Page 1

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:

)

PROPOSED SITE SPECIFIC RULE) R14-24

FOR SANITARY DISTRICT OF)

DECATUR FROM 35 ILL. ADM.) (Site Specific CODE SECTION 302.208(e)) Rule - Water)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS taken before HEARING
OFFICER TIMOTHY FOX, by Lisa Hahn Peterman, CSR, RMR,
a notary public within the County of Macon and State
of Illinois, at the Decatur Civic Center, #1 Gary K.
Anderson Plaza, Decatur, Illinois, on the 16th day of
May, 2018, at 8:30 a.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

TIMOTHY FOX, Chairman

BRENDA CARTER, Board Member

CYNTHIA SANTOS, Board Member

ALISA LIU, Technical Unit

May 16, 2018

```
Page 2
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
     ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
     100 W. Randolph Street
     Suite 11-500
 3
     Chicago, Illinois 60601
     312-814-3620
 4
     foxt@ipcb.state.il.us
          TIMOTHY J. FOX, HEARING OFFICER
 5
 6
 7
     ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
     1021 North Grand Avenue East
     P.O. Box 19276
 8
     Springfield, Illinois 62794
 9
     217-782-5544
     sara.terranova@illinois.gov
10
     rex.gradeless@illinois.gov
          SARA G. TERRANOVA, ESQ.
     BY:
          REX L. GRADELESS, ESQ.
11
12
              Appearing on behalf of the IEPA;
13
14
     HEPLERBROOM
     4340 Acer Grove Drive
     Springfield, Illinois 62711
15
     217-528-3674
16
     katherine.hodge@heplerbroom.com
     daniel.siegfried@heplerbroom.com
     joshua.houser@heplerbroom.com
17
     melissa.brown@heplerbroom.com
18
     BY:
          KATHERINE D. HODGE, ESQ.
          JOSHUA HOUSER, ESQ.
19
          MELISSA S. BROWN, ESQ.
          DANIEL L. SIEGFRIED, ESQ.
20
              Appearing on behalf of the Sanitary District
2.1
              of Decatur.
22
23
24
```

			Page	3
1	INDEX			
2	P	AGES		
3	Opening Remarks by Hearing Officer Fox	5		
4	Public Comment by Ryan McCrady	8		
5	Opening Statement by Joshua Houser	11		
6	Board's Questions for Timothy Kluge	29		
7	Board's Questions for Allison Cardwell	35		
8	Board's Questions for Bob Santore	41		
9	Board's Questions for Paul Bloom	66		
10	Board's Questions for Robert Colombo	74		
11	Testimony by Brian Koch	77		
12	District's Answers to Board's Final			
13	Questions	83		
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				

		Page 4
1	ЕХН	IBITS
2	NUMBER	ADMITTED
3	Hearing Exhibit 1	23
4	Hearing Exhibit 2	24
5	Hearing Exhibit 3	24
6	Hearing Exhibit 4	25
7	Hearing Exhibit 5	25
8	Hearing Exhibit 6	26
9	Hearing Exhibit 7	27
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

May 16, 2018

Page 5 1 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Good morning and 2 welcome to the Illinois Pollution Control Board 3 Hearing. 4 My name is Tim Fox, and I'm the Hearing 5 Officer for this Rulemaking, which is entitled Proposed Site Specific Rule for Sanitary District 6 of Decatur, from 35 Ill. Adm. Code Section 7 8 302.208(e), E as in Edward. The Board's docket number for this Rulemaking is R14-24. 9 10 Before we get under way, I do want to make some introductions of the folks that are here 11 12 from the Board. 13 At my immediate right is our Board 14 Member, Cynthia Santos, who is the lead Board Member for this docket, and at her right is Board 15 16 Member, Brenda Carter. At my left, present from 17 the Board's Technical Unit, is Alisa Liu. 18 This hearing today is governed by the Board's Procedural Rules. All information that is 19 2.0 relevant and that is not repetitious or privileged 2.1 will be admitted into the record. 22 Please bear in mind that any questions 23 that are posed by the Board, the Board Members, or 24 the Board Staff, are designed and intended solely

May 16, 2018

Page 6

to complete a record and to clarify the record and don't reflect any decision on either the proposal or the testimony or any of the other questions that are raised today.

2.1

For the sake of our court reporter, I would ask you to do a couple of things, please. I think we'll be fine without relying on microphones, but if you could be conscious of your volume so that she can hear you easily and accurately, that would be great.

Also, if the first time you speak or pose a question, you would identify yourselves and provide her with a spelling of your surname, I know that would be helpful for her in preparing the record as well.

By way of background, briefly, I do want to review very fast that the Sanitary District of Decatur filed its Amended Rulemaking Proposal with the Board on November 30th of 2017. The Board published Notice of this hearing on March 2nd of 2018 in the Herald & Review of Decatur.

On February 28th, the Hearing Officer directed participants intending to testify at this hearing to prefile testimony by April 25th, and on

May 16, 2018

Page 7

that date the Board received Prefiled Testimony on
behalf of the Sanitary District of Decatur from six
witnesses: Kent Newton, Timothy Kluge, Allison
Cardwell, Robert Santore, Paul Bloom, and Robert
Colombo, and no other participants or other
witnesses have prefiled their testimony for this
hearing today.

2.1

Although I had intended, as I reflected in my Hearing Officer Order, to begin today with the Prefiled Testimony, we do have one gentleman who has indicated that he would like to offer a public comment on the Sanitary District's Proposal. The gentleman's name is Ryan McCrady of the Economic Development Corporation, and in discussing briefly our order of hearing before we went on the record, we'll have Mr. McCrady step forward so that he — in a moment — step forward so that he can quickly offer a public comment. Then we will turn to the Sanitary District's Prefiled Testimony.

The Board's Procedural Rules again provide that the Prefiled Testimony is entered into the record as if it is read. However, if the Sanitary District wishes to offer an introduction or summary or other brief remarks, we can certainly

May 16, 2018

Page 8 1 have them do that. 2 We will then turn to the questions for 3 the Sanitary District's witnesses. The Board has 4 prepared some questions for the Sanitary District's 5 witnesses, put them in writing and shared them 6 earlier this morning with the District's witnesses, and our intent was to at least begin by proceeding 8 in numerical order through these as they're 9 organized witness by witness. 10 After running through those questions and any others that any of the other participants 11 12 may wish to ask, we can see whether anyone else 13 wishes to offer a public comment, and I think in all likelihood at that point adjourn for the day. 14 15 Do we have any questions procedurally 16 before we get under way? 17 Neither seeing nor hearing any, 18 Mr. McCrady, I appreciate your willingness to step 19 forward and offer a comment. If you would come 2.0 down to the front and begin, we can have you offer 2.1 that into the record right away. 22 Is this okay? MR. MCCRADY: 23 HEARING OFFICER FOX: I think the court 24 reporter will hear you just great from there.

May 16, 2018

Page 9 1 should work. 2 MR. MCCRADY: Great. 3 My name is Ryan McCrady. It's R-Y-A-N, M-C-C-R-A-D-Y. I'm the President of the Economic 4 5 Development Corporation of Decatur-Macon County, 6 commonly called the EDC. 7 The EDC supports the Amended Petition 8 for Site Specific Rule filed by the Sanitary District of Decatur with the Illinois Pollution 9 Control Board on November 30th, 2017. 10 11 The EDC feels that the Sanitary 12 District of Decatur has demonstrated that the site 13 specific water quality standard it seeks will not 14 adversely impact the Sangamon River and that 15 aquatic life will be protected at least as well as 16 protection offered by the existing general use 17 chronic water quality standard for nickel. 18 Moreover, we aware of the Sanitary 19 District's efforts to achieve compliance with the 2.0 existing standard, as well as the efforts and 2.1 studies undertaken by one of our largest industrial 22 users, Archer-Daniels-Midland, and the potential 23 costs associated with those alternatives. We note 24 that ADM has already spent several millions of

May 16, 2018

Page 10

dollars to reduce nickel concentrations in its discharge to the Sanitary District, that there are no other technically feasible and economically reasonable treatment options available to allow ADM to meet the nickel limit proposed by the Sanitary District for its effluent.

2.1

The EDC recognizes the valuable contribution both the Sanitary District and ADM provide to the local economy and the State of Illinois and strongly supports the District and ADM's efforts to continue operating their facilities in compliance with the Board regulations.

Furthermore, we know that ADM and the Sanitary District of Decatur have been good stewards of this community, they fill a significant social responsibility, and they've been good stewards of the environment during our time working with them here in the community.

Based on the foregoing, we recommend and request that the Board adopt the Sanitary District Site Specific Rule as proposed, and we appreciate the Board's consideration of our views and comments.

May 16, 2018

Page 11 1 Thank you for allowing me time to speak 2 this morning. 3 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. McCrady, 4 thank you for your comments, which, of course, have 5 been transcribed into the record. We appreciate 6 your time today. 7 MR. MCCRADY: Thank you. 8 HEARING OFFICER FOX: All right. Is 9 there anyone else who wishes to offer a public 10 comment before we move on to testimony and questions? 11 12 Neither seeing nor hearing anyone now, 13 Ms. Hodge, Mr. Houser, I think we are prepared to move to any introduction or summary that you may 14 15 wish to offer. 16 MR. HOUSER: Thank you, Mr. Hearing 17 Officer, Board Member Santos, Board Member Carter, 18 Ms. Liu. Good morning. 19 On behalf of the Sanitary District of 20 Decatur, my name is Josh Houser of HeplerBroom, and 2.1 we would like to begin by expressing our 22 appreciation to the Board and its Staff for the 23 time taken in reviewing our Proposal for a Site 24 Specific Water Quality Standard and in scheduling

May 16, 2018

Page 12

1 | this hearing in Decatur.

2.1

We would also like to thank the
Illinois EPA and its representatives for the
considerable time spent during the development of
this proposal and in coordinating discussions with
the USEPA to get their input, so that should the
Board adopt our site specific standard, we can all
have comfort that USEPA should approve it
expeditiously.

District's representatives who have worked long and very diligently on this proposal. Those who are here to testify include, to my right, second to the right, Mr. Kent Newton, Executive Director and Chief Financial Officer of the Sanitary District, who will speak generally about the District and its efforts.

To his right is Mr. Tim Kluge, former Technical Director of the Sanitary District, who has graciously agreed to continue supporting the District's need for a site specific standard and will address the District's operations and efforts at mitigation.

Two more down at the very end is

May 16, 2018

Page 13 1 Dr. Robert Colombo, Professor in the Department of 2 Biological Studies at Eastern Illinois University, 3 who has overseen extensive sampling of the Sangamon 4 River for water quality and aquatic macro 5 invertebrate, freshwater, and fish assemblages 6 upstream and downstream of the District's main 7 discharge point. Mr. Robert Santore is third from the 8 end there, partner with Windward Environmental, 9 10 LLC, the environmental science and consulting company that has provided technical support in 11 12 developing the District's site specific standard. 13 Let's see. To the right of Mr. Kluge is Ms. Allison Cardwell, Study Director from Oregon 14 15 State University, who performed the detailed 16 chronic toxicity studies on the Cladoceran 17 Ceriodaphnia dubia that supported the work of 18 Mr. Santore and Windward. 19 And, in addition, second from the end 2.0 there, we have Dr. Paul Bloom, Vice President, 2.1 Process and Chemical Research at 22 Archer-Daniels-Midland Company here in Decatur, 23 Illinois. He's here today and will provide 24 testimony on ADM's diligent efforts in studying and

May 16, 2018

Page 14

reducing nickel from its industrial wastewater discharge treatment process.

2.0

2.1

All of these individuals have prefiled their testimony and will be happy to discuss any of the topics addressed in their testimony or to answer any questions you may have.

Also, with me today representing the District, here to my right is Kathy Hodge; behind me here is Dan Siegfried; and behind me here is Melissa Brown of our firm.

Before we turn to the testimony, I would like to offer a very high level summary of why we're here today.

The Sanitary District of Decatur treats wastewater for the City of Decatur, nearby villages, and industrial and commercial users in the metropolitan area and discharges its treated wastewater into the Sangamon River. The District has an NPDES permit issued by the Illinois EPA that regulates and authorizes its discharges to the Sangamon River.

So as to comply with the Board's general use chronic water quality standard for nickel currently applicable to the Sangamon River,

May 16, 2018

Page 15 1 the Illinois EPA established an effluent limit for 2 nickel in the District's NPDES permit at 0.015 3 milligrams per liter measured as a monthly average. 4 Unfortunately, for various reasons, the District 5 has been and is unable to comply on a consistent basis with this discharge limit, and in an effort 6 to maintain compliance with its permit and 8 regulatory requirements, the District has explored 9 numerous alternative compliance options. In June 2009, the District petitioned 10 the Board for a variance that would authorize 11 12 continued discharges of nickel from the District's 13 Main Plant into the Sangamon River while it 14 explored these other options. 15 In January 2010, the Board granted the 16 District's requested variance until July 12, 2014, 17 subject to numerous conditions and a schedule for 18 completing various tasks. 19 In February 2014, the District 2.0 petitioned the Board for a one-year variance extension to allow it additional time to continue 2.1 22 its investigation. In support of its request, the 23 District noted that it had been actively 24 collaborating with the Illinois EPA and USEPA in

May 16, 2018

Page 16 1 the development of a site specific water quality 2 standard for nickel, based on the Biotic Ligand 3 Model, or BLM, adjustment to the nickel criterion. 4 In March 2014, the Board accepted the District's Petition for Extension and assigned a 5 6 hearing officer to the proceeding. 7 Thereafter, based on continuing 8 discussions with the Illinois EPA and USEPA, the 9 District filed its original Petition for Site Specific Ruling in June 2014 and moved for a series 10 of stays of the variance extension, which the Board 11 12 granted, subject to the requirement to submit 13 status reports. On February 24, 2017, Public Act 99-937 14 15 was signed into law. This legislation created Section 38.5 of the Illinois Environmental 16

was signed into law. This legislation created

Section 38.5 of the Illinois Environmental

Protection Act, which provides the Board with

authority to adopt time-limited water quality

standards. Pursuant to Section 38.5(c) of the Act,

the District's pending variance petition in PCB No.

14-111 was converted by operation of law into a

Petition for a Time-Limited Water Quality Standard.

The current status of that proceeding is that the

District has until December 31st, 2018, to file a

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

May 16, 2018

Page 17

substantially compliant time-limited water quality standard petition, should it be needed, if this site specific rulemaking does not succeed.

2.0

2.1

In light of that procedural background and after several years of study and detailed scientific testing, the best option that brings us here today is the District's Proposal of a Site Specific Water Quality Standard for Nickel in the particular area near the District's discharge from its Main Plant.

It is important to note that with this site specific proposal, the District is not asking the Board for the ability to discharge nickel in amounts greater than the past discharges. Instead, the District is simply asking for a site specific rule that takes into account the factors set forth in Section 27(a) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, including the technical feasibility and economic reasonableness of future reductions of nickel in the District's discharges to the Sangamon River.

Prior to, and since the time of its original proposal for site specific rule in June 2014, the District has engaged in ongoing, detailed

May 16, 2018

Page 18

discussions with the Illinois EPA, USEPA, and ADM, in particular, to refine the original proposal and answer Illinois EPA's and USEPA's technical and testing questions along the way.

2.0

2.1

The professors at Eastern Illinois
University, including Dr. Colombo, have been
engaged for approximately 20 years to conduct
thorough biotic and ecological evaluations of the
Sangamon River in the area of the Main Plant.

Mr. Santore of Windward and
Ms. Cardwell of Oregon State, based on their
particular expertise in these matters, were brought
in to evaluate with fine precision what would be an
environmentally acceptable revision to the chronic
water quality standard for nickel based on the
specific conditions of the Sangamon River at this
location. Testing was performed to evaluate the
toxicity on representative species, and protective
levels of nickel discharge were identified based on
the specifics of this area of the Sangamon River.

All of this testing and consultation with the Illinois EPA and USEPA culminated in the District's filing of its Amended Petition for Site Specific Rule on November 30, 2017. Consultation

May 16, 2018

Page 19 1 with the agencies has continued, and the District 2 made a number of updates to its calculations and 3 supplemented the record on April 20, 2018, with the filing of its Motion to File Revised Exhibits 14 4 5 and 28, New Exhibits 45 and 46, Revised Exhibit 6 List, and Minor Revision to Proposed Subsection 303.410. The Board granted this motion on April 25, 2018. 8 9 The end result of all of this analysis, 10 study, and effort is a proposed site specific chronic water quality standard for this particular 11 12 location that is slightly higher than the Board's 13 general use standard, but is still very much below 14 USEPA's national recommended standard for nickel 15 and those of other nearby states. 16 Specifically on this point and to 17 provide the Board with broader context, the 18 District's current NPDES permit limit is 0.015 19 milligrams per liter. If the site specific 20 proposal is granted, it would lead to an 2.1 anticipated NPDES permit limit of 0.0382 milligrams 22 per liter. 23 If we were to apply the USEPA's 24 national recommended chronic water quality standard

May 16, 2018

Page 20 1 for nickel, the result would be an anticipated 2 NPDES permit limit of approximately 0.154 3 milligrams per liter when applying the Sangamon 4 River's Hardness value of 359 milligrams per liter. 5 That is roughly ten times higher than the District's current limit and four times higher than 6 what the District is requesting here. 8 Iowa's chronic water quality standard 9 for nickel, at a Hardness of 359 milligrams per 10 liter, would also result in an anticipated NPDES permit limit of 0.154 milligrams per liter, and 11 12 Indiana's chronic water quality standard for 13 nickel, at a Hardness of 359 milligrams per liter, 14 would result in an anticipated NPDES permit limit 15 of 0.465 milligrams per liter. The details of these calculations and 16 17 comparisons are more fully discussed in 18 Mr. Santore's testimony, but from these various 19 levels, you get a sense of the national and 20 regional playing field. 2.1 Again, in this proceeding, based on 22 detailed site specific conditions and thorough 23 assessment of protection to aquatic species, the 24 District is seeking a revised standard that

May 16, 2018

Page 21

translates to only 0.0382 milligrams per liter, which is well below the federal and other state standards.

2.0

2.1

And finally on the topic of USEPA's approval following a Board-issued site specific rule, USEPA's regulations at 40 CFR 131.11 state that when states adopt water quality standards, they must be, quote, based on sound, scientific rationale to protect the designated use, end quote.

In addition, 40 CFR 131.6 requires that, when requesting USEPA approval for a revised water quality standard, states must submit the, quote, methods used and analyses conducted to support water quality standard revisions, end quote.

Based on all of the detailed work of the District and its consultants in this proceeding, the Amended Petition, and the exhibits attached to the Amended Petition, the District is confident that USEPA will be able to approve this site specific nickel water quality standard.

The supporting documentation clearly establishes how the water quality standard was derived and clearly demonstrates that the standard

May 16, 2018

Page 22 1 protects the designated use; that is, survival and 2 propagation of aquatic organisms, consistent with 3 the regulations previously noted. 4 With that background, Mr. Hearing 5 Officer, we now move for admission of the Prefiled 6 Testimony and the exhibits in this matter and 7 request the Prefiled Testimony be entered as if 8 read. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 10 Mr. Houser, did you have copies of that 11 to admit? 12 MR. HOUSER: I do. 13 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Houser, I 14 appreciate your introduction, if only because I had 15 mispronounced Mr. Santore's name. I will remember 16 to be correct about that, so I apologize for my 17 misstatement. 18 More importantly, let me turn to the 19 motion -- Mr. Houser's motion. I'm going to take 20 these one by one so that we can clarify by the 2.1 record by giving each of these sets of testimony a 22 unique exhibit number. 23 Did you have any preference in terms of 24 the order assigned to those?

	Page 23		
1	MR. HOUSER: I think just the order		
2	let me see here.		
3	If we can start with Mr. Newton's		
4	testimony, Prefiled Testimony.		
5	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Houser, on		
6	behalf of the Sanitary District of Decatur, has		
7	moved to admit the Prefiled Testimony of Mr. Newton		
8	as Hearing Exhibit Number 1.		
9	I do want to clarify before I see if		
10	there's any objections, that when this was filed,		
11	it was placed on the Board's Clerk's Office Online		
12	and has been available there to view by the public		
13	since it was placed there, I believe on April 26th		
14	on the filing date.		
15	The motion is to admit Mr. Newton's		
16	Testimony as Hearing Exhibit Number 1. Is there		
17	any objection to that?		
18	Neither seeing nor hearing any,		
19	Mr. Houser, we'll admit that as Exhibit Number 1.		
20	(Hearing Exhibit Number 1 was		
21	admitted into evidence.)		
22	And do you have a preference on the		
23	Exhibit Number 2, the witness whose testimony would		
24	be Number 2?		

	Page 24	
1	MR. HOUSER: Yes, please. Mr. Kluge.	
2	HEARING OFFICER FOX: The motion on	
3	behalf of the Sanitary District of Decatur is to	
4	admit Mr. Kluge's Prefiled Testimony as Hearing	
5	Exhibit Number 2. Is there any objection to the	
6	motion?	
7	Neither seeing nor hearing any, the	
8	motion is granted, Mr. Houser, and that will be	
9	marked and admitted as Hearing Exhibit Number	
10	2.	
11	(Hearing Exhibit Number 2 was	
12	admitted into evidence.)	
13	Does Exhibit Number 3 belong to anyone	
14	in particular in your mind?	
15	MR. HOUSER: Yes. Dr. Colombo, please.	
16	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Houser has	
17	moved to admit on behalf of the Sanitary District	
18	of Decatur the Prefiled Testimony of Dr. Robert	
19	Colombo as Hearing Exhibit Number 3. Is there any	
20	response or objection to the motion?	
21	Neither seeing nor hearing any,	
22	Mr. Houser, it's admitted as Exhibit number 3.	
23	(Hearing Exhibit Number 3 was	
24	admitted into evidence.)	

	Page 25			
1	Does Number 4 correspond to a			
2	particular witness for you?			
3	MR. HOUSER: Yes, Mr. Robert Santore.			
4	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore's			
5	testimony, Mr. Houser has moved to admit on behalf			
6	of the Sanitary District of Decatur as Hearing			
7	Exhibit Number 4. Any response or objection?			
8	Neither seeing nor hearing any,			
9	Mr. Houser, the motion is granted, and			
10	Mr. Santore's testimony is admitted as Exhibit			
11	Number 4.			
12	(Hearing Exhibit Number 4 was			
13	admitted into evidence.)			
14	Is Number 5 Ms. Cardwell or Mr. Bloom?			
15	MR. HOUSER: Ms. Cardwell.			
16	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Houser has			
17	moved to admit Ms. Cardwell's Prefiled Testimony as			
18	Hearing Exhibit Number 5 for the Sanitary District			
19	of Decatur. Is there any response or objection to			
20	the motion?			
21	Neither seeing nor hearing any,			
22	Mr. Houser, the motion is granted, and it is so			
23	admitted.			
24	(Hearing Exhibit Number 5 was			

May 16, 2018

Page 26 1 admitted into evidence.) 2 And the Prefiled Testimony of Dr. Bloom 3 I will presume you wish to admit as Hearing Exhibit Number 6. 4 Is there any objection or response to the motion to do so? 5 Again, neither seeing nor hearing any, 6 7 Mr. Houser, that is admitted as Hearing Number 6. 8 (Hearing Exhibit Number 6 was admitted into evidence.) 9 10 Did you have any other exhibits you wished to offer before you got under way? 11 12 MR. HOUSER: No. 13 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 14 The Board, however, does -- unusually, I recognize -- but earlier this morning, the Board 15 had shared both with counsel for the Sanitary 16 17 District of Decatur and the IEPA that is 18 represented here a written list of questions for 19 the District's witnesses, and I would move that --20 and I supplied, I believe, a number of copies both 2.1 to the District and at least one to the Agency. 22 there anyone who didn't receive that that would 23 wish to have one? I would move to admit the document 24

May 16, 2018

Page 27 1 entitled R14-24, Hearing Questions for Witnesses, 2 Sanitary District of Decatur, as Hearing Exhibit 3 Number 7. Is there any objection or response to 4 admitting that as a hearing exhibit here today? 5 Neither seeing nor hearing any, it will be so marked and admitted as Hearing Exhibit Number 6 7. 8 (Hearing Exhibit Number 7 was admitted into evidence.) 9 10 I do want to clarify that when we return to Chicago, we will file that with our 11 12 Clerk's Office so that it will appear in the 13 electronic docket for this case and you will have 14 access to the verbatim questions that the Board had 15 prepared and shared with the Sanitary District and 16 with IEPA, if you have any reason to wish to 17 consult those, particularly before the hearing transcript is ready. 18 19 Mr. Houser, I think we've come to the 2.0 point where we can swear in the District's 2.1 witnesses. Did you have anything else you wish to 22 bring up before we get under way? 23 MR. HOUSER: Would it be preferable if we provide another set of copies of the Prefiled 24

May 16, 2018

Page 28 1 Testimony to the court reporter? 2 HEARING OFFICER FOX: I believe the 3 court reporter would appreciate that, and if you 4 have them ready, I think she'd happily accept 5 those. 6 MR. HOUSER: With that, I agree we're 7 ready to move on to questions. 8 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 9 If the court reporter's ready, we can, 10 I suspect, Mr. Houser, swear them in all at once to take questions as a panel and do that with one 11 12 swearing rather than six. 13 (Sanitary District's witnesses sworn 14 by the court reporter.) 15 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Houser, thank 16 you again, and on behalf of the Board for all of 17 the District's witnesses, thank you for your 18 appearance here today. I know that in many cases 19 there was some significant travel and we appreciate 2.0 your willingness to be here and respond to 2.1 questions. 22 As I had mentioned earlier, we had 23 prepared a list, organized witness-by-witness, and 24 in discussing it with counsel for the District, we

May 16, 2018

Page 29

roughly agreed, at least, that it made sense to proceed through them in numerical order.

2.1

That, Mr. Kluge, would have us begin with you, of course, and we can do that in a moment.

If there is anyone who would wish to follow up the Board's questions, please feel free to raise your hand and let me know that you do have a question. I would just ask, for the court reporter, especially the first time that you speak, if you would identify yourself and any organization you may represent and provide her with the spelling of your name, that would help us with the clearest possible transcript.

Board's Questions for Timothy Kluge

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Kluge, I'll

just jump right into question number 1, and it

began with a reference to your Prefiled Testimony

regarding a translator study that had been

performed pursuant to the Board's -- I'm sorry -
to the District's NPDES permit -- that's National

Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit -
and our first question simply was, if you could

direct us in the record of testimony, exhibits, and

May 16, 2018

Page 30 1 amended petition, to the location of the study or 2 the study results in that record, please. 3 MR. KLUGE: Okay. My last name is 4 spelled K-L-U-G-E, and I am retired now, but was 5 formerly the Technical Director for the Sanitary 6 District. 7 The translator study itself consists of 8 results of analyses of samples that the District 9 collected from the Sangamon River and submitted to 10 the Illinois EPA, and to the best of my knowledge, that study itself is not currently in the record 11 12 but can certainly be provided. 13 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And Mr. Kluge, I 14 appreciate your willingness to do that. I know 15 before we adjourn, we'll work out deadlines for the 16 submission of any written information, so that 17 through your counsel we can make sure that you have 18 the amount of time that you need to prepare that. 19 So thank you for your willingness to do that. 2.0 Ms. Liu, do you have any questions? MS. LIU: 2.1 No. 22 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Was there anyone 23 else here today that had a question based on

Mr. Kluge's comments on the translator study?

24

May 16, 2018

Page 31 1 Mr. Kluge, I can move on to number 2. 2 Would you provide us with an explanation, 3 particularly a layperson's explanation, of what 4 precisely a translator study is and how it can be 5 used to calculate a new permit limit for nickel 6 discharges? 7 MR. KLUGE: Yes. The Board's water 8 quality standard for nickel is given in terms of 9 dissolved nickel, and the District's NPDES permit limit is in terms of total nickel. The purpose of 10 the translator study is to obtain site specific 11 12 data on what portion of the nickel in the 13 District's discharge is dissolved versus associated with suspended material, and the Illinois EPA 14 15 reviews that sampling data from the District and determines the translator value. 16 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Thank 18 you, Mr. Kluge. 19 Was there anyone who had any follow-up 2.0 questions, based on Mr. Kluge's response to number 2.1 2.3 22 Neither seeing nor hearing any, 23 Mr. Kluge, our third question noted that Exhibit 24 46, recently filed by the District, included a

May 16, 2018

Page 32 1 translator value of 0.966. Is that the same value 2 that was used in the translator study that you've 3 referred to? MR. KLUGE: That value is the value of 4 5 the translator that was determined by Illinois EPA, 6 based on the translator study. 7 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Great. 8 Is there any follow-up question to that 9 response? Mr. Kluge, moving on to number 4, the 10 Board had asked if you could explain the Hardness 11 12 value that IEPA had used to derive the permit 13 limits, both the original 0.011 milligrams per liter and subsequent 0.015 milligram per liter 14 15 limits and whether those were for total or dissolved nickel. 16 17 MR. KLUGE: In conjunction with the 18 translator study, the District also analyzed river 19 samples for Hardness and submitted those to the 20 Illinois EPA, and Illinois EPA determined what they 2.1 call a critical Hardness that would be used for 22 calculating the permit limit, and the permit limit 23 is, as I said, total nickel. 24 MS. LIU: So Mr. Kluge, do you remember

May 16, 2018

```
Page 33
1
     what the critical Hardness level was? Was it 359
2
     then as it is in the filings now?
3
                MR. KLUGE: Yes.
4
                MS. LIU: Thank you.
5
                HEARING OFFICER FOX:
                                      Are there any
6
     other follow-ups to Mr. Kluge's response to number
7
     4?
8
                Thank you. Moving on, Mr. Kluge, to
9
     number 5, would you be able to show the calculation
     that was used to determine those permit limits?
10
11
                MR. KLUGE:
                           Those calculations are
12
     shown in a letter from the Illinois EPA to the
13
     District that is dated in 2009, and I believe
14
     that's included in the record as Exhibit 4.
15
                MR. HOUSER: To the Amended Petition,
     Exhibit 4.
16
17
                HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Houser, I'm
18
     sorry.
             Can you say that again for me?
19
                MR. HOUSER: Exhibit 4 to the Amended
2.0
     Petition.
2.1
                HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good.
22
                Mr. Kluge and Mr. Houser, thank you for
23
     that clarification. That's a helpful citation, of
24
     course.
```

May 16, 2018

Page 34 Mr. Kluge, that, of course, wraps up 1 2 the five questions that we had raised for you based 3 on your Prefiled Testimony. 4 Are there any follow-ups before we would move on to another witness? 5 6 Neither seeing nor hearing any in our 7 audience -- oh, Ms. Liu, I apologize. I moved 8 ahead too quickly. 9 MS. LIU: I apologize, too. In Exhibit 4, I noticed that it does 10 say a metals translator of 0.848 was used. 11 12 that a different translator that was developed 13 before the 0.966 number? 14 MR. KLUGE: Yes. The 0.848 value is 15 specific for zinc and the 0.966 for nickel. 16 MS. LIU: Thank you. 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any other 18 follow-up questions for Mr. Kluge at this point? 19 Mr. Kluge, thank you very much for your 20 responses, which were appreciated. 2.1 Ms. Cardwell, I believe we can move on 22 to the questions that we had raised for you. 23 dive right in. 24

May 16, 2018

Page 35 1 Board's Ouestions for Allison Cardwell 2 HEARING OFFICER FOX: The pronunciation 3 of that species is Ceriodaphnia dubia? 4 MS. CARDWELL: Correct. Very good. 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: There's my 6 episode of good luck today. 7 Our first question was a clarification. 8 Your testimony that protection of that sensitive 9 species provided protection of others, is it correct that what your testimony indicates is that 10 by protecting one of the most sensitive species in 11 12 this reach of the Sangamon River, that other less 13 sensitive species would enjoy similar protection? 14 MS. CARDWELL: Yes. Although I'm 15 unfamiliar with the exact species that have been 16 sampled and identified in the Sangamon, the 17 Ceriodaphnia as a standard toxicity test organism, 18 that they would be acclimated to specific water 19 quality characteristics of the Sangamon. 2.0 It is also the most sensitive species 2.1 in the Illinois nickel water quality criteria, and 22 therefore, we would expect less sensitive species 23 to nickel to also be protected. 24 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up

May 16, 2018

Page 36

questions to that response?

2.1

Neither seeing nor hearing any,

Ms. Cardwell, you referred to the process of

acclimation, and our next four questions generally

deal with that.

Number 7 asks whether that process of acclimation involves breeding multiple generations of that species to increasingly high levels of Hardness and pH. Is that -- can you describe for us how that process is undertaken?

MS. CARDWELL: So the methodology in acclimation of organisms, the Ceriodaphnia is cultured in a standard EPA laboratory water, which is an approximate Hardness of 100 milligrams per liter.

Over the course of generations, for months and months, that Hardness is increased, and so the organisms are slowly introduced into that water. The health and reproduction is monitored, and so over the course of the many months, and up to a year, Hardness increased until we were at the level of Hardness within the Sangamon, and the organisms were reproducing and were of great health.

May 16, 2018

Page 37 1 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-ups to 2 that response to question number 7? 3 Neither seeing nor hearing any, 4 Ms. Cardwell, question 8 asks whether that process 5 also acclimates the organisms to different levels 6 of the Dissolved Organic Carbon. Could you respond to that, please? MS. CARDWELL: We did not acclimate the 8 9 test organisms to high DOC levels, although the standard water of the simulated effluent was 10 approximately one milligrams per liter DOC. 11 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-ups to 13 the response to question number 8? 14 Neither seeing nor hearing any, on 15 number 9, Ms. Cardwell, the Board had asked what 16 typically comprises the Natural Organic Matter, 17 NOM, and the Dissolved Organic Carbon, DOC, that is 18 present. 19 MS. CARDWELL: So, typically, in 20 natural systems, Natural Organic Matter or DOC, a 2.1 component of the water is made up from different 22 organisms, such as algae and also decomposing 23 vegetation, and that's the majority of the DOC 24 within the water column.

May 16, 2018

Page 38 1 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-ups to 2 the response to question 9? 3 Neither seeing or hearing any, 4 Ms. Cardwell, we can turn to number 10, which asks 5 whether any of the pH of Hardness or any other 6 factors in the stretch of the Sangamon River are unusual in any respect in your knowledge, and, if 8 so, if you can attribute any of those unusual 9 features to a particular cause or source. MS. CARDWELL: So I do not know the 10 specifics of waters within Illinois, but my 11 12 colleague, Dr. Santore, may be able to answer that 13 question more appropriately, if that's okay. 14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore, if 15 you'd be willing to, we'd appreciate knowing what 16 you have to say. 17 MR. SANTORE: Sure, I'd be happy to. 18 And just to be clear -- first of all, 19 Robert Santore, S-A-N-T-O-R-E, and I am not a 2.0 I do not have a Ph.D. doctor. 2.1 Yeah. The pH Hardness in DOC 22 characteristics of the Sangamon River are that it 23 is a relatively hard water source. Hardness of 359 24 is what we consider hard water or even very hard

May 16, 2018

Page 39 1 water, and from that standpoint, you know, that is 2 a characteristic. I know that there's going to be 3 follow-up questions that also get to these same types of issues. 4 5 It's not unusual. It is -- Hardness is 6 something that is a mineral component of the water. 7 It's calcium and magnesium. Those are contributed 8 from the geology of the area, and in this area it 9 is not unusual to see high Hardness waters. 10 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 11 Ms. Cardwell, did you have any 12 elaboration or any other response. 13 MS. CARDWELL: No. 14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Okay. Ms. Liu? 15 MS. LIU: Could you also comment on the Natural Organic Matter composition of the river as 16 17 well? 18 MR. SANTORE: Absolutely. 19 Natural Organic Matter is commonly found in all natural waters. Its amount varies, 2.0 for sure. 2.1 22 The Sangamon is -- has DOC 23 concentrations of -- depending on, you know, the 24 monitoring that we've seen, typically, from, you

May 16, 2018

Page 40 1 know, 6 to 12 to 14, that type of a range, of 2 milligrams per liter. 3 DOC is a way that we quantify Natural 4 Organic Matter, so it's a chemical measurement. We 5 don't actually measure NOM directly, we measure 6 DOC, and we know from the molecular structure of NOM that that carbon represents about 50 percent of 8 the NOM. So on a mass basis, we measure DOC. 9 know that it's about half the NOM, but they relate 10 to each other in that way. DOC is the analytical 11 way that we measure the presence of NOM, so that's 12 how they're related. 13 The values here, they are elevated but We've seen natural waters 14 they're not unusual. 15 that go well into the 20s and 30s, for example, 16 milligrams per liter, so these concentrations are 17 not unusual. 18 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Were there any 19 follow-ups to the responses to question number 10 2.0 regarding those issues? 2.1 Neither seeing nor hearing any, 22 Ms. Cardwell, one last question for you, number 11. 23 Your testimony had referred to spiking 24 nickel into the waters to determine an effective

May 16, 2018

Page 41 1 concentration, and the question was why you had 2 chosen a particular 20 percent level rather than 3 alternatives. 4 MS. CARDWELL: So the 20 percent effect 5 concentration is a standard end point for USEPA water quality criteria for chronic testing, and so 6 7 the 20 percent is a standard EPA end point. 8 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Cardwell, 9 thank you for your responses, which we appreciate, 10 and we --11 I can see, first of all, if there are any follow-ups to the responses she's offered, and 12 Ms. Cardwell, I'm not seeing any. 13 14 Mr. Santore, we can turn with question 15 number 12 to the series that begins with questions 16 for you. 17 Board's Questions for Bob Santore 18 HEARING OFFICER FOX: You had, I think, 19 touched upon the issue in number 12, which is the 2.0 reasons for the Hardness levels in this stretch, this segment of the Sangamon River. Did you want 2.1 22 to elaborate or have any further response to that 23 question? 24 MR. SANTORE: I can just elaborate a

May 16, 2018

Page 42 1 little bit to -- because, you know, we didn't 2 mention pH, but as I mentioned, the Hardness, high 3 Hardness, has to be a mineral component, and some 4 of the geology that tends to contribute calcium and 5 magnesium includes, for example, minerals like limestone, which also provide high alkalinity and 6 tend to result in a higher pH. 8 So the three factors we've been talking about -- DOC, pH, and Hardness -- are all 9 characteristic of the region and are affected by 10 the geology and are not -- they're elevated in the 11 12 Sangamon but they're not unusual for the region. 13 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 14 Any follow-ups to that response? 15 Mr. Santore, turning to number 13, we 16 had asked, in effect, if you think those 17 circumstances are likely at all to change. If so, 18 what might cause that and whether it was 19 foreseeable. 20 MR. SANTORE: Yes. That's a good 2.1 question. 22 Because we've tied, for example, a 23 Hardness to the geology, we don't expect that to 24 change. We do see seasonal changes in water

May 16, 2018

Page 43

quality. This part of the country has a snowy winter, for example, and so a lot of the hydrologic cycle is dependent on the climate and the weather.

2.1

We have looked at quite a bit of monitoring data for the Sangamon, looked at trends over time, as well as seasonal trends, and the -- the composition of the river appears to be pretty stable, and there is a relatively slight seasonal pattern to the water quality, but that has been considered and that was looked at in one of the exhibits that was submitted as the Critical Hardness -- the Critical Period Calculation Memo -- looked at that monitoring data and the seasonality of the water quality.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore, moving on to question number 14.

I should clarify, first, were there any follow-ups based on Mr. Santore's most recent response?

Not seeing or hearing any, question number 14, Mr. Santore, asked whether, in your experience, the levels of DOC, NOM, and Hardness in this stretch of the Sangamon River are typical or atypical of Illinois rivers.

May 16, 2018

Page 44 1 MR. SANTORE: I believe they're 2 typical. They're not unusual. 3 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up? 4 Mr. Santore, seeing none, question 5 number 15 asked whether site specific water quality standards are reviewed during IEPA's triennial 6 7 review and, if not, what kind of events or 8 circumstances might prompt a review of the 9 standards in a site specific permit -- I'm sorry -a site specific -- underlying a site specific 10 11 standard. 12 MR. SANTORE: I believe those types of reviews are common, but I don't honestly know if 13 it's part of IEPA's regular practice to do that as 14 15 part of a triennial review. HEARING OFFICER FOX: Great. 16 17 Any follow-up questions? 18 Mr. Santore, we can move on to question 19 number 16. It refers to the input data to the 2.0 Biotic Ligan Model, the BLM, and it refers to the two downstream sampling locations, and we've simply 2.1 22 asked if those are both within the stretch of the 23 Sangamon River that would be subject to the site 24 specific regulation as proposed.

May 16, 2018

Page 45 1 MR. SANTORE: Yes, they are. 2 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up on 3 that answer? 4 Not seeing or hearing any, the next 5 question, number 17, refers to calculation of nickel water quality standards and refers 6 specifically to Exhibit Number 46, containing the 8 results of those calculations, and our question was 9 whether you can show the calculations that were 10 made to generate Exhibit Number 46, including any parameter values. 11 12 MR. SANTORE: I can and it may be 13 useful for me to go up to the chart here because 14 these equations are on that Board. 15 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Please, go ahead. 16 Before you begin, could you give us, 17 just for the sake of the record, a brief 18 description of what you're referring to? What is 19 the nature of this demonstrative exhibit? 2.0 MR. SANTORE: Yes. 2.1 There are -- Hardness equations have 22 been used by USEPA for quite a few metals, water 23 quality criteria, over quite a bit of time, and 24 they all have the same format.

May 16, 2018

Page 46

So what we're going to look at is the general form of this Hardness equation and the parameters that are used in that equation, and then we'll look at the parameters that were used to generate the Illinois State Standard and how they were used in that equation.

2.1

We have two visual aids. The first of this is an excerpt from one of the testimonies that lists the equation itself, and the equation is the form of a logarithm. We usual natural logarithms. This is something that EPA has been doing for a number of decades, and it's the same form that is used for all of the metals, water quality criteria, or standards as they've been adopted by states.

So the Hardness equations all have the same form. They include a parameter shown here as an A and a B, and the B is the slope of the response. That's multiplied times the natural log of the Hardness.

So we've talked about Hardness for this water and we've talked about a critical Hardness value. That critical Hardness value would go into this equation in place of the symbol H here. That would be multiplied -- so the natural log of that

May 16, 2018

Page 47 1 value would be multiplied by the slope parameter B. 2 Then we would add the intercept parameter A, and 3 the result there would then be used as an exponent 4 to the -- E is a constant. It's a -- if you are 5 familiar with logarithms and natural logarithms, 6 natural logarithms are in the base of E, so that "exp" in this case is -- refers to an Excel 8 function that provides this exponentiation to the 9 symbol E, which is a constant that's used in 10 natural logarithms. So this is the form of the equation. 11 12 If you turn now to Exhibit 46, you can see how the equation is used in Illinois, as well 13 14 as neighboring states and at EPA nationally, to 15 produce these various nickel standards. 16 So for each of these standards, we have 17 listed the state -- Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, USEPA. 18 Within each of those, we are showing the acute and 19 the chronic version of the standard. 20 The slope parameter is shown on this 2.1 line. The intercept parameter is shown on that 22 line. 23 And remember, from this equation, we're 24 using -- the slope is the symbol B, the intercept

May 16, 2018

Page 48

is the symbol A here. So those are going to be substituted into this equation to make each of these calculations.

2.0

2.1

So we make those substitutions in each of these cases. The slope, the intercept, we use the critical Hardness value shown here, 359, and the results are shown in these darker green boxes. So the same equation, but these different slope and intercept parameters generate each of these values for acute and chronic standards for each of the states that we have listed here.

Does that adequately explain the equation and how it's used?

MS. LIU: In your exhibit, the box on the lower left side, the proposed Decatur site specific dissolved standard, there is a slope and an intercept there that is different from the slope and intercept that's part of the proposed site specific ruling. Can you point me to where in the record that part is discussed?

MR. SANTORE: So I want to first clarify that in this box -- is this the box that you're asking me about?

In this case, we have the slope and the

May 16, 2018

Page 49 1 intercept for the DOC equation, and then up here, 2 this upper box, we're talking about the slope and 3 the intercept for the Hardness portion of the 4 equation. Is that -- is there confusion about 5 6 this slope and this intercept are for DOC, as 7 opposed to what's up here for Hardness? 8 MS. LIU: I guess I'm still a little 9 confused. 10 MR. SANTORE: Okay. Thank you. Well, let's keep at it and we'll make sure we clear that 11 12 up. 13 Would you like to follow up with a more 14 specific question or how would you like me to 15 proceed? 16 MS. LIU: Would the DOC equation follow 17 the same format, A and B, for the natural log? MR. SANTORE: It has a slightly 18 19 different form. We didn't use natural logs, for 20 example. 2.1 MS. LIU: Okay. 22 MR. SANTORE: The Hardness equation, as 23 I mentioned, there's been a long history of its use 24 by EPA and by states in developing metal standards,

May 16, 2018

Page 50

and we adopted -- we used the same form because we weren't trying to change anything about how the Hardness component was done.

2.1

When we added DOC consideration to the site specific standard, although we do have a slope and an intercept associated with that, it has a slightly different mathematical form, and if you're interested in the form of that, I could turn to -- I believe -- I know it's in the exhibits. It's just a question of finding where we could point to it, and I might need to just look through the exhibits and tell you exactly where the form of that equation is shown.

This is in Exhibit 28, and on page 3 you should see this equation, and the slope and the intercept shown there are the same values that are in this table shown here.

MS. LIU: From there, how do you calculate the value of 36.9 micrograms per liter?

MR. SANTORE: Okay. So the 36.9 is the result of first taking the critical Hardness value through the Illinois State Criterion to account for the Hardness of the river. Now we're going to add to that consideration of the DOC of the river,

May 16, 2018

Page 51

which is done using the DOC equation.

2.1

The way we have utilized this information is to consider the effect of DOC as the multiplier that is consistent with the water factor ratio guidance times that Illinois state standard.

So the state standard is considering the effect of Hardness; that we use the DOC equation to consider the additional effects of DOC, and so you need to -- we need to walk through both parts of the calculation.

Just considering Hardness alone gives the 14.75 chronic standard, which is consistent with the Illinois state standard.

And then the way we work this DOC additional multiplier is we have the slope and the intercept in the equation that we just reviewed. If we put in a reference DOC, which is based on the reference waters that was used in the OSU testing, we get a EC 20 for nickel of 6.66 here.

If we use the DOC, the average DOC in the Sangamon River, that's the 8.33. We put that in that same equation and now we get 16.6, okay?

The ratio tells us how the bioavailability of nickel in the Sangamon is

May 16, 2018

```
Page 52
1
     altered by DOC, so that ratio is the 2.5.
                                                 The 2.5
2
     multiplied by the 14.75 gives us the 36.9.
3
                MS. LIU:
                          I gotcha.
4
                MR. SANTORE: Excellent.
5
                MS. LIU:
                         Thank you.
                MR. SANTORE: You're welcome.
6
7
                MS. LIU: Just for the sake of the
8
     record, your explanation was excellent. Could you
9
     translate that into writing, the full equation that
10
     you would have used to calculate through the
     spreadsheet, just so that we have it all?
11
12
                MR. SANTORE:
                              Yes.
13
                MS. LIU:
                          The full equation.
14
                MR. SANTORE: And would you like me to
     do that right now?
15
16
                MS. LIU: No, you don't have to do it
17
     right now.
18
                HEARING OFFICER FOX: That's another
19
     one of issues with counsel. We can take up a
20
     deadline or a date by which to submit that.
2.1
     Mr. Houser acknowledging we can take that all up.
22
                MS. LIU: I just want to take it one
23
    more step. So to go from the number that you
24
     described here, multiply it by the translator to
```

May 16, 2018

Page 53 1 get the dissolved -- so this would be the total 2 36. -- or dissolved would be 36.9 times the 3 translator would convert it to the --4 MR. SANTORE: That's right. And that's in that next box on this Exhibit 46 in the lower 5 6 right, yes. 7 MS. LIU: Thank you very much for 8 walking me through that. I appreciate it. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore, 10 thank you for that tutorial and the derivation of the standards, which is appreciated. 11 12 Does anyone else have any follow-up questions on his response to question number 17? 13 14 Neither seeing nor hearing any, 15 Mr. Santore, that's been -- we have question 18. 16 After resuming some of the -- after 17 examining some of the other standards, we had asked 18 for your comment on whether Exhibit 46 could reflect total and dissolved concentrations of 19 2.0 nickel. Your response to that? 2.1 MR. SANTORE: Yes. I think it already 22 does, though, in a way, because in the box on the 23 lower left, we have the dissolved calculation, and 24 then in the lower right, we have the translator

May 16, 2018

Page 54 1 total, and so the information is there. If there's 2 something I can do to clarify that in the exhibit, 3 I'd be happy to do that. 4 MS. LIU: Maybe when you get a chance 5 to sit down, could you look at it a little bit 6 closer? 7 I'd be happy to. MR. SANTORE: MS. LIU: I think some of the states 8 9 had translators worked into the equations and --10 but not necessarily applied, so I would appreciate 11 that. 12 MR. SANTORE: No problem. 13 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore, 14 moving on to question number 19, you had offered some comparisons of the Illinois standard, of 15 16 course. Are you aware of when the current Illinois 17 general use water quality standard for nickel had 18 been adopted? 19 MR. SANTORE: I believe it was around 2.0 1993. 2.1 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And jumping right 22 ahead to number 20, closely related, do you have an 23 explanation of why that standard is lower than the 24 criterion now recommended by USEPA in the other

May 16, 2018

Page 55

states that you've cited? Any assessment of the reason for that?

2.0

2.1

MR. SANTORE: Yes. The standards are based on published toxicity data, and as new data becomes available, standards can be reviewed and revised as necessary.

EPA has produced several different versions of a nickel standard. One -- for example, I think the first one was back around 1980 but then it was revised in 1986. The 1986 standard is actually -- on this chart is what is shown as adopted by the state of Iowa. So those values are consistent with, and based on, the 1986 EPA recommended water quality criteria.

Then EPA continued to revise the nickel standard, and it was revised again in '95 -- it was actually published in '96 -- and that version of the EPA recommended standard is what was adopted here by Indiana, so that the box here on this exhibit that shows the Indiana standard, those values are from that 1996 EPA document.

And then when Illinois adopted their standard, they chose to look to the literature and see if there were additional data, and, indeed,

May 16, 2018

Page 56 1 there were. There was a 1993 paper by 2 Schubauer-Berigan that included a chronic limit 3 on -- a chronic toxicity test to Ceriodaphnia 4 dubia, and those data indicated that Ceriodaphnia 5 was the most sensitive species that had been known, had been discovered. So when the Illinois standard 6 was developed, it included the Cerio data, but 8 those data were not cited by any of the EPA water 9 quality documents. 10 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up 11 questions to that response? 12 Mr. Santore, neither seeing nor hearing 13 any, we can move on to the next batch, beginning 14 with question number 21. 15 I think we could probably --MS. LIU: I believe he's answered some of these already. 16 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: I was just going 18 to say that it looked like the response to question 19 21 effectively had come up in a response to one of 2.0 the earlier questions. 2.1 Did you have anything to had in 22 response to that? 23 MR. SANTORE: No. I think Mr. Kluge 24 covered that quite well.

May 16, 2018

Page 57 1 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 2 And question number 22, the Board had 3 asked how the translator value 0.966 fit into the 4 equation for determining the Water Effect Ratio, 5 WER, the acronym. Do you have a response to that 6 question? 7 MR. SANTORE: Yeah. The way we have 8 laid this out, the translator is used after the Water Effect Ratios. The Water Effect Ratio is 9 10 actually based on the DOC equation, and then the additional step, which follows that, is to take the 11 12 translator into account, so it's not actually used 13 in the WER step, but it's used to translate from 14 Dissolved. 15 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore, 16 thank you. 17 Question number 23 had asked about the 18 equation for determining if the anticipated NPDES 19 permit limit had been obtained. Is that an 20 equation you have provided that you can refer to or 2.1 that you can provide to the Board? 22 MR. SANTORE: Yes. It's actually 23 exactly what we just walked through that's that 24 value that comes out.

May 16, 2018

Page 58

HEARING OFFICER FOX: As expected, I predicted something, Mr. Santore.

2.1

And in question number 24, the Board had asked how -- if you would explain the difference between how the dissolved and total nickel concentrations are accounted for in the expected NPDES permit limits.

MR. SANTORE: Yes.

what is protective of aquatic life, and to make that determination, we try to, as accurately as possible, characterize not just how much metal is there, but what the effect of that metal is, and over time, EPA has revised and refined its assessment of the most important factors that determine metal toxicity and bioavailability, and dissolved metal is the -- has been determined to be, for metal like nickel, a better, more accurate representation of the standard and its effects on aquatic life. So the standard itself is more accurate if it is determined on a dissolved metal basis.

When we look at a permit limit, we are looking at the amount that's being discharged, and

May 16, 2018

Page 59 1 that is most accurately characterized on the basis of total metal. 3 So we need to get from a dissolved 4 standard to a total effluent limit, and that's 5 where the translator is used to allow us to develop our standards on a dissolved basis and still use 6 7 that information to come up with a discharge limit based on total metal. 8 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore, 10 looking ahead to question number 25, it seems as if you had approached, if not actually responded more 11 12 or less to our question about why a permit limit 13 would be stated in terms of total concentrations since the site specific water quality standard is 14 15 stated in dissolved terms. Did you want to elaborate on that at all? 16 17 MR. SANTORE: Unless my answer was, you 18 felt, was incomplete or confusing, I think it's the 19 same information. 2.0 Excellent, thank you. 2.1 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Great. 22 Any follow-ups or any other questions 23 based on those most recent couple of responses of 24 Mr. Santore?

May 16, 2018

Page 60 1 Not seeing or hearing any, question 2 number 26 is -- pardon me -- whether the 3 anticipated NPDES permit limit of 0.0382 milligrams 4 per liter would be equal to the water quality 5 standard, and whether it is, in effect, a water 6 quality based effluent limit. 7 MR. SANTORE: The definition of a water 8 quality based effluent limit, there is some actual 9 local -- I'm not actually sure in terms of Illinois EPA if this would fit into their definition of a 10 water quality based effluent limit. I believe it 11 12 would. 13 MS. LIU: So would the 0.0382 14 milligrams per liter be the water quality standard, 15 the site specific water quality standard? MR. SANTORE: That would be the -- the 16 17 standard is actually the dissolved value, and 18 that's the total value that would be the permit limit but not the standard. 19 MS. LIU: So the standard would be 20 0.369? 2.1 22 MR. SANTORE: Correct. 23 MS. LIU: Okay. 24 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Moving on,

May 16, 2018

Page 61 1 Mr. Santore, to question number 27. The calculation of 0.0382 milligrams per liter limit, 2 3 does that account at all for either the eligibility 4 for a mixing zone or the availability -- the 5 availability -- let me start over again. Does that account for either the 6 7 potential availability of or eligibility for a mixing zone? 8 9 MR. SANTORE: It does not factor in any It is essentially -- we have not taken 10 dilution. that value and then also considered dilution from 11 12 upstream flow, which would be essentially what --13 the phrase mixing zone is implying that there's an 14 upstream source of water that is considered and 15 that you want the standard to be met at the edge of 16 that mixing zone. In this case, we are not 17 considering upstream flow in dilution from that. 18 MR. KLUGE: Could I add a clarification? 19 20 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Kluge, please 2.1 go ahead. 22 MR. KLUGE: The permit limits are based 23 on a value called the seven-day, ten-year, low 24 flow, and the upstream flow from the District's

May 16, 2018

Page 62 1 discharge is zero, as determined by the Illinois 2 State Water Survey, and I believe the map that 3 supports that is from one of the exhibits. 4 So in determining the permit limits, 5 there is no allowance for upstream dilution. 6 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Kluge, thank 7 you. 8 Mr. Santore, did you wish to elaborate 9 on Mr. Kluge's response at all? 10 I agree with what MR. SANTORE: No. was said. 11 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 13 And turning to question number 28, the 14 Board had asked whether IEPA has indicated concurrence with the expected NPDES permit limit or 15 16 commented on how they might determine a limit based 17 on this proposed site specific water quality 18 standard. 19 MR. SANTORE: There has been a lot of 2.0 back and forth with Illinois EPA throughout this work as it's progressed. I don't know 2.1 22 specifically, because you're asking a very specific 23 question. I can't speak for Illinois EPA, but I 24 know that everything has been reviewed and I have

Received, Clerk's Office 5/23/2018 May 16, 2018

	Page 63
1	not heard of a any objection that we have not
2	addressed or already tried to.
3	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good.
4	Any follow-up questions to
5	Mr. Santore's response? Neither seeing nor hearing
6	any.
7	MS. LIU: I believe he's addressed 29
8	and 30 already.
9	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. I had
10	the same sense.
11	Looking ahead, Mr. Santore, it appears
12	that your previous responses have addressed
13	questions number 29 and 30. However, if you have
14	any elaboration, any expansion that you'd like to
15	offer, we're happy to hear that.
16	MR. SANTORE: I have no further
17	comments.
18	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good.
19	Any follow-up questions based on the
20	Board's questions 29 or 30?
21	Not seeing or hearing any, our next
22	questions both deal with Exhibit Number 45,
23	recently submitted by the Sanitary District, and it
24	noted that there were comments and responses built

May 16, 2018

Page 64

1 in effectively to an e-mail chain of communication, 2 and question number 31 asked whether your most 3 recent comments in March of 2018 had been viewed 4 by -- had been shared with USEPA and whether they 5 had responded with any comments to you. 6 MR. SANTORE: Yes, they had -- those 7 comments have been shared. This has been a very 8 dynamic process with a lot of back and forth, so 9 I'm sure that they have seen our most recent 10 responses to their comments and questions. I have

HEARING OFFICER FOX: And in question number 32, the Board had asked whether either USEPA or IEPA has provided a comment on the revised proposal with a Water Effects Ration of 2.50.

not seen a final set of comments or questions from

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

EPA.

THE WITNESS: Yes. There's been significant comments and opportunities for discussions and back and forth with both EPA and IEPA throughout the process.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: And would you have the same responses to the previous question, that you're not aware of any objections or technical concerns with the Water Effects Ratio of

May 16, 2018

Page 65 1 2.50? 2 MR. SANTORE: Correct. There's been 3 comments and requests on both the part of EPA and 4 IEPA throughout this for us to clarify and refine 5 the work product and we have addressed all of the comments that we've received, and I have not seen 6 7 any additional comments that we have not yet 8 responded to. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Thank 10 you, Mr. Santore. 11 MS. LIU: Just to clarify, the revision 12 to using the WER of 2.50 is in April of 20 -- or 13 April 20th, and previously it was 2.33, and in the 14 interim, you have had conversations with USEPA back 15 and forth. 16 MR. SANTORE: That's right. 17 MS. LIU: I was wondering if you had 18 any documentation, since you had proposed the 2.5, 19 a reply from USEPA, or IEPA, if they were cool with 2.0 that number. 2.1 MR. SANTORE: I believe we have seen 22 responses since the 2.5 number was developed, and 23 there was no specific objections to 2.5. 24 MS. LIU: I don't know that it's in the

Received, Clerk's Office 5/23/2018 May 16, 2018

	Page 66
1	record. Would that be something that you'd be able
2	to provide in the record, something a record of
3	your phone conversation or an e-mail or a scribble?
4	MR. SANTORE: Yes. We've had quite a
5	few conference calls. We can certainly lay out the
6	timeline for those calls and who participated
7	because we did have a participation log from EPA.
8	MS. LIU: That would be very helpful,
9	thank you, just to close it a little. Thank you.
10	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Santore,
11	that, of course, comes with your response to
12	question number 32, the end of those that the Board
13	had directed specifically to you.
14	Does anyone have any follow-up
15	questions or additional questions?
16	Mr. Santore, I'm not seeing any, and we
17	appreciate the responses that you've offered us
18	here today. Thank you very much for those.
19	We can move on to Dr. Bloom to your
20	right and dive right in.
21	Board's Questions for Paul Bloom
22	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Dr. Bloom, in
23	your Prefiled Testimony, I'll begin, of course,
24	with question number 33.

May 16, 2018

Page 67

Your Prefiled Testimony stated that one of the primary sources of nickel in the discharges to the District are contained into the processed soybeans and corn that are coming into ADM's operations. Can you estimate -- do you have any estimate of what the percentage of nickel in that stream is accounted for by the incoming soybeans and corn?

2.1

MR. BLOOM: Yes. Thank you. Again, Paul Bloom, B-L-O-O-M.

That's a great question and it would be difficult for me to assign a definitive percentage from the incoming corn and soybeans. Our estimates were really based on total nickel balance that was completed from waste streams that were derived from a comprehensive Decatur site specific nickel balance study. So those waste streams we quantify going to our wastewater treatment plant.

The major sources that were identified from this study were, of course, the nickel contained in the incoming soybeans and corn. For soybeans, it was approximately 49.2 pounds per day. For corn, it was up to 19.1 pounds per day. And then the non-grain sources that were identified

May 16, 2018

Page 68 1 were from nickel from catalysts, and also 2 metallurgy from processed -- you know, from 3 operating the polyose plant. 4 So the nickel from the catalysts was 5 largely mitigated from IX or ion exchange 6 technology that was installed, and so we can say what nickel was removed from sources that we think 8 were derived from our process inputs, and that was 9 up to 1.3 pounds per day. 10 And the metallurgy from process 11 operations in the polyose plant -- of course, now 12 shut down -- was 1.9 pounds per day. 13 So the rest of that material, including the nickel from the soy molasses stream, which was 14 15 also removed at 2.7 pounds per day, that was 16 assumed to be from the incoming grain. 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Moving on to 18 question number 34, Dr. Bloom, do you know whether 19 the nickel that is effectively arriving at ADM's 20 facilities in the corn and soybeans is uptake from 2.1 the soil? Does it result from the application of 22 fertilizers or pesticides, or is there another 23 potential source that you can refer to? MR. BLOOM: 24 I do not have an answer for

May 16, 2018

Page 69 1 this question. One, it's not my area of expertise, 2 and our grain does arrive from various locations. 3 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And on to 35, and 4 question number 35, if you know, are you aware of 5 whether that issue specifically with the corn and soybeans is specific to Illinois because of soil 6 types or other local conditions, or is that 8 something that ADM may experience in other regions 9 of the country? Again, I don't have an 10 MR. BLOOM: answer for this question, as grain does arrive from 11 12 various locations at the facility. 13 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up to those questions, number 33, 4 and 5? 14 15 Not seeing or hearing any, Dr. Bloom, 16 your testimony had indicated other sources which 17 you have referred to. As part of its evaluation, 18 did ADM evaluate ways to reduce or substitute 19 nickel as raw materials in the catalyst or the 2.0 metallurgy? I think you may have begun to touch on 2.1 that, but if you have any elaboration or expansion, 22 please go ahead. 23 MR. BLOOM: Sure. It's a great 24 question.

May 16, 2018

Page 70

As part of this specific evaluation, I don't know of any studies that seek to substitute the catalysts or look at alternate metallurgy.

2.1

Separately, ADM does evaluate alternate catalysts on a routine basis. Typically, those catalysts for these operations are nickel-based that are offered and they're offered from the industry, and from the metallurgy standpoint, there were several explorations of alternate metallurgy for the polyose plant; however, those efforts have ceased since that operation was shut down in 2015.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: The next three or four questions, Dr. Bloom, deal with some of your testimony, particularly with Exhibit Number 42, on some of the investigations that ADM had done for reducing its discharge of nickel to the District's wastewater treatment plant, and it referred to some of the costs that had been incurred, of course, by ADM in doing so.

In question number 37, you had indicated that the removal of the soy molasses stream, which I think you at least quickly mentioned, accounts for at least 35 percent removal of soluble nickel and that the shutdown of the

May 16, 2018

Page 71 1 polyose plant, which you, of course, have referred 2 to, accounted for an 11 percent reduction. 3 In combination, would those allow you 4 to assert that those two steps alone reduce the 5 nickel output by the sum by 46 percent or is there a different calculation that you would use in 6 making that determination? 8 MR. BLOOM: I would agree with that 9 assessment. 10 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 11 Any follow-ups on that question? 12 In number 38, you had pointed out in 13 your Prefiled Testimony that the excess sludge 14 removal allowed the removal of more than 10 point 15 million dry pounds per year in the most recent two 16 complete years and that some improved housekeeping 17 had also resulted in reductions also. 18 Can you offer an estimate of what 19 additional percentage sludge removal and 2.0 housekeeping efforts have contributed to the 2.1 reduction in the nickel discharge to the District's 22 wastewater treatment? 23 MR. BLOOM: That's a great question, 24 and again, I don't have a good estimate for the

May 16, 2018

Page 72

additional reduction at this time, but I can say it will only help as the level of nickel in our sludge continues to decrease as we continue to proceed with sludge removal from the anaerobic digesters.

2.0

2.1

HEARING OFFICER FOX: And in our question number 39, we had noted your testimony about the decline in the concentration of nickel in the effluent to the District's wastewater treatment plant from approximately 0.120 milligrams per liter to about 0.060 milligrams per liter since calendar year 2010.

Would you estimate that the reductions that you've identified at about 50 percent, do those compare -- how do those compare to the way that the facilities were operating in 2007 before the District's permit limit really brought this issue to your attention.

MR. BLOOM: So I would also agree with the statement that the assessment that approximately -- the efforts that ADM's taken since 2007, and combined with the soy molasses removal, the catalyst ion exchange remove nickel from the sorbitol and the corn plant streams, and the polyose shutdown, reducing that metallurgy, would

May 16, 2018

Page 73 1 account for that approximately 50 percent reduction. 3 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Again, since the 4 benchmark year of 2007? 5 MR. BLOOM: Correct. 6 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Okay. 7 Dr. Bloom, our final question directed 8 specifically to you, number 40, referred in Exhibit Number 43 to a Table Number 4 with some additional 9 details about some of the technologies that ADM had 10 11 considered. 12 The first column appears to be Solid, and our question, basically, was whether that had 13 blocked out information or whether it should list 14 15 nickel remediation chemistries for each of the corresponding rows, and if you have any elaboration 16 17 or explanation to offer, please go ahead. 18 MR. BLOOM: Sure. Again, great 19 question, and what I can say is that the 2.0 blacked-out portion contained vendor names 2.1 specifically to the related chemistries that were 22 there. So as a follow-up, we'd be happy to provide 23 the type of chemistry, without the vendor name, 24 associated with Exhibit 43.

May 16, 2018

Page 74 1 MS. LIU: Thank you. 2 HEARING OFFICER FOX: That brings us to 3 the end of the questions that we specifically had from the Board for Dr. Bloom. 4 5 Is there anyone else who had any 6 follow-ups based on his responses here today? 7 Dr. Bloom, I'm certainly not seeing nor 8 hearing any, and we appreciate your responses here 9 today on our follow-up questions on your testimony. 10 Dr. Colombo, that leads us to you. have a single question, designated number 41, for 11 12 you. 13 Board Ouestions for Robert Colombo 14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: You had -- and 15 our question first, very, very generally, I 16 recognize that some of the conclusions that were 17 drawn from some of your observations, your 18 analysis, the Sangamon River, and the question was 19 whether the observations you had made highlight for 2.0 you any differences in the stretch of the Sangamon 2.1 River from other Midwestern streams related to 22 Hardness levels, dissolved organic -- or Dissolved 23 Organic Carbon concentrations. 24 Do you have any elaboration on that

May 16, 2018

Page 75 1 that you can offer? 2 MR. COLOMBO: Sure. Robert Colombo, 3 C-O-L-O-M-B-O. 4 So we conduct long-term electrofishing 5 samples on many -- especially Illinois rivers and streams -- and the fish community assemblage is a 6 cookie-cutter of most other fish community 8 assemblages in the tributaries of the Illinois rivers and the tributaries of the Wabash River and 9 the tributaries of the Mississippi River. 10 11 Additionally, if you look at the other 12 tributaries of the Illinois River, the Sangamon has 13 one of the more robust fish community assemblages 14 than the others. 15 In terms of as that's related to 16 Hardness and Dissolved Organic Carbon, it really is 17 that fishes in Illinois tributaries have -- are all 18 generally able to handle that level. 19 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Just for my own 2.0 clarification, when you used the phrase 2.1 cookie-cutter, am I understanding correctly to say 22 that there's a high degree of similarity? 23 MR. COLOMBO: A high degree of 24 similarity between with the fish assemblages here

May 16, 2018

Page 76 1 that you would find in the tributaries of the 2 Wabash or the Embarras River, and it's a very 3 similar fish assemblage in terms of abundance and 4 communities. 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Dr. Colombo, that 6 exhausts the single question we had for you, unless 7 anyone has any follow-up or clarifications they would like on the basis of that answer. 8 9 I am not seeing or hearing any. The Board, with its final two 10 questions, had questions regarding the proposed 11 12 rule language, and Mr. Houser and Ms. Hodge, I am 13 happy to leave it up to you whether this is 14 something you would like to consider and respond to 15 in a written response to the Board, since I suspect is something your witnesses may not be prepared to 16 17 answer. 18 Do you have any comment on that, 19 Mr. Houser? 20 MR. HOUSER: Could we just go off the 2.1 record for a few minutes just to confer? 22 HEARING OFFICER FOX: In fact, I think 23 we've reached the point in which it's wise to do 24 that, just to wrap up some deadlines and other

Received, Clerk's Office 5/23/2018 May 16, 2018

	Page 77
1	issues.
2	So if the court reporter would take us
3	off the record briefly, we'll go ahead with that.
4	(A brief recess was taken.)
5	If the court reporter's ready, we can
6	continue. Thank you very much.
7	We have gone off the record to discuss
8	some procedural issues relating to deadlines and
9	similar matters. The Sanitary District of Decatur
10	indicated that it wished to pose questions to the
11	IEPA, whose witness, Mr. Brian Koch, is here.
12	If the court reporter would swear in
13	Mr. Koch when she has a moment, we'll turn,
14	Mr. Houser, right to your questions.
15	(Witness sworn.)
16	Mr. Houser, please go ahead.
17	MR. HOUSER: Thank you.
18	
19	BRIAN KOCH
20	called as a witness on behalf of the Sanitary
21	District of Decatur, being first duly sworn, was
22	examined and testified as follows:
23	EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. HOUSER:

	14499
1	Q. Mr. Koch, can you please describe your
2	job title and responsibilities with the Illinois
3	EPA?
4	A. Sure. I'm an Environmental Protection
5	Specialist III. I work in the Water Quality
6	Standards Section within the Division of Water
7	Pollution Control and the Bureau of Water.
8	My main job duty is to develop toxic
9	space water quality standards and criteria, using
10	Illinois EPA methodology, as well as USEPA
11	methodology.
12	Q. Can you please describe your
13	educational background?
14	A. I have a Bachelor of Arts degree and a
15	Master of Science degree in Zoology.
16	Q. Can you please describe your history
17	and experience working with the Sanitary District
18	of Decatur's Proposal for Site Specific Rule for
19	Nickel?
20	A. I became involved, I believe, in 2010.
21	This is back when Decatur initially began
22	experimenting with the Biotic Ligand Model, and
23	I've been involved ever since.
24	Q. Is it true that you have been involved

	Page 19
1	on behalf of the Illinois EPA on many of the
2	conference calls, e-mail exchanges, and other
3	discussions between the District, USEPA, and
4	Illinois EPA, that have helped develop the
5	District's proposal?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. In your opinion, is the District's
8	Proposed Site Specific Water Quality Standard for
9	Nickel protective of the Sangamon River?
LO	A. Yes. I believe the Water Effect Ratio
11	of 2.5, as proposed by the District, would be
12	protective of the Sangamon River. I believe it's a
13	good representation of the actual toxicity of
14	nickel in that environment.
L5	Q. Okay. Thank you.
L 6	MR. HOUSER: Then, if I could, I would
17	like to follow up with Mr. Koch on some of the
18	Board's questions that were asked of other
19	witnesses to see if there are any other further
20	comments that could be provided.
21	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Houser,
22	please go ahead.
23	MR. HOUSER: And I'll just ask the

question over again from the Board's questions.

24

BY MR. HOUSER:

2.1

Q. Earlier, Mr. Santore testified in response to Board Questions Number 19 and 20, which were, Could you state when the current Illinois nickel chronic water quality standards for general use water was adopted and under which rulemaking?

And number 20, Could you explain why
the standard is so much lower than the criterion
recommended by USEPA and standards set by the other
states mentioned?

Did you agree with Mr. Santore's testimony in response to those two questions?

A. For the most part. For number 19, in regards to when the Illinois EPA general use chronic nickel standard was adopted or proposed, I believe you said 1993. Actually, we proposed that Rulemaking in 1999 and it was approved in 2003.

And then in regards to number 20, why
our standard is so much lower than USEPA and other
states, I do agree with Mr. Santore the reason for
the discrepancy is that Illinois EPA used
Ceriodaphnia dubia data, which, many of these
studies, the acute and chronic studies that we used
in our acute and chronic standards, were actually

May 16, 2018

Page 81

published at the end of 1992 and early 1993.

2.1

EPA had adopted their national criterion in 1995, but their literature review ended in December of 1992, so it appears that they just missed that window of when those papers were released.

I should also state that the USEPA national criterion uses an acute-to-chronic ratio for development of the chronic standard, whereas the Illinois EPA used a Tier 1 methodology.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

This was Board question number 28 asked, Has IEPA concurred with the anticipated NPDES permit limit or commented on how the Agency would determine the NPDES permit limit based on the proposed site specific water quality standard?

A. We have not provided anything in writing, but it's my understanding that we would use this site specific standard, the dissolved standard, back calculate to the total concentration of nickel, and apply that as an NPDES permit limit. So it would, in fact, serve as a water quality based effluent limit.

Q. And then this was Board question number

May 16, 2018

Page 82

32. Has either USEPA or IEPA provided comment on Decatur's revised proposal with a WER of 2.50?

2.1

A. Neither agency has provided written confirmation. However, I believe one of the exhibits -- and I can't recall which exhibit that was -- but it did show the back and forth discussions that Mr. Santore, EPA and IEPA personnel had in regards to development of the Water Effect Ratio, and it's my understanding that that conversation has essentially concluded our discussion on the Water Effect Ratio.

MR. HOUSER: And for the record, that would be -- I believe he's referring to Exhibit 45 that shows that exchange, and those are all the questions I have for Mr. Koch.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you,
Mr. Houser.

The Board has no follow-up questions for Mr. Koch. Is there anyone else or any other participant who has any follow-up questions based on his testimony?

Mr. Koch, neither seeing nor hearing any, I think we've concluded your testimony and we appreciate that.

May 16, 2018

Page 83 1 Mr. Houser, anything else that the 2 Sanitary District wishes to present at this point? MR. HOUSER: Other than answering the 3 4 final two Board questions, that's it. 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 6 think you had indicated you were prepared to take 7 those up right now? 8 MR. HOUSER: Yes. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: If you'd go 10 ahead, that would be great. Thank you. 11 District's Answers to Board's Final Questions MR. HOUSER: So in response to --12 13 Mr. Kluge will answer the question, but the 14 question 42 says, Please clarify whether the sample 15 collection protocols to demonstrate attainment of 16 chronic standards specified in Section 302.208(b) 17 still apply to proposed site specific chronic 18 nickel water quality standard. 19 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And Mr. Kluge, 2.0 you're still sworn in. Please feel free to go 2.1 ahead with your response. 22 MR. KLUGE: The District has not 23 proposed any change in the current Board Rules of 24 how those -- of how compliance with water quality

Received, Clerk's Office 5/23/2018 May 16, 2018

	Page 84
1	standards is demonstrated.
2	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up
3	questions for Mr. Kluge?
4	Not seeing or hearing any, Mr. Houser,
5	I would suspect you're going to turn to 43.
6	MR. HOUSER: I am going to turn to 43.
7	Asked to please comment on the
8	following changes to proposed site specific rule
9	language, and those changes are designated in the
10	question.
11	The District does not the District
12	agrees to the Board's proposed changes.
13	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any questions
14	either from Mr. Kluge or otherwise on the basis of
15	the District's position?
16	Neither seeing nor hearing any, I
17	appreciate your diligence in addressing those,
18	Mr. Houser. That's helpful, of course, in terms of
19	any Order the Board may adopt.
20	Anything else you wanted to bring up at
21	this point, Mr. Houser?
22	MR. HOUSER: No. Thank you.
23	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good.
24	I had, in going off the record in

May 16, 2018

Page 85 1 speaking about procedures, referred to our 2 requirement to request an Economic Impact Study. 3 I'll take a moment to address that before we turn 4 to a couple of deadlines and other procedural 5 issues. 6 Section 27(b) of the Environmental 7 Protection Act provides that the Board must request 8 that the Department of Commerce and Economic 9 Opportunity, DCEO, conduct an Economic Impact Study 10 of proposed rules before the Board adopts them. The Board then must make either the study or DCEO's 11 12 response and decision not to conduct one available 13 to the public at least 20 days before a public 14 hearing. 15 On January 28th, in a letter, the 16 Board's Chairman, Katie Papadimitriu, requested the 17 DCEO conduct this Economic Impact Study and 18 requested a Response no later than February 26th of 19 2018. The Board has received no response from DCEO 2.0 to this request. 2.1 Is there anyone present who wishes to 22 comment or testify, either on the Board's request 23 or the DCEO's response? 24 Unsurprisingly, I see no response and

May 16, 2018

Page 86 1 don't hear a response to that, so we can move on, 2 before we adjourn, to a couple of scheduling issues 3 and deadlines. 4 In going off the record, the District 5 and the Board had identified the following issues on which the District was helpfully committing to 6 7 provide some additional information. 8 In response to question number 1, 9 Mr. Kluge has indicated that he would submit a 10 translator study into the record. In response to question number 23, 11 12 Mr. Santore had agreed to provide an equation into 13 the record and provide some explanation for it. 14 In response to number 32, Mr. Santore, 15 again, had offered to provide into the record additional communications between the District and 16 17 the IEPA and USEPA. 18 And in response to question number 40, 19 Dr. Bloom had been willing to submit some 2.0 additional information into what had been submitted 2.1 to the Board as Exhibit Number 43. 22 Have I misstated or misunderstood any 23 of that? 24 Not seeing a negative response, I have,

May 16, 2018

Page 87 1 in addition to discussing the nature of those 2 responses, understand from the Sanitary District 3 that a 30-day deadline of Friday, June 16th --4 MR. HOUSER: 15th. 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: 15th. I'm sorry. 6 I stand corrected. A 30-day deadline of Friday, 7 June 15th, to submit that to the Board online 8 through its Clerk's Office Online was adequate time 9 to prepare that. 10 I also had let the IEPA know that we 11 had -- the Board would wish to hear IEPA's position 12 in response to what had been listed as Board 13 question number 15. It was originally directed to 14 Dr. -- or to Mr. Santore, and that was a question 15 specifically about IEPA's review of site specific standards, specifically under their triennial 16 17 review. 18 And I understand, Mr. Gradeless or 19 Ms. Terranova, that the same 30-day deadline of 20 Friday, June 16th, to submit a response --2.1 MS. TERRANOVA: 15th. 22 HEARING OFFICER FOX: 15th. 23 MS. TERRANOVA: You've got 16 on your 24 mind.

May 16, 2018

Page 88 1 HEARING OFFICER FOX: I hear that. Ι 2 apparently do. 3 That same 30-day deadline would be 4 adequate for the Agency to submit a Response in 5 writing to the Board. 6 Ms. Terranova is indicating, am I 7 correct, that that's acceptable? MS. TERRANOVA: 8 Yes. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Terranova, we 10 appreciate that very much and understand that you may not have precisely the correct witnesses today 11 12 to address any questions about that issue, so we 13 will look forward to seeing that on the same 14 deadline. 15 We had indicated to the Sanitary 16 District's counsel that the Board, on the basis of 17 the additional information that we receive from 18 them by that deadline, may trigger a few questions, 19 a few follow-up questions on the part of the Board, 20 and they had indicated that a seven-day deadline to 2.1 the 22nd of June would be acceptable, at which 22 point we can either submit those into the record or 23 indicate that we don't have any, so that we can put 24 that issue to rest.

2.1

May 16, 2018

Page 89

Have I left anything uncovered or left
any confusion on the part of any of the
participants at this point? Very good.

I believe our transcript will be ready
in five business days, which would bring us to next
Wednesday, the 23rd.

I want to assure the participants that
once we receive that, we will post it to our
Clerk's Office Online where it can, of course, be
viewed in its entirety, downloaded, printed and
fully accessible to you.

I think we have reached the point at which we can adjourn.

Have I left any other matters
unaddressed or any other questions left unanswered?

Seeing no responses and hearing none,
we can adjourn.

I certainly want to thank all of the witnesses -- including you, Mr. Koch, from the IEPA, of course -- for your testimony and your participation today. It was very helpful to us in developing a record on the Amended Proposal and we appreciate it.

With that, we can adjourn. Thank you

May 16, 2018

```
Page 90
     very much.
 1
 2
                    (Whereupon, the above-entitled
 3
                     proceedings were concluded 10:43
 4
                     a.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

May 16, 2018

```
1
     STATE OF ILLINOIS
                                  SS
                             )
 2.
     COUNTY OF MACON
 3
 4
              I, LISA HAHN PETERMAN, do hereby state that
 5
     I am a court reporter doing business in the State of
 6
     Illinois, County of Macon; that I reported by means
 7
     of machine shorthand the proceedings held in the
 8
     foregoing cause, and that the foregoing is a true and
 9
     correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as
     aforesaid.
10
11
12
13
                   Lisa Hahn Peterman, CSR, RMR
14
                   Notary Public, Macon County, Illinois
                   Illinois CSR No. 084-2149
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
```

A	21:10 87:1	80:20	83:11	9:22 13:22
a.m 1:14 90:4	additional 15:21	agreed 12:20 29:1	anticipated 19:21	area 14:17 17:9
	51:8,15 55:24	86:12	20:1,10,14 57:18	18:9,20 39:8,8
ability 17:13 able 21:20 33:9	57:11 65:7 66:15	agrees 84:12	60:3 81:13	69:1
	71:19 72:1 73:9	ahead 34:8 45:15	apologize 22:16	arrive 69:2,11
38:12 66:1 75:18	86:7,16,20 88:17	54:22 59:10 61:21	34:7,9	arriving 68:19
above-entitled 90:2	Additionally 75:11	63:11 69:22 73:17	apparently 88:2	Arts 78:14
Absolutely 39:18	address 12:22 85:3	77:3,16 79:22	appear 27:12	asked 32:11 37:15
abundance 76:3	88:12	83:10,21	appearance 28:18	42:16 43:21 44:5
accept 28:4	addressed 14:5	aids 46:7	Appearing 2:12,20	44:22 53:17 57:3
acceptable 18:14	63:2,7,12 65:5	algae 37:22	appears 43:7 63:11	57:17 58:4 62:14
88:7,21	addressing 84:17	Alisa 1:21 5:17	73:12 81:4	64:2,14 79:18
accepted 16:4	addressing 84.17 adequate 87:8 88:4	alkalinity 42:6		81:13 84:7
access 27:14	adequately 48:12	Allison 3:7 7:3	applicable 14:24	asking 17:12,15
accessible 89:11			application 68:21	48:23 62:22
acclimate 37:8	adjourn 8:14 30:15	13:14 35:1	applied 54:10	
acclimated 35:18	86:2 89:13,17,24	allow 10:4 15:21	apply 19:23 81:21 83:17	asks 36:6 37:4 38:4
acclimates 37:5	adjustment 16:3	59:5 71:3		assemblage 75:6 76:3
acclimation 36:4,7	Adm 1:5 5:7 9:24	allowance 62:5	applying 20:3	
36:12	10:4,8,14 18:1	allowed 71:14	appreciate 8:18	assemblages 13:5
account 17:16	69:8,18 70:4,15	allowing 11:1	10:23 11:5 22:14	75:8,13,24
50:22 57:12 61:3	70:19 73:10	altered 52:1	28:3,19 30:14	assert 71:4
61:6 73:1	ADM's 10:11 13:24	alternate 70:3,4,9	38:15 41:9 53:8	assessment 20:23
accounted 58:6	67:4 68:19 72:20	alternative 15:9	54:10 66:17 74:8	55:1 58:15 71:9
67:7 71:2	admission 22:5	alternatives 9:23	82:24 84:17 88:10	72:19
accounts 70:23	admit 22:11 23:7	41:3	89:23	assign 67:12
accurate 58:18,21	23:15,19 24:4,17	amended 6:18 9:7	appreciated 34:20	assigned 16:5 22:24
accurately 6:9	25:5,17 26:3,24	18:23 21:18,19	53:11	associated 9:23
58:11 59:1	admitted 4:2 5:21	30:1 33:15,19	appreciation 11:22	31:13 50:6 73:24
Acer 2:14	23:21 24:9,12,22	89:22	approached 59:11	assumed 68:16
achieve 9:19	24:24 25:10,13,23	amount 30:18	appropriately	assure 89:7
acknowledging	26:1,7,9 27:6,9	39:20 58:24	38:13	attached 21:19
52:21	admitting 27:4	amounts 17:14	approval 21:5,11	attainment 83:15
acronym 57:5	adopt 10:21 12:7	anaerobic 72:4	approve 12:8 21:20	attention 72:17
Act 16:14,17,19	16:18 21:7 84:19	analyses 21:13 30:8	approved 80:17	attribute 38:8
17:18 85:7	adopted 46:14 50:1	analysis 19:9 74:18	approximate 36:14	atypical 43:24
actively 15:23	54:18 55:12,18,22	analytical 40:10	approximately	audience 34:7
actual 60:8 79:13	80:6,15 81:2	analyzed 32:18	18:7 20:2 37:11	authority 16:18
acute 47:18 48:10	adopts 85:10	Anderson 1:13	67:22 72:9,20	authorize 15:11
80:23,24	adversely 9:14	answer 14:6 18:3	73:1	authorizes 14:20
acute-to-chronic	aforesaid 91:10	38:12 45:3 59:17	April 6:24 19:3,7	availability 61:4,5
81:8	agencies 19:1	68:24 69:11 76:8	23:13 65:12,13	61:7
add 47:2 50:23	agency 2:7 26:21	76:17 83:13	aquatic 9:15 13:4	available 10:4
61:18	81:14 82:3 88:4	answered 56:16	20:23 22:2 58:10	23:12 55:5 85:12
added 50:4	agree 28:6 62:10	answering 83:3	58:20	Avenue 2:7
addition 13:19	71:8 72:18 80:11	Answers 3:12	Archer-Daniels	average 15:3 51:20
	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>

]]]
aware 9:18 54:16	80:16 82:4,13	3:10,12 5:8,17,19	20:16 33:11 45:8	changes 42:24 84:8
64:23 69:4	89:4	7:20 10:23 14:22	45:9 48:3	84:9,12
B	belong 24:13	19:12 23:11 29:7	calendar 72:10	characteristic 39:2
	benchmark 73:4	29:15,20 31:7	call 32:21	42:10
B 4:1 46:17,17 47:1	best 17:6 30:10	35:1 41:17 63:20	called 9:6 61:23	characteristics
47:24 49:17	better 58:18	66:21 79:18,24	77:20	35:19 38:22
B-L-O-O-M 67:10	bioavailability	83:11 84:12 85:16	calls 66:5,6 79:2	characterize 58:12
Bachelor 78:14	51:24 58:16	85:22	carbon 37:6,17	characterized 59:1
back 55:9 62:20	Biological 13:2	Board-issued 21:5	40:7 74:23 75:16	chart 45:13 55:11
64:8,19 65:14	biotic 16:2 18:8	Bob 3:8 41:17	Cardwell 3:7 7:4	chemical 13:21
78:21 81:20 82:6	44:20 78:22	box 2:8 48:14,22,22	13:14 18:11 25:14	40:4
background 6:16	bit 42:1 43:4 45:23	49:2 53:5,22	25:15 34:21 35:1	chemistries 73:15
17:4 22:4 78:13	54:5	55:19	35:4,14 36:3,11	73:21
balance 67:14,17	blacked-out 73:20	boxes 48:7	37:4,8,15,19 38:4	chemistry 73:23
base 47:6	BLM 16:3 44:20	breeding 36:7	38:10 39:11,13	Chicago 2:3 27:11
based 10:20 16:2,7	blocked 73:14	Brenda 1:19 5:16	40:22 41:4,8,13	Chief 12:15
18:11,15,19 20:21	Bloom 3:9 7:4	Brian 3:11 77:11	Cardwell's 25:17	chose 55:23
21:8,16 30:23	13:20 25:14 26:2	77:19	Carter 1:19 5:16	chosen 41:2
31:20 32:6 34:2	66:19,21,22 67:9	brief 7:24 45:17	11:17	chronic 9:17 13:16
43:18 51:17 55:4	67:10 68:18,24	77:4	case 27:13 47:7	14:23 18:14 19:11
55:13 57:10 59:8	69:10,15,23 70:13	briefly 6:16 7:15	48:24 61:16	19:24 20:8,12
59:23 60:6,8,11	71:8,23 72:18	77:3	cases 28:18 48:5	41:6 47:19 48:10
61:22 62:16 63:19	73:5,7,18 74:4,7	bring 27:22 84:20	catalyst 69:19	51:12 56:2,3 80:5
67:14 74:6 81:15	86:19	89:5	72:22	80:15,23,24 81:9
81:23 82:20	Board 1:1,17,19,20	brings 17:6 74:2	catalysts 68:1,4	83:16,17
basically 73:13	2:2 5:2,12,13,14	broader 19:17	70:3,5,6	circumstances
basis 15:6 40:8	5:15,23,23,24	brought 18:12	cause 38:9 42:18	42:17 44:8
58:22 59:1,6 70:5	6:19,19 7:1 8:3	72:16	91:8	citation 33:23
76:8 84:14 88:16	9:10 10:12,21	Brown 2:19 14:10	ceased 70:11	cited 55:1 56:8
batch 56:13	11:17,17,22 12:7	built 63:24	Center 1:12	City 14:15
bear 5:22	15:11,15,20 16:4	Bureau 78:7	Cerio 56:7	Civic 1:12
began 29:18 78:21	16:11,17 17:13	business 89:5 91:5	Ceriodaphnia	Cladoceran 13:16
beginning 56:13	19:7,17 26:14,15		13:17 35:3,17	clarification 33:23
begins 41:15	27:14 28:16 32:11	<u>C</u>	36:12 56:3,4	35:7 61:19 75:20
begun 69:20	37:15 45:14 57:2	C 2:1	80:22	clarifications 76:7
behalf 2:12,20 7:2	57:21 58:3 62:14	C-O-L-O-M-B-O	certainly 7:24	clarify 6:1 22:20
11:19 23:6 24:3	64:14 66:12 74:4	75:3	30:12 66:5 74:7	23:9 27:10 43:17
24:17 25:5 28:16	74:13 76:10,15	calcium 39:7 42:4	89:18	48:22 54:2 65:4
77:20 79:1	80:3 81:12,24	calculate 31:5	CFR 21:6,10	65:11 83:14
believe 23:13 26:20	82:18 83:4,23	50:19 52:10 81:20	chain 64:1	clear 38:18 49:11
28:2 33:13 34:21	84:19 85:7,10,11	calculating 32:22	Chairman 1:18	clearest 29:13
44:1,12 50:9	85:19 86:5,21	calculation 33:9	85:16	clearly 21:22,24
54:19 56:16 60:11	87:7,11,12 88:5	43:12 45:5 51:10	chance 54:4	Clerk's 23:11 27:12
62:2 63:7 65:21	88:16,19	53:23 61:2 71:6	change 42:17,24	87:8 89:9
78:20 79:10,12	Board's 3:6,7,8,9	calculations 19:2	50:2 83:23	climate 43:3

			l	l
close 66:9	community 10:16	confusion 49:5	converted 16:21	50:22 54:24 80:8
closely 54:22	10:19 75:6,7,13	89:2	cookie-cutter 75:7	81:3,8
closer 54:6	company 13:11,22	conjunction 32:17	75:21	critical 32:21 33:1
Code 1:5 5:7	compare 72:14,14	conscious 6:8	cool 65:19	43:11,12 46:21,22
collaborating	comparisons 20:17	consider 38:24 51:3	coordinating 12:5	48:6 50:21
15:24	54:15	51:8 76:14	copies 22:10 26:20	CSR 1:10 91:13,14
colleague 38:12	complete 6:1 71:16	considerable 12:4	27:24	culminated 18:22
collected 30:9	completed 67:15	consideration	corn 67:4,8,13,21	cultured 36:13
collection 83:15	completing 15:18	10:23 50:4,24	67:23 68:20 69:5	current 16:23
Colombo 3:10 7:5	compliance 9:19	considered 43:10	72:23	19:18 20:6 54:16
13:1 18:6 24:15	10:12 15:7,9	61:11,14 73:11	Corporation 7:14	80:4 83:23
24:19 74:10,13	83:24	considering 51:6	9:5	currently 14:24
75:2,2,23 76:5	compliant 17:1	51:11 61:17	correct 22:16 35:4	30:11
column 37:24	comply 14:22 15:5	consistent 15:5	35:10 60:22 65:2	cycle 43:3
73:12	component 37:21	22:2 51:4,12	73:5 79:6 88:7,11	Cynthia 1:20 5:14
combination 71:3	39:6 42:3 50:3	55:13	91:9	
combined 72:21	composition 39:16	consists 30:7	corrected 87:6	<u>D</u>
come 8:19 27:19	43:7	constant 47:4,9	correctly 75:21	D 2:18 3:1
56:19 59:7	comprehensive	consult 27:17	correspond 25:1	Dan 14:9
comes 57:24 66:11	67:16	consultants 21:17	corresponding	DANIEL 2:19
comfort 12:8	comprises 37:16	consultation 18:21	73:16	daniel.siegfried
coming 67:4	concentration 41:1	18:24	costs 9:23 70:18	2:16
comment 3:4 7:12	41:5 72:7 81:20	consulting 13:10	counsel 26:16	darker 48:7
7:18 8:13,19	concentrations	contained 67:3,21	28:24 30:17 52:19	data 31:12,15 43:5
11:10 39:15 53:18	10:1 39:23 40:16	73:20	88:16	43:13 44:19 55:4
64:15 76:18 82:1	53:19 58:6 59:13	containing 45:7	country 43:1 69:9	55:4,24 56:4,7,8
84:7 85:22	74:23	context 19:17	County 1:11 9:5	80:22
commented 62:16	concerns 64:24	continue 10:11	91:2,6,14	date 7:1 23:14
81:14	concluded 82:10,23	12:20 15:21 72:3	couple 6:6 59:23	52:20
comments 10:24	90:3	77:6	85:4 86:2	dated 33:13
11:4 30:24 63:17	conclusions 74:16	continued 15:12	course 11:4 29:4	day 1:13 8:14 67:22
63:24 64:3,5,7,10	concurred 81:13	19:1 55:15	33:24 34:1 36:16	67:23 68:9,12,15
64:11,18 65:3,6,7	concurrence 62:15	continues 72:3	36:20 54:16 66:11	days 85:13 89:5
79:20	conditions 15:17	continuing 16:7	66:23 67:20 68:11	DCEO 85:9,17,19
Commerce 85:8	18:16 20:22 69:7	contribute 42:4	70:18 71:1 84:18	DCEO's 85:11,23
commercial 14:16	conduct 18:7 75:4	contributed 39:7	89:9,20	deadline 52:20 87:3
committing 86:6	85:9,12,17	71:20	court 6:5 8:23 28:1	87:6,19 88:3,14
common 44:13	conducted 21:13	contribution 10:8	28:3,9,14 29:9	88:18,20
commonly 9:6	confer 76:21	Control 1:1 2:2 5:2	77:2,5,12 91:5	deadlines 30:15
39:19	conference 66:5	9:10 78:7	covered 56:24	76:24 77:8 85:4
communication	79:2	conversation 66:3	created 16:15	86:3
64:1	confident 21:20	82:10	criteria 35:21 41:6	deal 36:5 63:22
communications	confirmation 82:4	conversations	45:23 46:13 55:14	70:13
86:16	confused 49:9	65:14	78:9	decades 46:12
communities 76:4	confusing 59:18	convert 53:3	criterion 16:3	Decatur 1:5,12,13

				3
2:21 5:7 6:18,21	17:24 20:22 21:16	discharged 58:24	16:5,20 17:7,9,20	<u> </u>
7:2 9:9,12 10:15	details 20:16 73:10	discharges 14:17	18:23 19:18 20:6	E 2:1,1 3:1 4:1 5:8
11:20 12:1 13:22	determination	14:20 15:12 17:14	26:19 27:20 28:13	47:4,6,9
14:14,15 23:6	58:11 71:7	17:20 31:6 67:2	28:17 29:21 31:9	e-mail 64:1 66:3
24:3,18 25:6,19	determine 33:10	discovered 56:6	31:13 61:24 70:16	79:2
26:17 27:2 48:15	40:24 58:9,16	discrepancy 80:21	71:21 72:8,16	
67:16 77:9,21	62:16 81:15	discuss 14:4 77:7	79:5,7 83:11	earlier 8:6 26:15
78:21	determined 32:5,20	discussed 20:17	84:15 88:16	28:22 56:20 80:2
Decatur's 78:18	58:17,21 62:1	48:20	dive 34:23 66:20	early 81:1
82:2	determines 31:16	discussing 7:14	Division 78:6	easily 6:9
Decatur-Macon	determining 57:4	28:24 87:1	DOC 37:9,11,17,20	East 2:7
9:5	57:18 62:4	discussion 82:11	37:23 38:21 39:22	Eastern 13:2 18:5
December 16:24	develop 59:5 78:8	discussions 12:5	40:3,6,8,10 42:9	EC 51:19
81:4	79:4	16:8 18:1 64:19	43:22 49:1,6,16	ecological 18:8
decision 6:2 85:12	developed 34:12	79:3 82:7	50:4,24 51:1,3,7,8	economic 7:14 9:4
decline 72:7	56:7 65:22	dissolved 31:9,13		17:19 85:2,8,9,17
		,	51:14,17,20,20 52:1 57:10	economically 10:3
decomposing 37:22 decrease 72:3	developing 13:12 49:24 89:22	32:16 37:6,17 48:16 53:1,2,19		economy 10:9
			docket 5:8,15 27:13 doctor 38:20	EDC 9:6,7,11 10:7
definition 60:7,10	development 7:14 9:5 12:4 16:1	53:23 57:14 58:5		edge 61:15
definitive 67:12		58:17,21 59:3,6	document 26:24	educational 78:13
degree 75:22,23	81:9 82:8	59:15 60:17 74:22	55:21	Edward 5:8
78:14,15	difference 58:5	74:22 75:16 81:19	documentation	effect 41:4 42:16
demonstrate 83:15	differences 74:20	District 1:4 2:20	21:22 65:18	51:3,7 57:4,9,9
demonstrated 9:12	different 34:12	5:6 6:17 7:2,23	documents 56:9	58:13 60:5 79:10
84:1	37:5,21 48:8,17	9:9,12 10:2,6,8,10	doing 46:11 70:19	82:9,11
demonstrates	49:19 50:7 55:7	10:15,22 11:19	91:5	effective 40:24
21:24	71:6	12:15,16,19 14:8	dollars 10:1	effectively 56:19
demonstrative	difficult 67:12	14:14,18 15:4,8	downloaded 89:10	64:1 68:19
45:19	digesters 72:4	15:10,19,23 16:9	downstream 13:6	effects 51:8 58:19
Department 13:1	diligence 84:17	16:24 17:12,15,24	44:21	64:16,24
85:8	diligent 13:24	19:1 20:7,24	Dr 13:1,20 18:6	effluent 10:6 15:1
dependent 43:3	diligently 12:12	21:17,19 23:6	24:15,18 26:2	37:10 59:4 60:6,8
depending 39:23	dilution 61:10,11	24:3,17 25:6,18	38:12 66:19,22	60:11 72:8 81:23
derivation 53:10	61:17 62:5	26:17,21 27:2,15	68:18 69:15 70:13	effort 15:6 19:10
derive 32:12	direct 29:24	28:24 30:6,8	73:7 74:4,7,10	efforts 9:19,20
derived 21:24	directed 6:23 66:13	31:15,24 32:18	76:5 86:19 87:14	10:11 12:17,22
67:15 68:8	73:7 87:13	33:13 63:23 67:3	drawn 74:17	13:24 70:10 71:20
describe 36:9 78:1	directly 40:5	77:9,21 78:17	Drive 2:14	72:20
78:12,16	Director 12:14,19	79:3,11 83:2,22	dry 71:15	either 6:2 61:3,6
described 52:24	13:14 30:5	84:11,11 86:4,6	dubia 13:17 35:3	64:14 82:1 84:14
description 45:18	discharge 10:2 13:7	86:16 87:2	56:4 80:22	85:11,22 88:22
designated 21:9	14:2 15:6 17:9,13	District's 3:12 7:12	duly 77:21	elaborate 41:22,24
22:1 74:11 84:9	18:19 29:22 31:13	7:19 8:3,4,6 9:19	duty 78:8	59:16 62:8
designed 5:24	59:7 62:1 70:16	12:11,21,22 13:6	dynamic 64:8	elaboration 39:12
detailed 13:15 17:5	71:21	13:12 15:2,12,16		63:14 69:21 73:16

74:24	46:15 54:9	25:12,18,24 26:3	facility 69:12	flow 61:12,17,24,24
electrofishing 75:4	especially 29:10	26:8 27:2,4,6,8	fact 76:22 81:22	folks 5:11
electronic 27:13	75:5	31:23 33:14,16,19	factor 51:4 61:9	follow 29:7 49:13
elevated 40:13	ESQ 2:10,11,18,18	34:10 45:7,10,19	factors 17:16 38:6	49:16 79:17
42:11	2:19,19	47:12 48:14 50:14	42:8 58:15	follow-up 31:19
eligibility 61:3,7	essentially 61:10,12	53:5,18 54:2	familiar 47:5	32:8 34:18 35:24
Elimination 29:22	82:10	55:20 63:22 70:14	fast 6:17	39:3 44:3,17 45:2
Embarras 76:2	established 15:1	73:8,24 82:5,13	feasibility 17:18	53:12 56:10 63:4
ended 81:4	establishes 21:23	86:21	feasible 10:3	63:19 66:14 69:13
engaged 17:24 18:7	estimate 67:5,6	exhibits 19:4,5	features 38:9	73:22 74:9 76:7
enjoy 35:13	71:18,24 72:12	21:18 22:6 26:10	February 6:22	82:18,20 84:2
entered 7:21 22:7	estimates 67:13	29:24 43:11 50:9	15:19 16:14 85:18	88:19
entirety 89:10	evaluate 18:13,17	50:12 62:3 82:5	federal 21:2	follow-ups 33:6
entitled 5:5 27:1	69:18 70:4	existing 9:16,20	feel 29:7 83:20	34:4 37:1,12 38:1
environment 10:18	evaluation 69:17	exp 47:7	feels 9:11	40:19 41:12 42:14
79:14	70:1	expansion 63:14	felt 59:18	43:18 59:22 71:11
environmental 2:7	evaluations 18:8	69:21	fertilizers 68:22	74:6
13:9,10 16:16	events 44:7	expect 35:22 42:23	field 20:20	following 21:5 84:8
17:17 78:4 85:6	evidence 23:21	expected 58:1,7	file 16:24 19:4	86:5
environmentally	24:12,24 25:13	62:15	27:11	follows 57:11 77:22
18:14	26:1,9 27:9	expeditiously 12:9	filed 6:18 9:8 16:9	foregoing 10:20
EPA 12:3 14:19	exact 35:15	experience 43:22	23:10 31:24	91:8,8
15:1,24 16:8 18:1	exactly 50:12 57:23	69:8 78:17	filing 18:23 19:4	foreseeable 42:19
18:22 30:10 31:14	EXAMINATION	experimenting	23:14	form 46:2,10,12,16
32:5,20,20 33:12	77:23	78:22	filings 33:2	47:10 49:19 50:1
36:13 41:7 46:11	examined 77:22	expertise 18:12	fill 10:16	50:7,8,12
47:14 49:24 55:7	examining 53:17	69:1	final 3:12 64:11	format 45:24 49:17
55:13,15,18,21	example 40:15 42:5	explain 32:11 48:12	73:7 76:10 83:4	former 12:18
56:8 58:14 60:10	42:22 43:2 49:20	58:4 80:7	83:11	formerly 30:5
62:20,23 64:12,19	55:8	explanation 31:2,3	finally 21:4	forth 17:16 62:20
65:3 66:7 78:3,10	Excel 47:7	52:8 54:23 73:17	Financial 12:15	64:8,19 65:15
79:1,4 80:14,21	excellent 52:4,8	86:13	find 76:1	82:6
81:2,10 82:7	59:20	explorations 70:9	finding 50:10	forward 7:16,17
EPA's 18:3	excerpt 46:8	explored 15:8,14	fine 6:7 18:13	8:19 88:13
episode 35:6	excess 71:13	exponent 47:3	firm 14:10	found 39:20
equal 60:4	exchange 68:5	exponentiation	first 6:11 29:10,23	four 20:6 36:4
equation 46:2,3,6,9	72:22 82:14	47:8	35:7 38:18 41:11	70:13
46:9,23 47:11,13	exchanges 79:2	expressing 11:21	43:17 46:7 48:21	Fox 1:10,18 2:5 3:3
47:23 48:2,8,13	Executive 12:14	extension 15:21	50:21 55:9 73:12	5:1,4 8:23 11:3,8
49:1,4,16,22	exhausts 76:6	16:5,11 extensive 13:3	74:15 77:21	22:9,13 23:5 24:2
50:13,15 51:1,8	exhibit 4:3,4,5,6,7	extensive 13.3	fish 13:5 75:6,7,13	24:16 25:4,16
51:16,22 52:9,13	4:8,9 19:5 22:22	$\overline{\mathbf{F}}$	75:24 76:3	26:13 28:2,8,15
57:4,10,18,20 86:12	23:8,16,19,20,23 24:5,9,11,13,19	facilities 10:12	fishes 75:17 fit 57:3 60:10	29:16 30:13,22 31:17 32:7 33:5
equations 45:14,21	24:3,9,11,13,19	68:20 72:15	five 34:2 89:5	33:17,21 34:17
Quations 45.14,21	24.22,23 23.7,10	30.20 , 2.10	11VE 34.4 07.3	JJ.11,41 J4.11
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

			_	-
35:2,5,24 37:1,12	gentleman 7:10	Н	39:14 40:18,21	23:19 24:1,8,15
38:1,14 39:10,14	gentleman's 7:13	H 4:1 46:23	41:8,18 42:13	24:16,22 25:3,5,9
40:18 41:8,18	geology 39:8 42:4	Hahn 1:10 91:4,13	43:15,20 44:3,16	25:15,16,22 26:7
42:13 43:15 44:3	42:11,23	half 40:9	45:2,4,15 52:18	26:12 27:19,23
44:16 45:2,15	give 45:16	hand 29:8	53:9,14 54:13,21	28:6,10,15 33:15
52:18 53:9 54:13	given 31:8	handle 75:18	56:10,12,17 57:1	33:17,19,22 52:21
54:21 56:10,17	gives 51:11 52:2	happily 28:4	57:15 58:1 59:9	76:12,19,20 77:14
57:1,15 58:1 59:9	giving 22:21	happy 14:4 38:17	59:21 60:1,24	77:16,17,24 79:16
59:21 60:24 61:20	go 40:15 45:13,15	54:3,7 63:15	61:20 62:6,12	79:21,23 80:1
62:6,12 63:3,9,18	46:22 52:23 61:21	73:22 76:13	63:3,5,9,18,21	82:12,17 83:1,3,8
64:13,21 65:9	69:22 73:17 76:20	hard 38:23,24,24	64:13,21 65:9	83:12 84:4,6,18
66:10,22 68:17	77:3,16 79:22	Hardness 20:4,9,13	66:10,22 68:17	84:21,22 87:4
69:3,13 70:12	83:9,20	32:11,19,21 33:1	69:3,13,15 70:12	Houser's 22:19
71:10 72:5 73:3,6	going 22:19 39:2	36:9,14,17,21,22	71:10 72:5 73:3,6	hydrologic 43:2
74:2,14 75:19	46:1 48:1 50:23	38:5,21,23 39:5,9	74:2,8,14 75:19	
76:5,22 79:21	56:17 67:18 84:5	41:20 42:2,3,9,23	76:5,9,22 79:21	
82:16 83:5,9,19	84:6,24 86:4	43:12,22 45:21	82:16,22 83:5,9	identified 18:19
84:2,13,23 87:5	good 5:1 10:15,17	46:2,15,19,20,21	83:19 84:2,4,13	35:16 67:19,24
87:22 88:1,9	11:18 22:9 26:13	46:22 48:6 49:3,7	84:16,23 85:14	72:13 86:5
foxt@ipcb.state.i	28:8 31:17 33:21	49:22 50:3,21,23	87:5,22 88:1,9	identify 6:12 29:11
2:4	35:4,6 39:10	51:7,11 74:22	89:16	IEPA 2:12 26:17
free 29:7 83:20	42:13,20 57:1	75:16	held 91:7	27:16 32:12 62:14
freshwater 13:5	62:12 63:3,9,18	health 36:19,24	help 29:13 72:2	64:15,20 65:4,19
Friday 87:3,6,20	65:9 71:10,24	hear 6:9 8:24 63:15	helped 79:4	77:11 81:13 82:1
front 8:20	79:13 83:5 84:23	86:1 87:11 88:1	helpful 6:14 33:23	82:7 86:17 87:10
full 52:9,13	89:3	heard 63:1	66:8 84:18 89:21	89:20
fully 20:17 89:11	gotcha 52:3	hearing 1:9 2:5 3:3	helpfully 86:6	IEPA's 44:6,14
function 47:8	governed 5:18	4:3,4,5,6,7,8,9 5:1	HeplerBroom 2:14	87:11,15
further 41:22 63:16	graciously 12:20	5:3,4,18 6:20,22	11:20	III 78:5
79:19	Gradeless 2:11	6:24 7:7,9,15 8:17	Herald 6:21	III 1:5 5:7
Furthermore 10:14	87:18	8:23 11:3,8,12,16	high 14:12 36:8	Illinois 1:1,12,13
future 17:19	grain 68:16 69:2,11	12:1 16:6 22:4,9	37:9 39:9 42:2,6	2:2,3,7,8,15 5:2
<u> </u>	Grand 2:7	22:13 23:5,8,16	75:22,23	9:9 10:10 12:3
$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}\mathbf$	granted 15:15	23:18,20 24:2,4,7	higher 19:12 20:5,6	13:2,23 14:19
G 2:10	16:12 19:7,20	24:9,11,16,19,21	42:7	15:1,24 16:8,16
Gary 1:12	24:8 25:9,22	24:23 25:4,6,8,12	highlight 74:19	17:17 18:1,3,5,22
general 9:16 14:23	great 6:10 8:24 9:2	25:16,18,21,24	history 49:23 78:16	30:10 31:14 32:5
19:13 46:2 54:17	32:7 36:23 44:16	26:3,6,7,8,13 27:1	Hodge 2:18 11:13	32:20,20 33:12
80:5,14	59:21 67:11 69:23	27:2,4,5,6,8,17	14:8 76:12	35:21 38:11 43:24
generally 12:16	71:23 73:18 83:10	28:2,8,15 29:16	honestly 44:13	46:5 47:13,17
36:4 74:15 75:18	greater 17:14	30:13,22 31:17,22	housekeeping	50:22 51:5,13
generate 45:10	green 48:7	32:7 33:5,17,21	71:16,20	54:15,16 55:22
46:5 48:9	Grove 2:14	34:6,17 35:2,5,24	Houser 2:18 3:5	56:6 60:9 62:1,20
generations 36:7	guess 49:8	36:2 37:1,3,12,14	11:13,16,20 22:10	62:23 69:6 75:5,8
36:16	guidance 51:5	38:1,3,14 39:10	22:12,13 23:1,5	75:12,17 78:2,10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

79:1,4 80:4,14,21	installed 68:6	17:23 87:3,7,20	laid 57:8	listed 47:17 48:11
81:10 91:1,6,14	intended 5:24 7:8	88:21	language 76:12	87:12
91:14	intending 6:23		84:9	lists 46:9
immediate 5:13	intent 8:7	K	largely 68:5	liter 15:3 19:19,22
impact 9:14 85:2,9	intercept 47:2,21	K 1:12	largest 9:21	20:3,4,10,11,13
85:17	47:24 48:5,9,17	K-L-U-G-E 30:4	law 16:15,21	20:15 21:1 32:14
implying 61:13	48:18 49:1,3,6	KATHERINE 2:18	lay 66:5	32:14 36:15 37:11
important 17:11	50:6,16 51:16	katherine.hodge	layperson's 31:3	40:2,16 50:19
58:15	interested 50:8	2:16	lead 5:14 19:20	60:4,14 61:2 72:9
importantly 22:18	interim 65:14	Kathy 14:8	leads 74:10	72:10
improved 71:16	introduced 36:18	Katie 85:16	leave 76:13	literature 55:23
include 12:13 46:16	introduction 7:23	keep 49:11	left 5:16 48:15	81:3
included 31:24	11:14 22:14	Kent 7:3 12:14	53:23 89:1,1,14	little 42:1 49:8 54:5
33:14 56:2,7	introductions 5:11	kind 44:7	89:15	66:9
includes 42:5	invertebrate 13:5	Kluge 3:6 7:3 12:18	legislation 16:15	Liu 1:21 5:17 11:18
including 17:18	investigation 15:22	13:13 24:1 29:3	let's 13:13 49:11	30:20,21 32:24
18:6 45:10 68:13	investigations	29:15,16 30:3,13	letter 33:12 85:15	33:4 34:7,9,16
89:19	70:15	31:1,7,18,23 32:4	level 14:12 33:1	39:14,15 48:14
incoming 67:7,13	involved 78:20,23	32:10,17,24 33:3	36:22 41:2 72:2	49:8,16,21 50:18
67:21 68:16	78:24	33:8,11,22 34:1	75:18	52:3,5,7,13,16,22
incomplete 59:18	involves 36:7	34:14,18,19 56:23	levels 18:19 20:19	53:7 54:4,8 56:15
increased 36:17,21	ion 68:5 72:22	61:18,20,22 62:6	36:8 37:5,9 41:20	60:13,20,23 63:7
increasingly 36:8	Iowa 47:17 55:12	83:13,19,22 84:3	43:22 74:22	65:11,17,24 66:8
incurred 70:18	Iowa's 20:8	84:14 86:9	life 9:15 58:10,20	74:1
Indiana 47:17	issue 41:19 69:5	Kluge's 24:4 30:24	Ligan 44:20	LLC 13:10
55:19,20	72:17 88:12,24	31:20 33:6 62:9	Ligand 16:2 78:22	local 10:9 60:9 69:7
Indiana's 20:12	issued 14:19	know 6:13 10:14	light 17:4	location 18:17
indicate 88:23	issues 39:4 40:20	28:18 29:8 30:14	likelihood 8:14	19:12 30:1
indicated 7:11 56:4	52:19 77:1,8 85:5	38:10 39:1,2,23	limestone 42:6	locations 44:21
62:14 69:16 70:21	86:2,5	40:1,6,9 42:1	limit 10:5 15:1,6	69:2,12
77:10 83:6 86:9	IX 68:5	44:13 50:9 62:21	19:18,21 20:2,6	log 46:18,24 49:17
88:15,20	т	62:24 65:24 68:2	20:11,14 31:5,10	66:7
indicates 35:10	$\frac{J}{\sqrt{2}}$	68:18 69:4 70:2	32:22,22 56:2	logarithm 46:10
indicating 88:6	J 2:5	87:10	57:19 58:23 59:4	logarithms 46:10
individuals 14:3	January 15:15	knowing 38:15	59:7,12 60:3,6,8	47:5,5,6,10
industrial 9:21	85:15	knowledge 30:10	60:11,19 61:2	logs 49:19
14:1,16	job 78:2,8	38:7	62:15,16 72:16	long 12:11 49:23
industry 70:8	Josh 11:20	known 56:5	81:14,15,21,23	long-term 75:4
information 5:19	Joshua 2:18 3:5	Koch 3:11 77:11,13	limits 32:13,15	look 46:1,4 50:11
30:16 51:3 54:1	joshua.houser@	77:19 78:1 79:17	33:10 58:7 61:22	54:5 55:23 58:23
59:7,19 73:14	2:17	82:15,19,22 89:19	62:4	70:3 75:11 88:13
86:7,20 88:17	July 15:16	L	line 47:21,22	looked 43:4,5,10,13
initially 78:21	jump 29:17	L 2:11,19	Lisa 1:10 91:4,13	56:18
input 12:6 44:19	jumping 54:21	laboratory 36:13	list 19:6 26:18	looking 58:24
inputs 68:8	June 15:10 16:10	iabuiatui y 30.13	28:23 73:14	59:10 63:11
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	1
lot 43:2 62:19 64:8	meet 10:5	22:15	multiply 52:24	32:16,23 34:15
low 61:23	Melissa 2:19 14:10	missed 81:5		35:21,23 40:24
lower 48:15 53:5	melissa.brown@	Mississippi 75:10	N	45:6 47:15 51:19
53:23,24 54:23	2:17	misstated 86:22	N 2:1 3:1	51:24 53:20 54:17
80:8,19	Member 1:19,20	misstatement 22:17	name 5:4 7:13 9:3	55:8,15 58:6,18
luck 35:6	5:14,15,16 11:17	misunderstood	11:20 22:15 29:13	67:2,6,14,16,20
	11:17	86:22	30:3 73:23	68:1,4,7,14,19
M	Members 1:17 5:23	mitigated 68:5	names 73:20	69:19 70:16,24
M-C-C-R-A-D-Y	Memo 43:12	mitigation 12:23	national 19:14,24	71:5,21 72:2,7,22
9:4	mention 42:2	mixing 61:4,8,13	20:19 29:21 81:2	73:15 78:19 79:9
machine 91:7	mentioned 28:22	61:16	81:8	79:14 80:5,15
Macon 1:11 91:2,6	42:2 49:23 70:23	Model 16:3 44:20	nationally 47:14	81:21 83:18
91:14	80:10	78:22	natural 37:16,20	nickel-based 70:6
macro 13:4	met 61:15	molasses 68:14	37:20 39:16,19,20	NOM 37:17 40:5,7
magnesium 39:7	metal 49:24 58:12	70:21 72:21	40:3,14 46:10,18	40:8,9,11 43:22
42:5	58:13,16,17,18,21	molecular 40:6	46:24 47:5,6,10	non-grain 67:24
main 13:6 15:13	59:2,8	moment 7:17 29:5	49:17,19	North 2:7
17:10 18:9 78:8	metallurgy 68:2,10	77:13 85:3	nature 45:19 87:1	notary 1:11 91:14
maintain 15:7	69:20 70:3,8,9	monitored 36:19	near 17:9	note 9:23 17:11
major 67:19	72:24	monitoring 39:24	nearby 14:15 19:15	noted 15:23 22:3
majority 37:23	metals 34:11 45:22	43:5,13	necessarily 54:10	31:23 63:24 72:6
making 71:7	46:13	monthly 15:3	necessary 55:6	notes 91:9
map 62:2	methodology 36:11	months 36:17,17	need 12:21 30:18	Notice 6:20
March 6:20 16:4	78:10,11 81:10	36:20	50:11 51:9,9 59:3	noticed 34:10
64:3	methods 21:13	morning 5:1 8:6	needed 17:2	November 6:19
marked 24:9 27:6	metropolitan 14:17	11:2,18 26:15	negative 86:24	9:10 18:24
mass 40:8	micrograms 50:19	motion 19:4,7	neighboring 47:14	NPDES 14:19 15:2
Master 78:15	microphones 6:7	22:19,19 23:15	neither 8:17 11:12	19:18,21 20:2,10
material 31:14	Midwestern 74:21	24:2,6,8,20 25:9	23:18 24:7,21	20:14 29:21 31:9
68:13	milligram 32:14	25:20,22 26:5	25:8,21 26:6 27:5	57:18 58:7 60:3
materials 69:19	milligrams 15:3	move 11:10,14 22:5	31:22 34:6 36:2	62:15 81:14,15,21
mathematical 50:7	19:19,21 20:3,4,9	26:19,24 28:7	37:3,14 38:3	number 4:2 5:9
matter 1:3 22:6	20:11,13,15 21:1	31:1 34:5,21	40:21 53:14 56:12	12:10 19:2 22:22
37:16,20 39:16,19	32:13 36:14 37:11	44:18 56:13 66:19	63:5 82:3,22	23:8,16,19,20,23
40:4	40:2,16 60:3,14	86:1	84:16	23:24 24:5,9,11
matters 18:12 77:9	61:2 72:9,10	moved 16:10 23:7	new 19:5 31:5 55:4	24:13,19,22,23
89:14	million 71:15	24:17 25:5,17	Newton 7:3 12:14	25:1,7,11,12,14
McCrady 3:4 7:13	millions 9:24	34:7	23:7	25:18,24 26:4,7,8
7:16 8:18,22 9:2,3	mind 5:22 24:14	moving 32:10 33:8	Newton's 23:3,15	26:20 27:3,6,8
11:3,7	87:24	43:16 54:14 60:24	nickel 9:17 10:1,5	29:17 31:1,20
means 91:6	mineral 39:6 42:3	68:17	14:1,24 15:2,12	32:10 33:6,9
measure 40:5,5,8	minerals 42:5	multiple 36:7	16:2,3 17:8,13,20	34:13 36:6 37:2
40:11	Minor 19:6	multiplied 46:18,24	18:15,19 19:14	37:13,15 38:4
measured 15:3	minutes 76:21	47:1 52:2	20:1,9,13 21:21	40:19,22 41:15,19
measurement 40:4	mispronounced	multiplier 51:4,15	31:5,8,9,10,12	42:15 43:16,21

44.5 10 45.5 7 10	21.17.22.7.22.5	4 10.4 15.0		H 26-0 20-5 21
44:5,19 45:5,7,10	31:17 32:7 33:5	options 10:4 15:9	participant 82:20	pH 36:9 38:5,21
46:12 52:23 53:13	33:17,21 34:17	15:14	participants 6:23	42:2,7,9
54:14,22 56:14	35:2,5,24 37:1,12	order 7:9,15 8:8	7:5 8:11 89:3,7	Ph.D 38:20
57:2,17 58:3	38:1,14 39:10,14	22:24 23:1 29:2	participated 66:6	phone 66:3
59:10 60:2 61:1	40:18 41:8,18	84:19	participation 66:7	phrase 61:13 75:20
62:13 63:13,22	42:13 43:15 44:3	Oregon 13:14	89:21	place 46:23
64:2,14 65:20,22	44:16 45:2,15	18:11	particular 17:9	placed 23:11,13
66:12,24 68:18	52:18 53:9 54:13	organic 37:6,16,17	18:2,12 19:11	plant 15:13 17:10
69:4,14 70:14,20	54:21 56:10,17	37:20 39:16,19	24:14 25:2 38:9	18:9 67:18 68:3
71:12 72:6 73:8,9	57:1,15 58:1 59:9	40:4 74:22,23	41:2	68:11 70:10,17
73:9 74:11 80:3,7	59:21 60:24 61:20	75:16	particularly 27:17	71:1 72:9,23
80:13,18 81:12,24	62:6,12 63:3,9,18	organism 35:17	31:3 70:14	playing 20:20
86:8,11,14,18,21	64:13,21 65:9	organisms 22:2	partner 13:9	Plaza 1:13
87:13	66:10,22 68:17	36:12,18,23 37:5	parts 51:10	please 5:22 6:6
numerical 8:8 29:2	69:3,13 70:12	37:9,22	pattern 43:9	24:1,15 29:7 30:2
numerous 15:9,17	71:10 72:5 73:3,6	organization 29:11	Paul 3:9 7:4 13:20	37:7 45:15 61:20
	74:2,14 75:19	organized 8:9	66:21 67:10	69:22 73:17 77:16
0	76:5,22 79:21	28:23	PCB 16:20	78:1,12,16 79:22
objection 23:17	82:16 83:5,9,19	original 16:9 17:23	pending 16:20	83:14,20 84:7
24:5,20 25:7,19	84:2,13,23 87:5	18:2 32:13	percent 40:7 41:2,4	point 8:14 13:7
26:4 27:3 63:1	87:22 88:1,9	originally 87:13	41:7 70:23 71:2,5	19:16 27:20 34:18
objections 23:10	oh 34:7	OSU 51:18	72:13 73:1	41:5,7 48:19
64:23 65:23	okay 8:22 30:3	output 71:5	percentage 67:6,12	50:10 71:14 76:23
observations 74:17	38:13 39:14 49:10	overseen 13:3	71:19	83:2 84:21 88:22
74:19	49:21 50:20 51:22		performed 13:15	89:3,12
obtain 31:11	60:23 73:6 79:15	P	18:17 29:20	pointed 71:12
obtained 57:19	81:11	P 2:1,1	Period 43:12	Pollutant 29:22
offer 7:11,18,23	once 28:10 89:8	P.O 2:8	permit 14:19 15:2,7	Pollution 1:1 2:2
8:13,19,20 11:9	one-year 15:20	page 50:14	19:18,21 20:2,11	5:2 9:9 78:7
11:15 14:12 26:11	ongoing 17:24	PAGES 3:2	20:14 29:21,22	polyose 68:3,11
63:15 71:18 73:17	online 23:11 87:7,8	panel 28:11	31:5,9 32:12,22	70:10 71:1 72:24
75:1	89:9	Papadimitriu	32:22 33:10 44:9	portion 31:12 49:3
offered 9:16 41:12	Opening 3:3,5	85:16	57:19 58:7,23	73:20
54:14 66:17 70:7	operating 10:11	paper 56:1	59:12 60:3,18	pose 6:12 77:10
70:7 86:15	68:3 72:15	papers 81:5	61:22 62:4,15	posed 5:23
Office 23:11 27:12	operation 16:21	parameter 45:11	72:16 81:14,15,21	position 84:15
87:8 89:9	70:11	46:16 47:1,2,20	personnel 82:8	87:11
officer 1:10 2:5 3:3	operations 12:22	47:21	pesticides 68:22	possible 29:14
5:1,5 6:22 7:9	67:5 68:11 70:6	parameters 46:3,4	Peterman 1:10	58:12
8:23 11:3,8,17	opinion 79:7	48:9	91:4,13	post 89:8
12:15 16:6 22:5,9	opportunities	pardon 60:2	petition 9:7 16:5,9	potential 9:22 61:7
22:13 23:5 24:2	64:18	part 43:1 44:14,15	16:20,22 17:2	68:23
24:16 25:4,16	Opportunity 85:9	48:18,20 65:3	18:23 21:18,19	pounds 67:22,23
26:13 28:2,8,15	opposed 49:7	69:17 70:1 80:13	30:1 33:15,20	68:9,12,15 71:15
29:16 30:13,22	option 17:6	88:19 89:2	petitioned 15:10,20	practice 44:14
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	option 17.0		pennonea 15.10,20	practice 77.17
		I	I	I

				_
precisely 31:4	proceedings 1:9	73:22 86:7,12,13	50:10 53:13,15	raise 29:8
88:11	90:3 91:7	86:15	54:14 56:14,18	raised 6:4 34:2,22
precision 18:13	process 13:21 14:2	provided 13:11	57:2,6,17 58:3	Randolph 2:2
predicted 58:2	36:3,6,10 37:4	30:12 35:9 57:20	59:10,12 60:1	range 40:1
preferable 27:23	64:8,20 68:8,10	64:15 79:20 81:17	61:1 62:13,23	ratio 51:5,23 52:1
preference 22:23	processed 67:3	82:1,3	64:2,13,22 66:12	57:4,9 64:24
23:22	68:2	provides 16:17	66:24 67:11 68:18	79:10 81:8 82:9
prefile 6:24	produce 47:15	47:8 85:7	69:1,4,11,24	82:11
prefiled 7:1,6,10,19	produced 55:7	public 1:11 3:4	70:20 71:11,23	Ration 64:16
7:21 14:3 22:5,7	product 65:5	7:12,18 8:13 11:9	72:6 73:7,13,19	rationale 21:9
23:4,7 24:4,18	Professor 13:1	16:14 23:12 85:13	74:11,15,18 76:6	Ratios 57:9
25:17 26:2 27:24	professors 18:5	85:13 91:14	79:24 81:12,24	raw 69:19
29:18 34:3 66:23	progressed 62:21	published 6:20	83:13,14 84:10	reach 35:12
67:1 71:13	prompt 44:8	55:4,17 81:1	86:8,11,18 87:13	reached 76:23
prepare 30:18 87:9	pronunciation 35:2	purpose 31:10	87:14	89:12
prepared 8:4 11:13	propagation 22:2	pursuant 16:19	questions 3:6,7,8,9	read 7:22 22:8
27:15 28:23 76:16	proposal 6:2,18	29:20	3:10,13 5:22 6:3	ready 27:18 28:4,7
83:6	7:12 11:23 12:5	put 8:5 51:17,21	8:2,4,10,15 11:11	28:9 77:5 89:4
preparing 6:14	12:12 17:7,12,23	88:23	14:6 18:4 26:18	really 67:14 72:16
presence 40:11	18:2 19:20 64:16		27:1,14 28:7,11	75:16
present 1:17 5:16	78:18 79:5 82:2	Q	28:21 29:7,15	reason 27:16 55:2
37:18 83:2 85:21	89:22	quality 9:13,17	30:20 31:20 34:2	80:20
President 9:4 13:20	proposed 1:4 5:6	11:24 13:4 14:23	34:18,22 35:1	reasonable 10:4
presume 26:3	10:5,22 19:6,10	16:1,18,22 17:1,8	36:1,4 39:3 41:15	reasonableness
pretty 43:7	44:24 48:15,18	18:15 19:11,24	41:17 44:17 53:13	17:19
previous 63:12	62:17 65:18 76:11	20:8,12 21:7,12	56:11,20 59:22	reasons 15:4 41:20
64:22	79:8,11 80:15,16	21:14,21,23 31:8	63:4,13,19,20,22	recall 82:5
previously 22:3	81:16 83:17,23	35:19,21 41:6	64:10,11 66:15,15	receive 26:22 88:17
65:13	84:8,12 85:10	43:1,9,14 44:5	66:21 69:14 70:13	89:8
primary 67:2	protect 21:9	45:6,23 46:13	74:3,9,13 76:11	received 7:1 65:6
printed 89:10	protected 9:15	54:17 55:14 56:9	76:11 77:10,14	85:19
Prior 17:22	35:23	59:14 60:4,6,8,11	79:18,24 80:3,12	recess 77:4
privileged 5:20	protecting 35:11	60:14,15 62:17 78:5,9 79:8 80:5	82:15,18,20 83:4	recognize 26:15
probably 56:15	protection 2:7 9:16	81:16,22 83:18,24	83:11 84:3,13	74:16
problem 54:12	16:17 17:18 20:23	quantify 40:3	88:12,18,19 89:15	recognizes 10:7
procedural 5:19	35:8,9,13 78:4	67:17	quickly 7:18 34:8	recommend 10:20
7:20 17:4 77:8	85:7	question 6:12 29:9	70:22	recommended
85:4	protective 18:18	29:17,23 30:23	quite 43:4 45:22,23	19:14,24 54:24
procedurally 8:15	58:10 79:9,12	31:23 32:8 35:7	56:24 66:4	55:14,18 80:9
procedures 85:1	protects 22:1	37:2,4,13 38:2,13	quote 21:8,9,13,15	record 5:21 6:1,1
proceed 29:2 49:15 72:3	protocols 83:15	40:19,22 41:1,14	R	6:15 7:16,22 8:21 11:5 19:3 22:21
proceeding 8:7	provide 6:13 7:21 10:9 13:23 19:17	41:23 42:21 43:16	$\overline{\mathbf{R}}$ 2:1	29:24 30:2,11
16:6,23 20:21	27:24 29:12 31:2	43:20 44:4,18	R-Y-A-N 9:3	33:14 45:17 48:20
21:18	42:6 57:21 66:2	45:5,8 49:14	R14-24 1:4 5:9 27:1	52:8 66:1,2,2
21.10	72.0 37.21 00.2	,		32.0 00.1,2,2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı

76:21 77:3,7	released 81:6	requires 21:10	51:16 55:5 62:24	78:18 84:8
82:12 84:24 86:4	relevant 5:20	Research 13:21	reviewing 11:23	rulemaking 5:5,9
86:10,13,15 88:22	relying 6:7	respect 38:7	reviews 31:15	6:18 17:3 80:6,17
89:22	remarks 3:3 7:24	respond 28:20 37:6	44:13	rules 5:19 7:20
reduce 10:1 69:18	remediation 73:15	76:14	revise 55:15	83:23 85:10
71:4	remember 22:15	responded 59:11	revised 19:4,5	ruling 16:10 48:19
reducing 14:1	32:24 47:23	64:5 65:8	20:24 21:11 55:6	running 8:10
70:16 72:24	removal 70:21,23	response 24:20	55:10,16 58:14	Ryan 3:4 7:13 9:3
reduction 71:2,21	71:14,14,19 72:4	25:7,19 26:4 27:3	64:15 82:2	<u> </u>
72:1 73:2	72:21	31:20 32:9 33:6	revision 18:14 19:6	
reductions 17:19	remove 72:22	36:1 37:2,13 38:2	65:11	S 2:1,19 4:1
71:17 72:12	removed 68:7,15	39:12 41:22 42:14	revisions 21:14	S-A-N-T-O-R-E
refer 57:20 68:23	repetitious 5:20	43:19 46:18 53:13	REX 2:11	38:19
reference 29:18	reply 65:19	53:20 56:11,18,19	rex.gradeless@ill	sake 6:5 45:17 52:7
51:17,18	REPORT 1:9	56:22 57:5 62:9	2:10	sample 83:14
referred 32:3 36:3	reported 91:6	63:5 66:11 76:15	right 5:13,15 8:21	sampled 35:16
40:23 69:17 70:17	reporter 6:5 8:24	80:3,12 83:12,21	11:8 12:13,14,18	samples 30:8 32:19
71:1 73:8 85:1	28:1,3,14 29:10	85:12,18,19,23,24	13:13 14:8 29:17	75:5
referring 45:18	77:2,12 91:5	86:1,8,11,14,18	34:23 52:15,17	sampling 13:3
82:13	reporter's 28:9	86:24 87:12,20	53:4,6,24 54:21	31:15 44:21
refers 44:19,20	77:5	88:4	65:16 66:20,20	Sangamon 9:14
45:5,6 47:7	reports 16:13	responses 34:20	77:14 83:7	13:3 14:18,21,24
refine 18:2 65:4	represent 29:12	40:19 41:9,12	river 9:14 13:4	15:13 17:20 18:9
refined 58:14	representation	59:23 63:12,24	14:18,21,24 15:13	18:16,20 20:3
reflect 6:2 53:19	58:19 79:13	64:10,22 65:22	17:21 18:9,16,20	30:9 35:12,16,19
reflected 7:8	representative	66:17 74:6,8 87:2	30:9 32:18 35:12	36:22 38:6,22
regarding 29:19	18:18	89:16	38:6,22 39:16	39:22 41:21 42:12
40:20 76:11	representatives	responsibilities	41:21 43:7,23	43:5,23 44:23
regards 80:14,18	12:3,11	78:2	44:23 50:23,24	51:21,24 74:18,20
82:8	represented 26:18	responsibility	51:21 74:18,21	75:12 79:9,12
region 42:10,12	representing 14:7	10:17	75:9,10,12 76:2	Sanitary 1:4 2:20
regional 20:20	represents 40:7	rest 68:13 88:24	79:9,12	5:6 6:17 7:2,12,19
regions 69:8	reproducing 36:23	result 19:9 20:1,10	River's 20:4	7:23 8:3,4 9:8,11
regular 44:14	reproduction 36:19	20:14 42:7 47:3	rivers 43:24 75:5,9	9:18 10:2,5,8,15
regulates 14:20	request 10:21	50:21 68:21	RMR 1:10 91:13	10:21 11:19 12:15
regulation 44:24	15:22 22:7 85:2,7	resulted 71:17	Robert 3:10 7:4,4	12:19 14:14 23:6
regulations 10:13	85:20,22	results 30:2,8 45:8	13:1,8 24:18 25:3	24:3,17 25:6,18
21:6 22:3	requested 15:16	48:7	38:19 74:13 75:2	26:16 27:2,15
regulatory 15:8	85:16,18	resuming 53:16	robust 75:13	28:13 30:5 63:23
relate 40:9	requesting 20:7	retired 30:4	roughly 20:5 29:1	77:9,20 78:17
related 40:12 54:22	21:11	return 27:11	routine 70:5	83:2 87:2 88:15
73:21 74:21 75:15	requests 65:3	review 6:17,21 44:7	rows 73:16	Santore 3:8 7:4
relating 77:8	requirement 16:12	44:8,15 81:3	rule 1:4,5 5:6 9:8	13:8,18 18:10
relatively 38:23	85:2	87:15,17	10:22 17:16,23	25:3 38:12,14,17
43:8	requirements 15:8	reviewed 44:6	18:24 21:6 76:12	38:19 39:18 41:14

41:17,24 42:15,20	85:24	side 48:15	44:9 87:5	spent 9:24 12:4
43:15,21 44:1,4	seeing 8:17 11:12	Siegfried 2:19 14:9	sound 21:8	spiking 40:23
44:12,18 45:1,12	23:18 24:7,21	signed 16:15	source 38:9,23	spreadsheet 52:11
45:20 48:21 49:10	25:8,21 26:6 27:5	significant 10:16	61:14 68:23	Springfield 2:8,15
49:18,22 50:20	31:22 34:6 36:2	28:19 64:18	sources 67:2,19,24	SS 91:1
52:4,6,12,14 53:4	37:3,14 38:3	similar 35:13 76:3	68:7 69:16	stable 43:8
53:9,15,21 54:7	40:21 41:13 43:20	77:9	soy 68:14 70:21	Staff 5:24 11:22
54:12,13,19 55:3	44:4 45:4 53:14	similarity 75:22,24	72:21	stand 87:6
56:12,23 57:7,15	56:12 60:1 63:5	simply 17:15 29:23	soybeans 67:4,7,13	standard 9:13,17
57:22 58:2,8 59:9	63:21 66:16 69:15	44:21	67:21,22 68:20	9:20 11:24 12:7
59:17,24 60:7,16	74:7 76:9 82:22	simulated 37:10	69:6	12:21 13:12 14:23
60:22 61:1,9 62:8	84:4,16 86:24	single 74:11 76:6	space 78:9	16:2,22 17:2,8
62:10,19 63:11,16	88:13 89:16	sit 54:5	speak 6:11 11:1	18:15 19:11,13,14
64:6 65:2,10,16	seek 70:2	site 1:4,5 5:6 9:8,12	12:16 29:10 62:23	19:24 20:8,12,24
65:21 66:4,10,16	seeking 20:24	10:22 11:23 12:7	speaking 85:1	21:12,14,21,23,24
80:2,20 82:7	seeks 9:13	12:21 13:12 16:1	Specialist 78:5	31:8 35:17 36:13
86:12,14 87:14	seen 39:24 40:14	16:9 17:3,7,12,15	species 18:18 20:23	37:10 41:5,7
Santore's 20:18	64:9,11 65:6,21	17:23 18:23 19:10	35:3,9,11,13,15	44:11 46:5 47:19
22:15 25:4,10	segment 41:21	19:19 20:22 21:5	35:20,22 36:8	48:16 50:5 51:5,6
43:18 63:5 80:11	sense 20:19 29:1	21:21 31:11 44:5	56:5	51:12,13 54:15,17
Santos 1:20 5:14	63:10	44:9,10,10,23	specific 1:4,5 5:6	54:23 55:8,10,16
11:17	sensitive 35:8,11,13	48:15,18 50:5	9:8,13 10:22	55:18,20,23 56:6
SARA 2:10	35:20,22 56:5	59:14 60:15 62:17	11:24 12:7,21	58:9,19,20 59:4
sara.terranova@	Separately 70:4	67:16 78:18 79:8	13:12 16:1,10	59:14 60:5,14,15
2:9	series 16:10 41:15	81:16,19 83:17	17:3,8,12,15,23	60:17,19,20 61:15
says 83:14	serve 81:22	84:8 87:15	18:16,24 19:10,19	62:18 79:8 80:8
schedule 15:17	set 17:16 27:24	six 7:2 28:12	20:22 21:5,21	80:15,19 81:9,16
scheduling 11:24	64:11 80:9	slight 43:8	31:11 34:15 35:18	81:19,20 83:18
86:2	sets 22:21	slightly 19:12 49:18	44:5,9,10,10,24	standards 16:19
Schubauer-Berig	seven-day 61:23	50:7	48:16,19 49:14	21:3,7 44:6,9 45:6
56:2	88:20	slope 46:17 47:1,20	50:5 59:14 60:15	46:14 47:15,16
science 13:10 78:15	shared 8:5 26:16	47:24 48:5,8,16	62:17,22 65:23	48:10 49:24 53:11
scientific 17:6 21:8	27:15 64:4,7	48:17,24 49:2,6	67:16 69:6 70:1	53:17 55:3,5 59:6
scribble 66:3	she'd 28:4	50:5,15 51:15	78:18 79:8 81:16	78:6,9 80:5,9,24
seasonal 42:24 43:6	shorthand 91:7,9	slowly 36:18	81:19 83:17 84:8	83:16 84:1 87:16
43:8	show 33:9 45:9	sludge 71:13,19	87:15	standpoint 39:1
seasonality 43:13	82:6	72:2,4	specifically 19:16	70:8
second 12:13 13:19	showing 47:18	snowy 43:1	45:7 62:22 66:13	start 23:3 61:5
Section 1:5 5:7	shown 33:12 46:16	social 10:17	69:5 73:8,21 74:3	state 1:11 10:9
16:16,19 17:17	47:20,21 48:6,7	soil 68:21 69:6	87:15,16	13:15 18:11 21:2
78:6 83:16 85:6	50:13,16,17 55:11	solely 5:24	specifics 18:20	21:6 46:5 47:17
see 8:12 13:13 23:2	shows 55:20 82:14	Solid 73:12	38:11	50:22 51:5,6,13
23:9 39:9 41:11	shut 68:12 70:11	soluble 70:24	specified 83:16	55:12 62:2 80:4
42:24 47:13 50:15	shutdown 70:24	sorbitol 72:23	spelled 30:4	81:7 91:1,4,5
52:20 55:24 79:19	72:24	sorry 29:20 33:18	spelling 6:13 29:12	stated 59:13,15

	İ	İ	ı	I
67:1	70:2	91:9	12:2 28:15,17	74:6,9 88:11
statement 3:5	substituted 48:2	takes 17:16	30:19 31:17 33:4	89:21
72:19	substitutions 48:4	talked 46:20,21	33:8,22 34:16,19	topic 21:4
states 19:15 21:7	succeed 17:3	talking 42:8 49:2	41:9 49:10 52:5	topics 14:5
21:12 46:14 47:14	Suite 2:3	tasks 15:18	53:7,10 57:16	total 31:10 32:15
48:11 49:24 54:8	sum 71:5	technical 1:21 5:17	59:20 62:6 65:9	32:23 53:1,19
55:1 80:10,20	summary 7:24	12:19 13:11 17:18	66:9,9,18 67:9	54:1 58:5 59:2,4,8
status 16:13,23	11:14 14:12	18:3 30:5 64:24	74:1 77:6,17	59:13 60:18 67:14
stays 16:11	supplemented 19:3	technically 10:3	79:15 81:11 82:16	81:20
step 7:16,17 8:18	supplied 26:20	technologies 73:10	83:10 84:22 89:18	touch 69:20
52:23 57:11,13	support 13:11	technology 68:6	89:24	touched 41:19
steps 71:4	15:22 21:14	tell 50:12	things 6:6	toxic 78:8
stewards 10:16,18	supported 13:17	tells 51:23	think 6:7 8:13,23	toxicity 13:16
stream 67:7 68:14	supporting 12:20	ten 20:5	11:13 23:1 27:19	18:18 35:17 55:4
70:22	21:22	ten-year 61:23	28:4 41:18 42:16	56:3 58:16 79:13
streams 67:15,17	supports 9:7 10:10	tend 42:7	53:21 54:8 55:9	transcribed 11:5
72:23 74:21 75:6	62:3	tends 42:4	56:15,23 59:18	transcript 27:18
Street 2:2	sure 30:17 38:17	terms 22:23 31:8	68:7 69:20 70:22	29:14 89:4 91:9
stretch 38:6 41:20	39:21 49:11 60:9	31:10 59:13,15	76:22 82:23 83:6	translate 52:9
43:23 44:22 74:20	64:9 69:23 73:18	60:9 75:15 76:3	89:12	57:13
strongly 10:10	75:2 78:4	84:18	third 13:8 31:23	translates 21:1
structure 40:6	surname 6:13	Terranova 2:10	thorough 18:8	translator 29:19
studies 9:21 13:2	Survey 62:2	87:19,21,23 88:6	20:22	30:7,24 31:4,11
13:16 70:2 80:23	survival 22:1	88:8,9	three 42:8 70:12	31:16 32:1,2,5,6
80:23	suspect 28:10 76:15	test 35:17 37:9 56:3	tied 42:22	32:18 34:11,12
study 13:14 17:5	84:5	testified 77:22 80:2	Tier 81:10	52:24 53:3,24
19:10 29:19 30:1	suspended 31:14	testify 6:23 12:13	Tim 5:4 12:18	57:3,8,12 59:5
30:2,7,11,24 31:4	swear 27:20 28:10	85:22	time 6:11 10:18	86:10
31:11 32:2,6,18	77:12	testimonies 46:8	11:1,6,23 12:4	translators 54:9
67:17,20 85:2,9	swearing 28:12	testimony 3:11 6:3	15:21 17:22 29:10	travel 28:19
85:11,17 86:10	sworn 28:13 77:15	6:24 7:1,6,10,19	30:18 43:6 45:23	treated 14:17
studying 13:24	77:21 83:20	7:21 11:10 13:24	58:14 72:1 87:8	treatment 10:4
subject 15:17 16:12	symbol 46:23 47:9 47:24 48:1	14:4,5,11 20:18 22:6,7,21 23:4,4,7	time-limited 16:18	14:2 67:18 70:17
44:23 submission 30:16	System 29:22	23:16,23 24:4,18	16:22 17:1 timeline 66:6	71:22 72:8 treats 14:14
submit 16:12 21:12	system 29.22 systems 37:20	25:5,10,17 26:2	times 20:5,6 46:18	trends 43:5,6
52:20 86:9,19	Systems 57.20	28:1 29:18,24	51:5 53:2	tributaries 75:8,9
87:7,20 88:4,22	T	34:3 35:8,10	Timothy 1:10,18	75:10,12,17 76:1
submitted 30:9	T 4:1	40:23 66:23 67:1	2:5 3:6 7:3 29:15	tried 63:2
32:19 43:11 63:23	table 50:17 73:9	69:16 70:14 71:13	title 78:2	triennial 44:6,15
86:20	take 22:19 28:11	72:6 74:9 80:12	today 5:18 6:4 7:7	87:16
Subsection 19:6	52:19,21,22 57:11	82:21,23 89:20	7:9 11:6 12:10	trigger 88:18
subsequent 32:14	77:2 83:6 85:3	testing 17:6 18:4,17	13:23 14:7,13	true 78:24 91:8
substantially 17:1	taken 1:9 11:23	18:21 41:6 51:18	17:7 27:4 28:18	try 58:11
substitute 69:18	61:10 72:20 77:4	thank 11:1,4,7,16	30:23 35:6 66:18	trying 50:2
Sanstitute 07.10	·	,	30.23 33.0 00.10	01 Jing 50.2
L	ı	ı	1	ı

7 10 0 2 14 11	(2.5		1 , 20,11,20,0	1 20 22
turn 7:18 8:2 14:11	62:5	versions 55:8	waters 38:11 39:9	28:23
22:18 38:4 41:14	uptake 68:20	versus 31:13	39:20 40:14,24	witnesses 7:3,6 8:3
47:12 50:8 77:13	use 9:16 14:23	Vice 13:20	51:18	8:5,6 26:19 27:1
84:5,6 85:3	19:13 21:9 22:1	view 23:12	way 5:10 6:16 8:16	27:21 28:13,17
turning 42:15	48:5 49:19,23	viewed 64:3 89:10	18:4 26:11 27:22	76:16 79:19 88:11
62:13	51:7,20 54:17	views 10:23	40:3,10,11 51:2	89:19
tutorial 53:10	59:6 71:6 80:6,14	villages 14:16	51:14 53:22 57:7	wondering 65:17
two 12:24 44:21	81:19	visual 46:7	72:14	work 9:1 13:17
46:7 71:4,15	useful 45:13	volume 6:8	ways 69:18	21:16 30:15 51:14
76:10 80:12 83:4	USEPA 12:6,8		we'll 6:7 7:16 23:19	62:21 65:5 78:5
type 40:1 73:23	15:24 16:8 18:1	W	30:15 46:4 49:11	worked 12:11 54:9
types 39:4 44:12	18:22 21:11,20	W 2:2	77:3,13	working 10:18
69:7	41:5 45:22 47:17	Wabash 75:9 76:2	we're 14:13 28:6	78:17
typical 43:23 44:2	54:24 64:4,14	walk 51:9	46:1 47:23 49:2	wrap 76:24
typically 37:16,19	65:14,19 78:10	walked 57:23	50:23 63:15	wraps 34:1
39:24 70:5	79:3 80:9,19 81:7	walking 53:8	we've 27:19 39:24	writing 8:5 52:9
	82:1 86:17	want 5:10 6:17	40:14 42:8,22	81:18 88:5
U	USEPA's 18:3	23:9 27:10 41:21	44:21 46:20,21	written 26:18 30:16
unable 15:5	19:14,23 21:4,6	48:21 52:22 59:15	65:6 66:4 76:23	76:15 82:3
unaddressed 89:15	users 9:22 14:16	61:15 89:7,18	82:23	
unanswered 89:15	uses 81:8	wanted 84:20	weather 43:3	X
uncovered 89:1	usual 46:10	waste 67:15,17	Wednesday 89:6	X 3:1 4:1
underlying 44:10	utilized 51:2	wastewater 14:1,15	welcome 5:2 52:6	Y
understand 87:2,18		14:18 67:18 70:17	went 7:15	Yeah 38:21 57:7
88:10	V	71:22 72:8	WER 57:5,13	
understanding	valuable 10:7	water 1:5 9:13,17	65:12 82:2	year 36:21 71:15 72:11 73:4
75:21 81:18 82:9	value 20:4 31:16	11:24 13:4 14:23	weren't 50:2	
undertaken 9:21	32:1,1,4,4,12	16:1,18,22 17:1,8	willing 38:15 86:19	years 17:5 18:7
36:10	34:14 46:22,22	18:15 19:11,24	willingness 8:18	71:16
unfamiliar 35:15	47:1 48:6 50:19	20:8,12 21:7,12	28:20 30:14,19	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$
Unfortunately 15:4	50:21 57:3,24	21:14,21,23 31:7	window 81:5	zero 62:1
unique 22:22	60:17,18 61:11,23	35:18,21 36:13,19	Windward 13:9,18	zinc 34:15
Unit 1:21 5:17	values 40:13 45:11	37:10,21,24 38:23	18:10	zone 61:4,8,13,16
University 13:2,15	48:9 50:16 55:12	38:24 39:1,6 41:6	winter 43:2	Zoology 78:15
18:6	55:21	42:24 43:9,14	wise 76:23	20010gy 70.13
Unsurprisingly	variance 15:11,16	44:5 45:6,22	wish 8:12 11:15	0
85:24	15:20 16:11,20	46:13,21 51:4	26:3,23 27:16,21	0.011 32:13
unusual 38:7,8	varies 39:20	54:17 55:14 56:8	29:6 62:8 87:11	0.015 15:2 19:18
39:5,9 40:14,17	various 15:4,18	57:4,9,9 59:14	wished 26:11 77:10	32:14
42:12 44:2	20:18 47:15 69:2	60:4,5,7,11,14,15	wishes 7:23 8:13	0.0382 19:21 21:1
unusually 26:14	69:12	61:14 62:2,17	11:9 83:2 85:21	60:3,13 61:2
updates 19:2	vegetation 37:23	64:16,24 78:5,6,7	witness 8:9,9 23:23	0.060 72:10
upper 49:2	vendor 73:20,23	78:9 79:8,10 80:5	25:2 34:5 64:17	0.120 72:9
upstream 13:6	verbatim 27:14	80:6 81:16,22	77:11,15,20	0.154 20:2,11
61:12,14,17,24	version 47:19 55:17	82:9,11 83:18,24	witness-by-witness	0.369 60:21
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	_		
0.465 20:15	2	28th 6:22 85:15	86:21
0.848 34:11,14	2 4:4 23:23,24 24:5	29 3:6 63:7,13,20	4340 2:14
0.966 32:1 34:13,15	24:10,11 31:1,21	2nd 6:20	45 19:5 63:22 82:13
57:3	2.33 65:13		46 19:5 31:24 45:7
084-2149 91:14	2.5 52:1,1 65:18,22	3	45:10 47:12 53:5
	65:23 79:11	3 4:5 24:13,19,22	53:18 71:5
1	2.50 64:16 65:1,12	24:23 50:14	49.2 67:22
1 1:12 4:3 23:8,16	82:2	30 18:24 63:8,13,20	
23:19,20 29:17	2.7 68:15	30-day 87:3,6,19	5
81:10 86:8	20 18:7 19:3 41:2,4	88:3	5 3:3 4:7 25:14,18
1.3 68:9	41:7 51:19 54:22	302.208(b) 83:16	25:24 33:9 69:14
1.9 68:12	65:12 80:3,7,18	302.208(e) 1:5 5:8	50 40:7 72:13 73:1
10 38:4 40:19 71:14	85:13	303.410 19:7	
10:43 90:3	2003 80:17	30s 40:15	6
100 2:2 36:14	2007 72:15,21 73:4	30th 6:19 9:10	6 4:8 26:4,7,8 40:1
1021 2:7	2007 72.13,21 73.4 2009 15:10 33:13	31 64:2	6.66 51:19
11 3:5 40:22 71:2	2010 15:15 72:11	312-814-3620 2:4	60601 2:3
11-500 2:3	78:20	31st 16:24	62711 2:15
12 15:16 40:1 41:15	2014 15:16,19 16:4	32 64:14 66:12 82:1	62794 2:8
41:19	16:10 17:24	86:14	66 3:9
13 42:15	2015 70:11	33 66:24 69:14	7
131.11 21:6	2017 6:19 9:10	34 68:18	
131.6 21:10	16:14 18:24	35 1:5 3:7 5:7 69:3	7 4:9 27:3,7,8 36:6
14 19:4 40:1 43:16	2018 1:14 6:21	69:4 70:23	37:2
43:21	16:24 19:3,8 64:3	359 20:4,9,13 33:1	74 3:10
14-111 16:21	85:19	38:23 48:6	77 3:11
14.75 51:12 52:2	20s 40:15	36 53:2	8
15 44:5 87:13	20th 65:13	36.9 50:19,20 52:2	83:437:4,13
15th 87:4,5,7,21,22	20 1 56:14,19	53:2	8.33 51:21
16 44:19 87:23	217-528-3674 2:15	37 70:20	8:30 1:14
16.6 51:22	217-782-5544 2:9	38 71:12	83 3:13
16th 1:13 87:3,20	22 57:2	38.5 16:16	05 5.15
17 45:5 53:13	22 37.2 22nd 88:21	38.5(c) 16:19	9
18 53:15	23 4:3 57:17 86:11	39 72:6	937:15 38:2
19 54:14 80:3,13	23rd 89:6		95 55:16
19.1 67:23	24 4:4,5 16:14 58:3	4	96 55:17
19276 2:8	25 4:6,7 19:8 59:10	4 4:6 25:1,7,11,12	99-937 16:14
1980 55:9	25th 6:24	32:10 33:7,14,16	
1986 55:10,10,13	26 4:8 60:2	33:19 34:10 69:14	
1992 81:1,4	26th 23:13 85:18	73:9	
1993 54:20 56:1	27 4:9 61:1	40 21:6,10 73:8	
80:16 81:1	27(a) 17:17	86:18	
1995 81:3	27(a) 17.17 27(b) 85:6	41 3:8 74:11	
1996 55:21	28 19:5 50:14 62:13	42 70:14 83:14	
1999 80:17	81:12	43 73:9,24 84:5,6	
	01.12		
	-	•	•