
9:20 10:24	stated 46:15	60:11	summarizing	23:19 24:9
14:5 18:2,2	statements	still 26:16 45:13	68:11	34:10 42:17
26:2 64:14	38:24	stin 20:10 43:13	Summary 16:13	51:4,11 52:1,3
specifically 9:7	States 9:5 51:19	stormwater	17:16	52:18 54:8,9
16:13 29:24	62:22	46:13,16 47:2	supplemental	54:19 58:15
specifications	stating 57:20	47:16	28:12,17 33:5	59:5 61:21
44:14 58:23	stating 37.20	story 67:5	36:3 41:16	65:4,23 79:10
59:1	30:11 32:16	straightforward	51:18 54:9	taken 1:11 53:12
37.1	50.11 52.10	Straightfor ward	J 1.10 J 7.7	80:11

<del></del>				
takes 27:6,7	30:1,2 31:9,11	thought 11:3	23:7 24:2 30:9	38:15 39:19,19
41:8	35:23 36:22	32:1 38:12	31:16 33:22	41:9 49:1 66:9
taking 27:2	37:3 38:20,20	49:5 50:2 63:1	43:6,15 45:8	tunnels 50:4,4
47:11 62:2	39:9 40:2 43:8	63:4	48:10,14 59:12	turbulence
tale 73:15	46:15 50:13,15	three 43:11,12	59:15 63:17	55:16
talk 14:17 36:7	50:18 51:10	48:18 52:18	68:13,16 70:20	turn 5:19 24:3
talked 78:18	60:24 61:1	54:18 58:12,14	74:3,10 75:3	turns 54:11
talking 14:2	64:14	58:16 70:9	79:2,5,9	TWAIT 2:11
27:23 29:15	thank 6:19,20	71:7,10 72:5,8	titled 12:11	75:16
30:7 31:15	14:12 18:23	76:2,6,17,23	14:18 16:13	two 9:12,15,16
54:17 58:18	21:5 34:16	77:7,18 78:8	29:18 63:8	27:7 29:7
70:6 72:13	39:15 42:6	three-and-a-h	70:17	45:10,14 51:11
75:23 76:23	43:15 44:23	52:3,15 78:9	today 4:16 5:5	52:1 54:14
tank 73:21	48:12,13 68:12	three-dimensi	5:11 6:8,19	57:14 60:8
tanks 47:3	74:24 78:20	38:17	14:3,5 18:7	62:21 64:5
<b>Tanner</b> 2:2 4:10	79:7,13	through 9:10	today's 4:21	66:16 78:23
target 48:19	<b>Thanks</b> 17:14	14:17 20:20	together 12:7	two-and-a-half
TARP 46:1,3,3	35:9 48:9	22:6 41:5	72:12 77:4	76:24
49:15,21	their 9:8 11:2	75:11	told 58:7	two-page 11:18
team 48:8	17:7 19:7 20:9	<b>till</b> 79:11	tomorrow 6:9	type 43:2 55:7
technical 4:15	20:19 21:2,4	time 5:24 9:18	tons 15:11,12,13	55:10
53:20,21 63:9	26:4,18	11:6 21:8,22	16:7 18:16,19	types 47:24 57:2
63:20	things 42:2 44:6	22:3 23:12,17	top 74:17	typical 20:9,10
technologies	47:24	25:3,20 27:7	topography 26:4	55:12
42:8,14 54:24	think 4:18 21:20	27:22,23 29:4	total 78:9	
56:22 57:11,17	22:3,7 24:10	29:11 35:16,19	toward 61:3	U
57:23	28:10 29:2	35:21 36:22	towards 44:11	U 37:2
technology 28:2	30:5,7 32:16	37:24 39:6,13	track 8:1	<b>UIA</b> 38:5 48:22
42:11 55:22	33:22 35:15,24	46:13,18,21	transcribed	unaware 46:2
tell 57:3 61:24	36:7 38:12,21	49:2,12 50:12	80:11	uncertainty 69:8
62:4 66:22	38:24 39:21	50:17 53:7,10	transcript 1:8	under 18:5
72:21 74:11	41:6 43:11	54:1,5,16,17	76:7 80:9	19:20 33:23
tenth 4:17	50:15,19 51:7	54:23 55:19,23	transfer 33:6	35:3 39:9
term 50:8	51:21 52:1,15	58:11,17,18	treated 21:16	understand
terms 16:1,7,9	52:18,20 53:8	59:5 65:14	50:24	17:23 19:13
50:16 56:17	53:10,11 54:19	66:6 69:16	treating 62:10	25:3 27:10
58:18 72:23	54:20 56:2	73:2,8	treatment 42:8	34:17 38:11,15
testified 7:22	57:6 59:10	times 19:14 70:9	trees 15:14 16:8	38:15 39:17,20
8:15 37:11	60:14 61:19	time-consuming	18:18 21:14	55:5 68:19
testifier 5:15	65:9 66:5,8	52:12	tremendous	73:5 74:9
testimony 4:22	67:5,9 69:4	<b>Tipsord</b> 1:10 2:2	56:13	understanding
5:3,8,10,12,13	71:14 75:16	4:1,2 6:20,24	tried 56:10,12	37:6 72:20,22
6:19,23 7:13	thinks 64:13	7:3,8,12 8:6,9	67:21	understood
7:23,24 13:1	third 72:2	8:12 10:2,9,12	trouble 73:11	19:15 54:19
13:10 14:2,3,4	Thomas 2:3	11:19,23 12:12	true 73:22 80:9	unfair 71:6
14:5,10 15:10	4:13 5:7	13:24 14:7,12	try 44:6 57:10	unit 50:23
17:24 18:6	THORNBURG	14:22 17:15	62:14 79:10,11	United 9:5 51:19
22:20,23 26:16	LILORIDONG	ł da	·	62:22
22.20,23 20.10	2.12	1 19·21 21·24	I Tranno (1174	1 02.22
26.24.28.23	2:12	19:21 21:24	trying 31:24	I .
26:24 28:2,3	2:12 <b>though</b> 26:14	19:21 21:24 22:9,14,19,22	32:3 37:22,24	units 68:23 University 25:21

			······································	
27:3,9,10,13	versus 12:8	way 8:9 18:16	58:8 63:15	68:1,12
30:24 36:24	18:17	23:15 24:21,23	65:13	witness 7:6 22:2
37:6	very 4:12 6:16	25:5,17,18	weren't 10:23	22:11,17 59:11
unknown 10:19	41:3,4 42:19	27:9 30:3 39:2	32:10,11 43:24	67:24 80:12
10:20 19:16	42:20 48:12	48:24 49:3,21	we'll 6:9 7:3,14	witnesses 5:2
20:3	49:24 51:19	51:7,18 58:21	10:13 11:20,24	24:3
unreasonable	52:12 57:22,22	59:8,9 65:6	12:13 14:17,23	wives 73:15
52:16	57:22 66:13,15	website 11:1	26:20 38:7	words 40:17
until 5:19 6:8	67:15 79:7	20:8 21:2,4	63:19	work 6:14,17
23:21 24:9	violation 34:13	Webster 29:8	we're 17:2 25:10	23:18,22 24:3
27:4 35:6 59:7	violations 33:20	73:1	25:11 26:19	26:9 27:14
79:15	******	weir 55:11 56:3	29:3,14,23	36:24 38:14
update 25:21	W	welcome 6:12	32:23,23 33:11	47:18 61:16
updated 14:20	Wacker 2:12	79:8	38:3,23 40:20	63:2 64:19
16:4,12 17:6	wait 5:19,20	well 14:21 15:7	40:24 41:8,9	worked 55:19
38:21	35:6	20:4 23:15	49:10 63:18	working 63:1
updating 37:12	walk 75:11	24:10 31:19,24	70:6 75:23	worksheets
65:21	want 7:20 8:22	32:8,18 35:4	76:23	67:12
upper 69:23	24:13 35:10	35:16,20 36:6	we've 5:13 9:12	workshop 42:23
70:18,23 71:8	38:11 49:11	37:3 38:19	29:4,6 50:19	workshops
74:14	57:19,20 65:14	40:2 42:13	51:19 52:4	57:10
use 17:9,10,10	65:22 70:15	45:3 48:21	69:24 72:18	worth 66:7,10
18:10,11 34:3	wanted 18:7	49:19 51:7	WHEREOF	66:18 67:4,6,7
46:7 65:15	24:22	54:11,19 56:2	80:12	69:17
66:11 72:19	<b>wants</b> 67:6	57:6,9 64:22	<b>while</b> 22:16	wouldn't 20:5
used 9:1,20	Wasik 5:7	65:22 69:11	whole 36:12	42:24 73:18
36:15 38:5	wasn't 19:15	70:14 72:9,24	52:16	writing 44:21
42:21 47:22	46:3,20 56:6	73:14 75:13	<b>Williams</b> 2:9 9:3	written 60:21
65:20	Waste 10:5	went 12:22	10:7,11 11:21	
useful 50:1	Wastewater	15:21 20:4,8	20:22,24 21:5	<u>X</u>
52:17	62:13 68:6	21:13 58:9,13	21:7,13,19,22	<b>X</b> 3:1
uses 78:18	water 1:3,4 2:15	were 7:20 8:14	22:1 23:6,7,10	Y
using 12:8 13:19	4:4 5:3 21:16	8:16,24 9:6,9	23:24 24:4,6,8	
25:14 33:18	24:19 33:7,9	9:14 10:21,24	27:19 28:7	yeah 7:3 8:6
37:14 38:7	52:6 55:8,11	11:2,8 13:16	29:21 32:15	17:1 19:5
39:18	55:12,24 56:3	13:18,20,23	33:14,19 34:1	20:23 34:4
<b>UV</b> 16:2 17:3	56:8 62:23	14:1,9 15:10	34:12,16 35:2	55:6 68:21
46:12,12	69:22 70:4,7	15:13,16 16:3	35:6,9,13,18	70:8 71:16
MANAGEMENT CONTROL CON	72:16,23 73:6	17:13 18:5	36:17,21 37:8	72:1,15 73:20
V	waterfall 55:6	25:2,2,4,14,17	38:11 39:16	74:7 75:20
<b>value</b> 49:11	55:15	25:18 26:7,14	41:12,15 42:6	77:12,20 78:10
65:21	waters 77:11,14	29:11 33:12	43:4,7,17	year 15:11,12,17
		38:6 43:18	44:24 45:5	16:2,7,8,9 18:17,20 31:5
variability 28:4	waterway 1:4	1		
variable 44:5	4:5 29:19	46:15,17,19	48:17 49:14	1
variable 44:5 various 66:19	4:5 29:19 30:12 31:13	46:15,17,19 47:22,24 48:21	50:8,11,19	62:21 65:11
variable 44:5 various 66:19 velocity 68:18	4:5 29:19 30:12 31:13 33:1,2 41:3	46:15,17,19 47:22,24 48:21 48:22 49:1	50:8,11,19 51:4 53:1,6,13	62:21 65:11 69:17,19 78:23
variable 44:5 various 66:19 velocity 68:18 venture 61:17	4:5 29:19 30:12 31:13 33:1,2 41:3 69:14	46:15,17,19 47:22,24 48:21 48:22 49:1 50:3 51:12	50:8,11,19 51:4 53:1,6,13 53:20 54:3,16	62:21 65:11 69:17,19 78:23 <b>yearly</b> 67:4
variable 44:5 various 66:19 velocity 68:18 venture 61:17 verified 36:11	4:5 29:19 30:12 31:13 33:1,2 41:3 69:14 waterways 48:2	46:15,17,19 47:22,24 48:21 48:22 49:1 50:3 51:12 54:12,17 55:20	50:8,11,19 51:4 53:1,6,13 53:20 54:3,16 57:4,7 58:1,4	62:21 65:11 69:17,19 78:23 yearly 67:4 years 51:5,11
variable 44:5 various 66:19 velocity 68:18 venture 61:17	4:5 29:19 30:12 31:13 33:1,2 41:3 69:14	46:15,17,19 47:22,24 48:21 48:22 49:1 50:3 51:12	50:8,11,19 51:4 53:1,6,13 53:20 54:3,16	62:21 65:11 69:17,19 78:23 yearly 67:4

24:5,7,10 27:20 28:3,8 29:13,17 30:2 30:19 31:15,24 119:20	0:13 \$ 1:15 59:2 2:19 23:18 59:18	1989 58:13 1990 58:8 1994 58:10 2 2 35:22 36:1 58:8 60:23 61:1 74:15,16 74:20 2.3 72:8	75:9 23 3:10 24 11:9 24th 4:19 25 70:9 25th 4:20,20 26 5:2,3 29 10:21 11:10	<b>50</b> 28:5 32:4 <b>50,100</b> 18:20 <b>500</b> 52:19 <b>55.3</b> 12:23 <b>57,700</b> 18:16 <b>57,900</b> 18:19
Zenz 5:6 22:3,4 22:6,8,11,13 22:14,24 23:15 24:5,7,10 27:20 28:3,8 29:13,17 30:2 30:19 31:15,24	\$\frac{1}{\$\\$1:15 59:2}\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	2 2 35:22 36:1 58:8 60:23 61:1 74:15,16 74:20	24 11:9 24th 4:19 25 70:9 25th 4:20,20 26 5:2,3 29 10:21 11:10	<b>500</b> 52:19 <b>55.3</b> 12:23 <b>57,700</b> 18:16 <b>57,900</b> 18:19
22:6,8,11,13 22:14,24 23:15 24:5,7,10 27:20 28:3,8 29:13,17 30:2 30:19 31:15,24   *500 52 *600 52 119:20	\$\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	2 2 35:22 36:1 58:8 60:23 61:1 74:15,16 74:20	24th 4:19 25 70:9 25th 4:20,20 26 5:2,3 29 10:21 11:10	<b>55.3</b> 12:23 <b>57,700</b> 18:16 <b>57,900</b> 18:19
22:14,24 23:15 24:5,7,10 27:20 28:3,8 29:13,17 30:2 30:19 31:15,24 <b>\$500</b> 51 <b>\$600</b> 52 <b>1</b> 19:20	1:15 59:2 2:19 2 1 23:18 59:18 2	2 35:22 36:1 58:8 60:23 61:1 74:15,16 74:20	25 70:9 25th 4:20,20 26 5:2,3 29 10:21 11:10	<b>57,700</b> 18:16 <b>57,900</b> 18:19
24:5,7,10 27:20 28:3,8 29:13,17 30:2 30:19 31:15,24 119:20	2:19 1 223:18 59:18 2	2 35:22 36:1 58:8 60:23 61:1 74:15,16 74:20	<b>25th</b> 4:20,20 <b>26</b> 5:2,3 <b>29</b> 10:21 11:10	<b>57,900</b> 18:19
27:20 28:3,8 29:13,17 30:2 30:19 31:15,24 119:20	1 223:18 59:18 2	58:8 60:23 61:1 74:15,16 74:20	<b>26</b> 5:2,3 <b>29</b> 10:21 11:10	
29:13,17 30:2 30:19 31:15,24 119:20	23:18 59:18 2	61:1 74:15,16 74:20	<b>29</b> 10:21 11:10	6
30:19 31:15,24 1 19:20	23:18 59:18 2	74:20		
] 50.17 51.15,21   #0.0	59:18		10.24.20.2	<b>6</b> 47:18 50:21
32:15,18 33:17   58:8 3		4.3 /2:0 I	19:24 20:3	
52.15,10 55.17	72,10   2	<b>20</b> 42:7 79:11	3	60:20 76:3,8 76:12,19,21
34:17 35:1,4,8 74:18	1 1	200 42.7 79.11 200 6:15	3 27:23 31:3,5	60606 2:13
35:20 36:5,6 <b>1.2</b> 76:2		<b>2000</b> 61:9 69:17	58:13 74:15,16	<b>62794</b> 2:9
36:20 37:3,9 <b>1.3</b> 76:2	I -	<b>2000</b> 61:9 69.17 <b>2001</b> 61:9,10	74:22	<b>64</b> 3:13
37:11,12,19,22 <b>1/2</b> 31:3	l <del>-</del>	69:18	3rd 1:15	04 3.13
1 2/11/12/12/12/12		2003 62:12 68:6	<b>3-3-09</b> 7:18 8:11	7
39:14 40:2 10 3:5 6	í . í l =	2007 23:18,22	10:16 12:4,17	73:4 51:4 76:3,8
5211 1012	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2007 23.18,22	15:3 17:22	76:14,21
43:8,11,21 10:00 1	· 1 =	65:7,8,11 66:1	23:5 30:16	<b>7.7</b> 18:18
15.0,11,21	4 30:22	66:3 67:1	31:23 64:3	<b>70</b> 69:12,22
47:12 48:16,21 31:23		2008-2009 65:11	71:3 75:10	<b>71</b> 3:14 19:22
49:19 50:10,14 39:6	-	65:13	<b>30</b> 3:11 11:7	<b>72.8</b> 12:22
12.12 20.10,1 1	~ <b>~ ~ ~</b>	2009 1:16 5:1	28:5 68:20,23	74,200,000
53:23 54:3,11 69:16	· · ·	24:9 27:1	68:24 69:6,18	18:11
54:23 55:6 1021 2:		80:13	<b>301</b> 1:5 4:7	<b>75</b> 3:15
56:21 57:2,5,6 11 77:2		<b>211</b> 3:4 7:14,15	<b>302</b> 1:5 4:7	
57:9 58:3,6,20   12 3:6,7	7 11:7	7:17	<b>303</b> 1:5 4:7	8
27.220.230,20		<b>212</b> 3:5 10:6,13	<b>304</b> 1:6 4:8	8 23:21 53:14
60:13,18,22 78:11		10:15 19:21	<b>32</b> 3:12	77:10
61:13,24 62:12   13 15:2	0 16:9	<b>213</b> 3:6 11:20	<b>33</b> 17:3	<b>8.9</b> 18:18
	78:9,11	12:1,3 20:12	<b>337.9</b> 72:7	<b>80</b> 69:3,5,13,14
64:22 65:6,22   133 14:	3 2	214 3:7 12:13,14	<b>339.2</b> 72:7	69:21 70:7
67:15 68:7,14 14 15:2	0 16:9	12:16	<b>340.2</b> 72:7	71:11
68:17,21 69:7   14,200	16:4	<b>215</b> 3:8 14:23,24	<b>35</b> 1:5 4:7	80-gram-a-sec
69:11 70:8   15 3:8		15:2 16:17,21		78:14
71:4,10,14,16   <b>15-foot</b>	56:10	<b>216</b> 3:9 17:18,19	4	<b>8300</b> 18:22
71:18,21,24   <b>15-yea</b> ı	r 50:16	17:21	<b>4</b> 27:24 31:4,10	<b>84-3565</b> 80:19
<b>72:4,9,15,17 16</b> 60:2	4 2	<b>217</b> 3:10 23:1,2	58:13 59:24	9
72:20,24 73:14   <b>16,400</b>	16:3	23:4	72:6 75:15,16	***************************************
73:20 74:7,12   <b>160</b> 1:1	1 -	<b>218</b> 3:11 30:10	75:19	<b>9</b> 58:4 64:17
74:16,19,21,23 <b>164</b> 68:	4,9	30:12,15 31:18	<b>40</b> 11:8,8 59:9	77:10,13
75:1,11,13,20   17 3:9 5		<b>219</b> 3:12 31:20	<b>4400</b> 2:12	<b>9:00</b> 6:9 <b>90</b> 32:20 48:19
76:1,4,9,16,19 69:21		31:22	<b>49,800</b> 18:17	49:7 59:3
76:22 77:1,3,6 <b>18</b> 29:4	<del>-</del>	<b>22</b> 43:4,17		<b>92</b> 58:14
1 / / • > • 1 = • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		<b>220</b> 3:13 63:19	5	9600 18:22
,,,==,=,=,,	52:4,19	63:22 64:2	<b>5</b> 28:1,6 49:6,7	7000 10.22
70.10,10,21	58:16	68:2,4	50:20 58:8	
79:6,7,8 69:20	<del>-</del>	<b>221</b> 3:14 70:21	75:18 76:1,3,5	
<b>Zenz's</b> 29:24 <b>19</b> 41:1	5	70:24 71:2	76:7,10,11,19	