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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Good morning and welcome to this Illinois Pollution Control Board meeting. My name is Vanessa Horton and I am the Hearing Officer for this rulemaking proceeding entitled Rulemaking for the Proposed New 35 Illinois Administrative Code 845:

Standards for the Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals in Surface Impoundments. The Board docket number for this rulemaking is \(R\)--

MS. TIPSORD: Timeout.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Just to begin, could I ask everyone to mute themselves. We'll just give it one minute. We're muting everybody. Okay. I think we got it. All right. The Board docket number for this rulemaking is R20-19.

Also present from the Board today is on Webex Chair Barbara Flynn Currie and here in person is Member Carter and Board staff present here is General Counsel Marie Tipsord, rulemaking coordinator Shannon Bilbruck, myself and on Webex also is Anand Rao, Chief Environmental Scientist for the Board and Essence Brown, Environmental Scientist, as well as several
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
other attorneys for the Board.
This hearing is governed by the Board's procedural rules. All information that is relevant and that is not repetitious or privileged will be admitted into the record. Please bear in mind that any questions posed today by the Board and its staff are intended solely to help develop a clear and complete record for the Board's decision and do not reflect any decision on the proposal, testimony or other questions.

Due to COVID-19, in addition to the video conferencing, we're allowing Webex participation via computer and phone. As a reminder, pre-filed testimony is available to view on our clerk's office online, or COOL, through the Board's website. Simply search the docket number R20-19.

For the sake of our court reporter, please speak clearly and avoid speaking at the same time as another person so that we can help produce a clear transcript. For those participating via Webex on phone or using the call me feature for sound, if you want to speak during the hearing, please take your phone off
speakerphone and talk into the phone normally as it will produce a much clearer sound.

MS. BUGEL: I'm sorry to interrupt, but I am hearing from people online that they -that it's -- the volume is muddled.

MR. RAO: Vanessa, this is Anand.
We can hardly hear what you're saying.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Can you hear me any better now?

MR. RAO: I think they're having problems, too.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm testing the microphone here. Are you having -- is it any better if \(I\) speak this way?

MR. RAO: A little better now.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Sorry. I was not speaking directly into the microphone, but \(I\) shall do so now. All right. Continuing on.

Okay. So if you wish to speak, you will also have to unmute yourself. All individuals entering the Webex feed are muted upon entry. For those on a computer, you can click the microphone symbol to unmute yourself. For those
participating as a call-in user, you must press Star 6 on your keypad to unmute yourself. I would also like to note that there may be a slight delay in the Webex video. So please be mindful of that when communicating with each other.

If you are on video or
telephone, please identify yourself before speaking. This is a little bit difficult to get used to, but it is very important for our court reporter to be able to know who is speaking. If you need to get my attention and are participating via Webex, please use the chat function or the raised hand function and we will be able to call on you. Shannon is manning the host computer here. So she will be manning the chat and the raised hand function.

As we had in-person and Webex participants, these hearings will necessarily be a little slower than usual. Please bear with us. We are moving at a slower pace to make sure we are addressing everyone on video as well as making sure participants are not talking over each other as this makes it impossible for the court reporter to collect an accurate record.

 we are video recording today's hearing to ensure our court reporter is able to get an accurate transcript. Once the Board receives the transcript, the recording will be destroyed. As for the notice, hearings were initially scheduled for July and August, but due to a motion by parties to push back the date of the second hearing and a subsequent motion by IEPA to extend the date to pre-file answers, those initial dates were canceled.

On July 14, 2020, the first hearing was rescheduled for today, August 11 th, 2020. The Board published notice of this hearing on July 17th, 2020, in both the Springfield Journal Register and the Chicago Sun Times.

A Hearing Officer order directed participants intending to testify at this hearing to pre-file their testimony on June 2nd, 2020. On June 2nd, 2020, the Board received pre-filed testimony on behalf of the Agency by Stephanie Diers. No other participants pre-filed testimony. Pre-filed questions based on the pre-filed testimony were required to be filed with the Board
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by June 23rd, 2020. Public comments were also filed by -- were filed by Little Village Environmental Justice Organization on June 15th, 2020. Also on June 15th, public comments were filed jointly by the Environmental Law and Policy Center, Prairie Rivers Network and the Sierra Club.

> Pre-filed questions were filed on June 23rd, 2020, by the Board, the City of Springfield Office of Public Utilities, Little Village Environmental Justice Organization, Midwest Generation, Dynegy, Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club and Ameren.

On June 30th, 2020, based on the volume of pre-filed questions, IEPA requested and was granted an extension of time to file their written answers. Those answers were due on August 3rd, 2020. IEPA filed pre-filed answers on August 3rd, 2020, to questions from Little Village, ELPC, Prairie Rivers, Sierra Club, City of Springfield, IERG, Ameren and the Board.
```

On August 5th, 2020, IEPA filed

```
a supplement to their pre-filed answers which included answers to questions from Midwest Generation and Questions 1 through 84 from Dynegy. On August 6th, 2020, IEPA filed its second supplement to their pre-filed answers which included answers to the remaining questions raised by Dynegy.

Moving the mic even closer.
Hopefully this will be better. Okay. Now to the order of today's hearing, the Agency's pre-filed testimony. Section 104.424(f) of the Board's procedural rules provide that this pre-filed testimony will be entered into the record as if read, but the Agency may begin with a brief introduction or summary if it wishes to do so. We will then turn to questions
for Agency witnesses beginning with Section 845.100 and moving on section by section. I will follow the following order when asking for questions from participants. First, I will call on this group as a whole; Little Village Environmental Justice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club; second, I will call on Midwest Generation;
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]
third, City of Springfield; fourth, Dynegy; fifth, Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group; sixth, Ameren; seventh, Office of the Illinois Attorney General; eighth, the Pollution Control Board Technical Unit and Board members and then ninth, after all those questions, we can see if there is anyone else who did not pre-file testimony but would like to testify here today.

Under Section 102.424(g) of the Board's procedural rules, testimony that is not pre-filed is allowed as time permits and where it will not prejudice another participant. If as a participant you do not have any questions for IEPA witnesses on that particular section, just let me know and we will move on to the next group.

We have designated certain times during these hearings for public comment. The first will be tomorrow, August 12th, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Then the second designated time will be Thursday from noon to 1:30 p.m.

Are there any questions about the order of proceeding? Yes.

MS. BUGEL: Thank you, Vanessa. I do have two questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Can you
state your name first?
MS. BUGEL: Yes, Faith Bugel
representing Sierra Club. I do have two questions about procedures.

One is that Sierra Club
obviously is working in a coordinated manner with other organizations. As a result, we have multiple attorneys who may have questions for certain witnesses or on certain sections. When -when we have that situation, would you prefer us to go one attorney at a time and finish all their questions or would you prefer to go section by section and even subsection by subsection?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I think it would work best to go one attorney at a time just for audio purposes. We'll see how that goes and then if that's not working well, then we can switch it up.

MS. BUGEL: Very good.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Let's start that way.

MS. BUGEL: And one other question on the same point, similar point. If attorneys
have follow-up questions, in the past we have sort of jumped in during a hearing at the time that the relevant topic is being discussed.

Would you prefer that or would you rather wait for our turn or wait until the end?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Let's wait for your turn. Let's try that first. Let's wait for your turn and if there are significant follow-up questions after everyone has gone, perhaps you can call -- you know, raise your hand and we can address those.

MS. BUGEL: Okay. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes. MS. GALE: I have another request from -- sorry. My name is Kristen Gale. I'm here on behalf of Midwest Generation and my thing is they're still having a hard time hearing you. So if you can do your best effort to be next to the microphone, that would be great.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I mean, are they hearing better when I'm right here or do we think we should move the table entirely to be closer to the TV?
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MR. RAO: Can you repeat what you mentioned about the procedures in the last five minutes or so? We could hardly hear what you said.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Oh, dear.
I'll repeat that. Thank you very much.
MR. RAO: Thank you very much.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem.
So the Agency's pre-filed testimony, Section 104.424(f) of the Board's procedural rules provide that the pre-filed testimony will be entered into the record as if read, but the Agency may begin with a brief introduction or summary if it wishes to do so.

We will then turn to questions
for the Agency's witnesses beginning with Section 845.100 and moving on section by section. I will follow the following order when asking for questions from participants.

First, I will call on this group as a whole; Little Village Environmental Justice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Prairie Rivers Network and Sierra Club; second, Midwest Generation; third, City of Springfield; fourth,

Dynegy; fifth, Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group; sixth, Ameren; seventh, Office of the Illinois Attorney General; eighth, Pollution Control Board Technical Unit and Board members; and, ninth, after those questions we can see if there is anyone who did not pre-file testimony, but would like to testify here today. Under Section 102.424(g) of the Board's procedural rules, testimony that is not pre-filed is allowed as time permits and where it will not prejudice another participant.

MS. TIPSORD: Vanessa, I have a text that you need to slow down.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I shall
slow down now that you can hear me. Okay. If as a participant group you do not have any questions for IEPA witnesses on that particular section, just let me know and we will move on to the next group.

We have designated certain times during these hearings for public comments. First will be tomorrow, August 12th, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. -- 7:30. I'm sorry. Then the second designated time will be Thursday from noon to 1:30
p.m. And we had two or three questions here in the room about the order of proceedings.

The first was from Faith Bugel from Sierra Club who noted that she -- the groups asking questions at first are working together and how should they coordinate their questions and so they're going to be going attorney by attorney with their own questions and we'll see how that works and if that is working well, we'll proceed that way. If not, we'll switch it up. Then the second question I forget.

MS. TIPSORD: Follow-up.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Follow-up questions. Yes. So if at the end of all nine sets of questioners if there are follow-up questions, you can ask follow-up questions at the end of your own section and then at the end of the entire section we'll check back and see if there are follow-up questions and we'll see how that works with the first couple of sections and move on from there.

All right. Now, moving to
testimony. From the Agency, I believe the Agency witnesses will be as follows: William Buscher,

Lynn Dunaway, Amy Zimmer, Lauren Martin, Chris Pressnall, Robert Mathis, Darin Lecrone, Melinda Shaw.

Shannon, could you unmute the Agency's room?

MS. BILBRUCK: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We're just unmuting them right now. There we go. So would the witnesses from the Agency prefer to be sworn in as a panel? Sorry. I think you were unmuted there for a second in the White Oaks Room. Would the Agency witnesses prefer to be sworn in as a panel?

MS. ZEIVEL: Yes, please.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: All right.
Would the court reporter please swear in the Agency witnesses.

WHEREUPON:
WILLIAM BUSCHER, LYNN DUNAWAY, AMY ZIMMER, LAUREN MARTIN, CHRIS PRESSNALL, ROBERT MATHIS, DARIN LECRONE, MELINDA SHAW
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, deposeth and saith as follows: HEARING OFFICER HORTON: As a point
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of clarification, our court reporter would like everyone to identify themselves each time that they are speaking so that he will know who is speaking.

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine
Zeivel. We can't hear the court reporter.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. As
mentioned earlier, the pre-filed testimony is entered into the record as if read. Would the Agency like to have the witnesses pre-filed testimony made a hearing exhibit?

MS. ZEIVEL: Yes, please.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: For the record, is there any objection to this motion? Neither hearing nor seeing any, I grant the motion and am marking the Agency's pre-filed testimony as Exhibit 1 and entering it into the record.
(Document marked as Hearing
Exhibit No. 1 for
identification.)
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Does the
Agency wish to offer a brief introduction or summary?

MS. ZEIVEL: No introduction or
summary, but we are available to introduce and identify the Agency witnesses for the benefit of the hearing participants.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: That's great. Could you, in the room, go through and state your names.

MS. ZEIVEL: Absolutely. I'll
start. My name is Cristine Zeivel. I'm counsel for Illinois EPA.

MR. BUSCHER: Bill Buscher, Division of Public Water Supplies Groundwater Section.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway, Division
of Public Water Supplies Groundwater Section.
MR. LECRONE: Darin Lecrone,
Division of Water Pollution Control Permits.
MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin, Division
of Public Water Supplies Groundwater Section.
MS. SHAW: Melinda Shaw, Groundwater
Section.
MR. PRESSNALL: Chris Pressnall, Illinois EPA, Environmental Justice Coordinator.

MR. MATHIS: Bob Mathis, Bureau of
Land Financial Assurance Program.
MS. DIERS: Stephanie Diers, legal
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]
counsel for Illinois EPA.
MS. ZEIVEL: Did you hear all of us?
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm not going
to be able to hear their testimony all day.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We're just
coordinating the microphone here. Could you
reintroduce yourself one more time to see if that is better for our court reporter.

MS. ZEIVEL: Sure. Christine
Zeivel, Legal --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Much
better.
MS. ZEIVEL: -- counsel for Illinois
EPA.
MR. BUSCHER: Bill Buscher, Division
of Public Water Supplies Groundwater Section.
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway, Division
of Public Water Supplies Groundwater Section.
MR. LECRONE: Darin Lecrone,
Division of Water Pollution Control Permits.
MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin, Division
of Public Water Supplies Groundwater Section.
MS. SHAW: Melinda Shaw, Division of
Public Water Groundwater Section.
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]

MR. PRESSNALL: Chris Pressnall,
Environmental Justice Coordinator.
MR. MATHIS: Bob Mathis, Bureau of
Land Financial Assurance Program.
MS. DIERS: Stephanie Diers, legal counsel Illinois EPA.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Wonderful.
Did you have one participant via Webex?
MS. ZEIVEL: Correct. Her name
comes up under Gerard visually on the grid view, but, Amy, can you unmute yourself and introduce yourself.

MS. ZIMMER: Can you hear me?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. ZIMMER: Okay. Amy Zimmer,
Groundwater Section Public Water Supplies.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Great. Thank you, everyone.
So if the Agency is ready, we'll
proceed to questions. And we are starting with Section 845.100. So our first set of questioners is Little Village Environmental Justice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Prairie Rivers Network and Sierra Club.
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]
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different subparts of Part 100, then the different Agency witnesses can respond.

MS. CASSEL: Okay. Thank you very much. So my first question, and I apologize for not identifying myself, my name is Jennifer Cassel. I'm an attorney with Earthjustice on behalf of Prairie Rivers Network.

My first question is for Melinda
Shaw. Ms. Shaw, in your response to our Question 4 (e) on Page 17 of the pre-filed answers, you testified that CCR -- I quote "CCR surface impoundments not subject to Part 257 are not subject to the requirements of Part --

THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Cassel,
I think you might be shuffling some papers. I'm sorry, but that's picking up on the microphone.

MS. TIPSORD: Or the IEPA room.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Or perhaps the IEPA room is.

MR. MORE: Hearing Officer --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MR. MORE: -- would it be more
convenient if we enter the responses as exhibits?
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

I envision a lot of questions are going to relate to them. It may be easier just to say Page 17 of Exhibit X.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Certainly. We will enter the pre-filed answers as Exhibit Hearing 2.
(Document marked as Hearing Exhibit No. 2 for identification.)

MR. MORE: There's three sets. Can we do each one as separate? This is Josh More for Dynegy. I think that will be more efficient.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: So IEPA's first pre-filed answers will be Exhibit 2, the second Exhibit 3 and the third Exhibit 4.
(Document marked as Hearing
Exhibit No. 3-4 for
identification.)
MR. MORE: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Cassel, you can proceed. Sorry.

MS. CASSEL: Thanks very much. So to Ms. Shaw the Agency interprets -- my question is the Agency interprets legacy ponds, that is
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
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inactive ash ponds that plan no longer burning coal as of October 2015, to be subject to Part 845, is that correct?

MS. ZEIVEL: Just for a point of clarification from the Agency, if a certain question is directed at a particular witness that another witness here or Amy would like to respond, we are responding as a panel. So if it is directed to a particular person, I have directed the Agency witnesses that anybody may respond.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Understood.
MS. CASSEL: Yes, sure. So my question is the Agency interprets what are known as legacy ponds, that is inactive ash ponds that plan no longer burning coal as of October 19th, 2015, to be subject to Part 845 , is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: I --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: If you are responding, please state your name.

MR. DUNAWAY: Sorry. Lynn Dunaway. Yes.

MS. CASSEL: Second question. Does the Agency interpret CCR surface impoundments that were closed prior to October 19th, 2015, under an

Agency-approved closure plan, but have not completed postclosure care to be subject to 845 as well?

MR. DUNAWAY: They are -- those
would be considered inactive -- I'm sorry. Lynn Dunaway. Those are inactive closed CCR surface impoundments. They are regulated under 845.170.

MS. CASSEL: They are subject then to Part 845 under the provision set forth therein?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway.
Correct.
MS. CASSEL: Okay. Thank you very much. Those were all the questions that I had for Section 845.100, Hearing Officer.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you,
Ms. Cassel. Next, Ms. Bugel, would be?
MS. BUGEL: I believe that is all of our questions for 845.100.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
MS. BUGEL: So we'll move on.
MS. GALE: Yes, I'm going to get a
microphone. Okie dokie. Does that work? This is Kristen Gale on behalf of Midwest Generation.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I can hear
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you fine.
MS. GALE: Great. My first question
is actually related to the statement of facts. It's actually based on a question that the environmental groups posed.

So in the Agency's answer on
Page 26 of Exhibit 1, the Agency identified various CCR surface impoundments that it believed had some sort of liner.

Is the Agency aware that the two CCR surface impoundments at Waukegan also have a synthetic liner and have had that liner since the 1970's?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. I am aware that the east pond and the west pond at Waukegan do have a synthetic liner.

MS. GALE: Great. Thank you.
Moving on to Exhibit 2, the Agency's answers to Midwest Generation's questions. Sorry.

Exhibit -- no, 2 -- 3. Exhibit 3.
On Page 6 of the answers,
Question 4, the Agency states that its authority to identify CCR surface impoundments is its authority to permit water treatment units, what --
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
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where is that authority coming from?
MR. BUSCHER: This is Bill Buscher.
The authority to identify those actually comes from the act at 22.59. We do administer a permit program. So we are aware of such types of impoundments that exist.

MS. GALE: Right, and they were
permitted as part of the NPDES permit program, is that what you mean?

MR. BUSCHER: That is correct.
MS. GALE: Question 7 on Page 7.
Midwest Generation asked what were an owner/operators options to challenge the Agency's determination and the Agency answered "The owners/operators will need to determine their options," what does the Agency mean by that?

MR. BUSCHER: Bill Buscher. You have options relative to addressing that issue of concern. Can you repeat the question?

MS. GALE: Sure. So it's really in reference to the Agency's answer which says, "The Agency's answer to Question 7 which asked what were an owners/operators options to challenge the Agency's determination."
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questions. So on Exhibit 2, Page 133 -- I'll give everyone a minute.

The question is related to
Question 17 and CWLP asked if a facility could use the same web page for both sets of information from Illinois and from the federal rule and the Agency states that they intended that the CCR website to be dedicated only to the information required by 845.

My question is, does the Agency
believe there should be two websites?
MS. SHAW: Melinda Shaw. Yes, it is
the Agency's intent that there be two websites. One we clearly identified that -- the Illinois CCR rule, compliance data and information.

MS. GALE: Won't that contribute to confusion to the public to have two sources of information?

MS. SHAW: I think if it's clearly identified, it won't be confusing.

MS. GALE: I guess -- was there
more?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I think
they're conferring.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

MS. GALE: Okay. I'm sorry. Is
there more or were you finished with the answer?
MS. SHAW: That was the answer.
MS. GALE: Thanks. Why does the Agency -- why can't the website that the entities have already established cover the common requirements and for any requirements that are Illinois specific just have a separate part and have one website for the public to be able to go to for all of the relevant information?

MS. SHAW: Our Agency is responsible for looking at the information that pertains to Part 845, not necessarily all of 257 as well.

MS. GALE: Just so I understand the reason for the two websites is so the Agency is able to look at what is just for Part 845?

MS. SHAW: Well, this is -- this is Melinda Shaw. Sorry. This is to satisfy the part of 845 .

MS. GALE: Again, this is just a reminder, but the satisfy the part of 845 is for public information. Where I'm going with that is wouldn't it be simpler for the public to have one source of information?
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MS. SHAW: The Agency is responsible for -- combined with 845.

MS. GALE: Okay. Back to my earlier questions about the Agency's answers about the options available to entities who dispute/disagree with the Agency's determination of CCR surface impoundments.

Does the Agency have a
preference as to which option an entity would pursue?

MR. BUSCHER: No. This is Bill Buscher. No.

MS. GALE: I have nothing further for this part.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you, Ms. Gale. Moving on to City of Springfield who I believe is -- okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm going to use this as a test to see if you can hear me. This is Deborah Williams appearing on behalf of the City of Springfield. I don't have any questions on 845.100. Are we doing all the 100 's now?

I got a little -- I know the
question that was just asked by Midwest Generation
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I would have put under a much later section. So I just want to make sure that I'm not missing an opportunity that -- I don't know if we're talking about all the 100's or just Section 100.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes, just 100.

MS. GALE: Sorry.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes, no
problem.
MS. WILLIAMS: So I have nothing on the purpose and scope. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: It's a learning curve here. So just purpose and scope right now. So, Dynegy.

MR. MORE: Josh More on behalf of Dynegy. Before we get to our specific questions, I was wondering if \(I\) could do a follow up to the questions that Ms. Gale just asked. I thought since it's fresh in the Agency's mind I would start with that if that's all right.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: And if it's on purpose and scope, then that's fine, yes. MR. MORE: It is. Well, it's a
follow up to the question about the website.
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or keep that --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Let's hold that if that's -- that's in a later section, correct?

MR. MORE: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
MR. MORE: It's tied to the purpose and scope in the sense that if the purpose is compliance with the CCR rule, that helps determine what obligations arise in connection with your CCR website and I think that's why Ms. Gale was asking it in this context.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'll allow it and then let's try and focus on specific sections moving forward.

MR. MORE: Yeah, that's fair. Thank you. So, again, Josh More on behalf of Dynegy.

First question for the Agency.
Is 845 intended to operate in lieu of the CCR rule 40 CFR 257?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. That is the intent once we have approval from U.S. EPA. However, that has to happen first before it can be
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in lieu of Part 257.
MR. MORE: Thank you. Once you have approval from U.S. EPA, is compliance with Part 845 deemed compliance with the CCR rule?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. That, we don't know. I mean, that's a federal program. So we're not sure exactly how that works since we don't have approval.

MR. MORE: Okay. But the
expectation would be once you have approval, the owner/operator will be subject to -- the objective is to be subject to 845 and not worry about any conflicting or differing requirements under the CCR rule. They will be focusing on complying with 845, much like what you see in the air program with the SIP-approved requirement.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. I'm not familiar with the air program, but it is our goal that, yes, you would just be subject to 845 .

MR. MORE: Okay. So, at that time, once we have approval, would it make sense to only have a single website demonstrating all the requirements under 845 because there's differing requirements on what is on a website under the CCR
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rule. At that time, would an owner/operator be able to go to a single website?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. That would be our goal, but, as I said, I just don't know how the program will work with U.S. EPA.

MR. MORE: Thank you. I'm now going to turn it over to Mr . Bonebrake to ask our specific questions concerning applicability.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Good morning. Steve Bonebrake for a number of Dynegy affiliates. I appreciate the opportunity to ask some questions of IEPA this morning. I have a number of questions pertaining to Section 845.100 , but some of the provisions in that section are also defined terms within Section 845.120. So I thought it'd be most efficient in asking my questions about 845.100 I also picked up some of the remaining -MR. CARTER: One second. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We got it.

Okay.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Pertaining to the definitions of the terms that are referenced in 845.100 if that's okay with the Hearing Officer. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I think
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that's okay.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Thank you. And my questions based upon my review of the testimony was not clear with respect to whom at IEPA might be most equipped to respond. So I'll address them to the panel of IEPA folks and they can then respond as appropriate.

With respect to Section 845.100, which appears to be essentially an applicability provision, is this section intended to identify the categories of \(C C R\) units that are covered by Part 845 as proposed and also expressly identify some units and uses that are not covered by proposed 845? One moment. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. If I -could you repeat your question again, please?

MR. BONEBRAKE: Sure. The question was with respect to Section 845.100 , is that section intended to identify the CCR units that will be subject to proposed Part 845 as well as expressly identify some units and uses that would not be subject to requirements under proposed Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
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```

(C) and (D).

```

MR. BONEBRAKE: In the units -- CCR units that are subject to the requirements of proposed Part 845, are they identified in Subsection's B and C of 845.100?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Those CCR surface impoundments are identified in \(100(\mathrm{~b})\),

MR. BONEBRAKE: I'm sorry. Did you say (D) as well?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Okay. Thank you.
Are there any CCR units other than those identified in Subsection's B, C and D of 845.100 that would be subject to any requirement under Part 845 as proposed?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Let's move first to Subsection B. Subsection B refers to new and existing CCR surface impoundments. Subsection C refers to inactive CCR surface impoundments and Subsection D refers to inactive CCR surface impoundments.

So all three subsections refer to CCR surface impoundments. So is it correct
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that a CCR unit must first be a CCR surface impoundment to be considered subject to any requirement under proposed Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: And CCR surface
impoundment is defined in Section 845.120, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: And if we look at that definition in 845.120, there is a reference to 415 ILCS 5- -- excuse me. 5/3.143.

What is that statutory reference
to?
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. That is
Section 3.143 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.

MR. BONEBRAKE: And was that section added by a recently adopted statute in Illinois that is the driver for this rulemaking?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Okay. I'll refer to that recent Illinois statute as the Illinois CCR Act today, is that okay with the IEPA panel? MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
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MR. BONEBRAKE: So is it correct that the Illinois CCR Act in proposed Part 845 defines CCR surface impoundment in identical ways? MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes. MR. BONEBRAKE: And you are familiar with the federal CCR rule Part 257, which is the driver for this rulemaking and is it correct that that Part 257 also defines the term CCR surface impoundment?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: And does Part 257
define surface impoundment in a manner identical to the definition included in proposed Part 845, Section 120?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: So is it IEPA's
intent that its proposed Part 845 rules, like the Illinois CCR Act, will define CCR surface impoundments all in the same way?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. All CCR surface impoundments will be defined the same way.

MR. BONEBRAKE: And is it also
correct then that IEPA's view is that the federal rules in Part 257 and the proposed state rules in
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Part 845 will apply to the same CCR surface impoundments?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Section 22.59 of the act identifies two types of CCR surface impoundments and those are existing and those are new ones. Existing ones under 22.59 of the act is any CCR surface impoundment created after the executive date of the act and new ones are any created after the --

THE COURT REPORTER: Created what?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Would you repeat that, just the last part. Create what?

MR. DUNAWAY: New -- new CCR surface impoundments or any CCR surface impoundment created after the executive date of 22.59 of the act.

MR. BONEBRAKE: I think my question was a little different in that my question was is Part 845 intended to apply to the same ponds that are subject to requirements under Part 257 given that they both define CCR surface impoundments in an identical fashion?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. In the Agency's opinion, they will be the same ones.
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\(\square\) correct that it is IEPA's view that the CCR surface impoundments that will be part of 845 requirements are the same CCR surface impoundments that would be subject to a fee under the CCR surface -- excuse me -- CCR Act?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Could you repeat that, please?

MR. BONEBRAKE: Sure. Is it the position of IEPA that the CCR surface impoundments that are regulated under Part 845 are the same CCR surface impoundments that are subject to fees under the Illinois CCR Act?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. These are not part of 845. However, the act does require that the CCR surface impoundments --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: One second.
MR. DUNAWAY: -- under this rule do have to pay a fee.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Could you repeat? Sorry. There was some interference.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Thank you.
MR. DUNAWAY: Fees are not part of this rule. However, all CCR surface impoundments
require a paid fee.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Is it IEPA's intent then if a CCR surface impoundment is regulated under Part 845, the owner/operator must pay a fee under the Illinois CCR Act, but if the CCR pond is not regulated under Part 845, no fee -- no fee is due?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No.
MR. BONEBRAKE: I'm sorry. Did you say no?

MR. DUNAWAY: Correct. I said no.
MR. BONEBRAKE: So could you explain your negative answer to that question why you answered that question no?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine
Zeivel. The Agency is going to object to this line of questioning. The fees are not subject of 845. There is ongoing outside pending litigation regarding the subject of fees. We will provide -the Agency witnesses will provide responses regarding the interpretation of the definitions of the rule.

However, the application to the assessment of fees is a decision that is made
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outside of Part 845.
MR. BONEBRAKE: A follow-up question
then. Is the decision regarding fees then by IEPA under the Illinois CCR Act determinative of whether the CCR surface impoundment is subject to Part 845 requirements?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: So if the Agency is
taking the position that the fee decision under the act is a determination regarding applicability under Part 845, I think the objection regarding the scope of questioning is inappropriate and should be overruled because we're asking questions --

MS. ZEIVEL: The interpretation --
MR. BONEBRAKE: -- of 845.
MS. ZEIVEL: The Agency's objection was not about nor did we -- nor did the response Mr. Dunaway give speak to the applicability of the Agency's decision to 845. It's an interpretation of whether the Agency defined the statutory directive under the same way that 845 will be applied. The answer was a directive of yes.

That's an Agency interpretation
of a statutory mandate that is happening outside of the 845 context.

The question was directed as to whether the Agency would similarly apply 845 to those state entities and the answer was yes, but the Agency would object to the characterization of the fee determination determining applicability of 845. One does not beget the other.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'll sustain the objection.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Just as a matter of clarity, because that was a speaking objection, is it IEPA's position that the decision on fees is not determinative of applicability under Part 845 because I understand it's the basis of the objection, but I'm trying to understand the IEPA's position.

MS. ZEIVEL: Sorry. Was there a
question?
MR. BONEBRAKE: Yes, the question was part -- excuse me. The Illinois CCR Act fee decision, is it then -- based upon the objection that I heard, is it IEPA's position that that decision does not determine IEPA's view of whether
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a unit is or is not subject to Part 845?
MS. ZEIVEL: I believe the objection was sustained regarding -- I'm not exactly sure how you are -- you are creating a link between the two that the Agency objects to. We can make a determination of appropriateness regarding fees and the applicability of the rule. Just because they may be the same determination does not mean one speaks for the other and the connection that is being made is not one that the Agency agrees to or will continue down the line of questioning, hence the objection which has been sustained. MR. BONEBRAKE: Thank you. You have answered my question. Because IEPA in Part 845, specifically Section 120 in its definition of CCR surface impoundment is copying the federal Part 257 definition of CCR surface impoundments, is it IEPA's view that it is also incorporating U.S. EPA's guidance and interpretations about the scope of CCR surface impoundment under Part 257 as applied under Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Our requirement is that we be as protective and comprehensive as Part 257, but we can go beyond

Part 257.
MR. BONEBRAKE: So you would follow the IEPA guidance to the extent necessary so that Part 845 is at least as stringent as Part 257?

MS. ZEIVEL: Can we ask for clarification? Christine Zeivel. Clarification on the question. You stated IEPA guidance.

MR. BONEBRAKE: I'm sorry. I meant U.S. EPA guidance.

MS. ZEIVEL: Can you please restate the question with the --

MR. BONEBRAKE: Sure. Will IEPA --
does IEPA plan to follow U.S. EPA guidance pertaining to the definition of \(C C R\) surface impoundment for Part 257 purposes in implementing Part 845 to the extent the U.S. EPA guidance sets the minimum standards for CCR surface impoundments?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. As I stated before, 845 must be as protective and comprehensive as 257, but we are not limited by Part 257. We have the mandate of 22.59 of the act.

> MR. BONEBRAKE: So in those
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instances where IEPA does not plan for Part 845 to go beyond Part 257, will it follow U.S. EPA's guidance regarding the meaning of the term CCR surface impoundment?

MR. BUSCHER: Could you repeat that question? This is Bill Buscher.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Sure. In those instances where IEPA does not intend Part 845 to go beyond federal Part 257, will IEPA follow U.S. EPA's guidance regarding Part 257?

MR. BUSCHER: We will. This is Bill
Buscher.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: One second. Can everyone mute themselves? Okay. Please continue.

MR. BUSCHER: I believe as was stated we are -- 845 will be applied according to the 845 regulations that we're working on and we will make our own decisions as to how that program works and it needs to be at the very least as protective as U.S. EPA's regulation and we can go beyond that and we plan on making our decisions relative to these regulations based on the information in front of us at the time.
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MR. BONEBRAKE: I'd like to turn to the definition of CCR surface impoundment in 845.120 and this relates to the applicability provision which refers to the term CCR surface impoundment in numerous places.

To be a CCR surface impoundment under proposed Part 845 and the Illinois CCR Act, which has the same definition of CCR surface impoundment, the unit must first be a depression, excavation or diked area; second, it must be designed to hold an accumulation of both CCR and liquids; and, third, it must treat, store or dispose of CCR, is that correct?

MR. BUSCHER: Bill Buscher. That is correct.

MR. BONEBRAKE: To be covered under federal rule Part 257, a unit had to be designed to hold and was, in fact, holding CCR and liquids as of October 2015, is that correct? Unless -- I should qualify that. Unless it was considered to be a new unit under Part 257.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Could you repeat that question now that \(I\) have the definitions in front of me?
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MR. BONEBRAKE: Okay. To be an existing CCR surface impoundment or an inactive CCR surface impoundment under Part 257, the unit had to be designed to hold and, in fact, be holding \(C C R\) and liquids as of October 2015, correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. That is what Part 257 says.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Okay. With respect to Part 845, what is the timeframe for the comparable decision as to when a CCR unit needs to be designed to contain liquids and CCR?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. I didn't hear part of -- the first part of your question. Could you repeat it, please?

MR. BONEBRAKE: Sure. I just -- I just -- we just had a question and answer regarding the timeframe under Part 257 for the reference to designing to hold and, in fact, containing \(C C R\) and liquids and then \(I\) moved to a question with respect to Part 845 and its definition of \(C C R\) and surface impoundments and my question then is for purposes of Part 845.

> At what time must a CCR surface
impoundment -- excuse me -- must a CCR unit be designed to contain liquids and CCR to be considered a CCR surface impoundment under Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. When it is designed and begins operation.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Can that be prior to 2015?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Must a unit still be designed to hold liquids and CCR as of October 2015 to be considered a CCR surface impoundment under Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No.
MR. BONEBRAKE: So in that respect,
Part 845 has deviated from the Part 257 paradigm, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: What is the basis
for that different treatment under Part 845?
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The
basis for that treatment is under 22.59 of the act where it defines only existing surface impoundments and new CCR surface impoundments
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based on the date -- the second date of that act.
MR. BONEBRAKE: IEPA is treating all
CCR units prior to that date that otherwise qualify as CCR surface impoundments as subject to Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Now, Part \(845.100(b)\)
refers to new and existing CCR surface impoundments, did IEPA in Part 845 adopt the U.S. EPA definitions of those terms in Part 257?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway.
Illinois EPA did not adopt the same definitions as Part 257 for existing or for inactive CCR surface impoundments.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Can you identify for us what changes IEPA made in proposed Part 845 to the comparable definitions for existing and inactive in Part 257?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. It looks like existing CCR surface impoundment we have used the same definition as Part 257 in Part 845 and it appears we have eliminated the requirement that there still be liquids on \(C C R\), and we included active and inactive facilities.

MR. BONEBRAKE: What was the
rationale for deleting the reference to liquids in the definition of inactive CCR surface impoundments in proposed Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. CCR surface impoundments have to be dewatered for closure. You could theoretically say that once you have dewatered that, it no longer contained liquids, therefore it was no longer a CCR surface impoundment and we found that to be not reasonable.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Why did you find it to be not reasonable?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Because we -- if you're in the process of closing a CCR surface impoundment, you can't stop once you just drain the water out of it.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Well, the definition of CCR surface impoundment requires that the unit be designed to hold an accumulation of CCR and liquids, correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway.
Designed that way, yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: So aren't you
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creating a conflict in your definition as revised from Part 257 of inactive CCR surface impoundment and your definition of CCR surface impoundment?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No, we don't believe so because the dewatering is a process in order to be able to close a CCR surface impoundment.

MR. BONEBRAKE: In the definition of inactive CCR surface impoundment in Part 845, did IEPA also change U.S. EPA's reference to receive CCR -- from CCR to -- Strike that. Start over again. That was a bad question.

In IEPA's Part 845 definition of inactive CCR surface impoundment, did IEPA change language in Part 257's definition by including the word placed in lieu of the phrase received?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: What is the meaning of the word placed as used in the definition of CCR surface impoundment -- inactive CCR surface impoundment.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We felt the word placed was more -- more clear than received.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Can you give us some indication of the intended meaning of the word placed because I don't see a definition in Part 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The common understanding of the word placed is to put it in the CCR surface impoundment.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Well, for instance, is it -- is it IEPA's view that the term means an intentional act of putting CCR into a pond?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No, it doesn't have to be intentionally placed there.

MR. BONEBRAKE: So under what other circumstances would CCR in a pond be considered placed?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. It may have been inadvertent placement. They put it in the wrong place, someone at the facility. It could be a surface impoundment that was designed to hold CCR and liquids and while it may or may not have been intentionally placed there, it may have eroded from other areas and entered that pond. Those are some examples.

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine
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Zeivel. We're getting into the specific words and definitions of words within a definition in a completely other section.

So I'm wondering how long and
how deep we will continue into this line of questioning considering we're still on Section 845.100?

MR. BONEBRAKE: With respect to that particular term, I'm done, but obviously there are references to terms in 845.100 that are picked up in 120. So I'm trying for efficiency sake to combine them where \(I\) can so we have an understanding of applicability, which turns on how terms -- how terms are defined.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I would ask you to refrain from proceeding with questions on specific terms as they are in Section 120 and focusing only on broader questions for 100.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Then I'll reserve the right to come back for some additional questions on the definitions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Certainly.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Did IEPA perform any risk assessment or other study to decide which CCR
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unit should or should not be covered under Part 845's applicability provisions?

MR. BUSCHER: This is Bill Buscher.
No.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Did U.S. EPA conduct a risk assessment in connection with its federal CCR rule in Part 257?

MR. BUSCHER: I believe they have.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Did U.S. EPA use its risk assessment to determine risk to human health and environment from CCU -- CCR units?

MR. BUSCHER: I believe that was their intention.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Did U.S. EPA rely on its risk assessment to help identify the CCR units that should be regulated under Part 257?

MR. BUSCHER: I think you'd have to ask EPA that.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Do you recall
related references in the preamble to the Part 257 rules?

MR. BUSCHER: Generally, yes. Bill
Buscher, by the way.
MR. BONEBRAKE: And is IEPA relying
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upon the U.S. EPA risk assessment to support its proposed Part 845?

MR. BUSCHER: Our intention is to
have a program that meets or exceeds the requirements of 257 -- CCR 257.

THE COURT REPORTER: CCR what?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: CCR 257, is that what you stated? Just for the court reporter. He didn't hear.

MR. BUSCHER: Yes, that's the federal 257 program on ash -- on coal combustion residuals.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Is it -- is it
correct then that Illinois EPA has no risk assessment of its own to support any proposed Part 845 requirement that differs from or goes beyond the federal CCR rules?

MR. BUSCHER: We have no risk assessment of our own.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Did U.S. EPA rely upon its risk assessment to make a distinction between units that contain de minimis amounts of CCR and those that contain significant amounts of
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CCR and, therefore, warranted regulation under Part 257?

MR. BUSCHER: I'm not familiar. I did not review that risk assessment. So I can't really answer the question. Bill Buscher, by the way.

MR. BONEBRAKE: I'd like to refer to Exhibit 3 and this would be Dynegy's Question 4 at Page 38 of Exhibit 3. I'll give you a moment to get there.

MR. BUSCHER: You said 4?
MR. BONEBRAKE: Yes, Question 4. So
has IEPA had an opportunity to look at Question 4?
MR. BUSCHER: Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: And you see there a quote from an 80 Federal Register at 21357.

In responding to this question, did IEPA confirm the accuracy of that quote?

MR. BUSCHER: Did we confirm the accuracy of the quote?

MR. BONEBRAKE: Yes, in Question 4 or otherwise review it. I'm trying to follow up on my earlier question whether U.S. EPA addressed the risk assessment in its determination of which

CCR surface impoundment should be covered under its rule.

MR. BUSCHER: I don't think that we -- we review -- this is Bill Buscher. What is your question?

MR. BONEBRAKE: So my question is, first of all, does this reflect -- refresh the recollection of IEPA that U.S. EPA relied upon a risk assessment to identify units that were -that warranted regulation under Part 257?

MR. BUSCHER: We're aware that they took this course of action, yes.

MR. BONEBRAKE: And U.S. EPA found, did it not, that the units that warranted regulation were those that contain a large amount of CCR managed with water under a hydraulic head that promotes the rapid leaching of contaminants?

MR. BUSCHER: I think -- I believe that's a qualification they made. My understanding of 257 is they did not only regulate that type of impoundment, they regulated all of the CCR impoundments.

MR. BONEBRAKE: What is the basis
```

for that view, Mr. Buscher?
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MR. BUSCHER: The basis for that
view is that they don't have a size limitation on what 257 applies to. They --

MR. BONEBRAKE: But U.S. EPA has a require -- go ahead. I didn't mean to cut you off, Mr. Buscher.

MR. BUSCHER: Go ahead.
MR. BONEBRAKE: I was going to ask a follow-up question.

But U.S. EPA does have a requirement that a CCR surface impoundment is not regulated unless it contains liquids as of October 2015, correct?

MR. BUSCHER: I believe that's U.S. EPA's definition.

MR. BONEBRAKE: So is it IEPA's position that Part 257 regulates CCR units that have de minimis quantities of \(C C R\) assuming the unit otherwise meets the definition of CCR surface impoundment?

MR. DUNAWAY: Well, in the -- this
is Bill Buscher.
In the process of their
promulgation of 257 , U.S. EPA did not define de
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minimis. They left it vague.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Is it correct that U.S. EPA addressed the concept of de minimis CCR units in its preamble for its final CCR rule?

MR. BUSCHER: They may have.
MR. BONEBRAKE: At this point, I'd like to refer to an exhibit that was attached to the environmental groups prehearing exhibit filing. I believe it's Exhibit 5, which is the final April 17, 2015, rule with preamble. I'll give everybody a moment to make sure they have a copy of that exhibit.

Does IEPA have a copy of that Exhibit No. 5, which was one of the exhibits in the environmental groups prehearing exhibit filing?
(Document marked as Hearing Exhibit No. 5 for identification.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: So it's Exhibit 5 within the --

MR. BONEBRAKE: Within the filing, correct.

MR. MORE: And we would have it --
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MR. BONEBRAKE: I'll give IEPA just a brief opportunity to take a look at this page. I'm going to ask a couple of questions pertaining to whether U.S. EPA, in fact, revised in connection with this discussion its definition of CCR surface impoundment and whether it addressed the concept of de minimis CCR ponds.

MR. BUSCHER: It's been reviewed.
MR. BONEBRAKE: All right. And if you look at the middle column on Page 21357 at the top in the paragraph that runs over from the prior column on the last sentence, it says, "However, EPA agrees with commentors that units containing only truly, quote, unquote, de minimis levels of CCR are unlikely to present the significant risk that this rule is intended to address," do you see that, Mr. Buscher?

MR. BUSCHER: I do. Yes, I do.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Is it also correct looking at the left column at the top you'll see a reference to the fact that EPA initially proposed a CCR rule that did not contain a reference to treat, store or dispose of CCR, do you see that?

MR. BUSCHER: It's in the first
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column?
MR. BONEBRAKE: Yes. You'll see the definition in the -- "EPA proposed to define a CCR surface impoundment to mean a facility or part of a facility which is a natural topographic depression, manmade excavation or dike area formed primarily of earth and materials" and it goes on from there.

MR. BUSCHER: Yes, sir.
MR. BONEBRAKE: There is no -- there is no reference in that proposed -- earlier proposed definition to treat, store or dispose of CCR, is there, Mr. Buscher?

MR. BUSCHER: That would be -- that would appear to be correct.

MR. BONEBRAKE: But, in fact, when the final CCR -- Strike that.

In fact, when the final federal Part 257 rule was adopted it included treat, store or dispose of CCR as a required element of a CCR surface impoundment, is that correct.

MR. BUSCHER: I believe it is.
MR. BONEBRAKE: And that was -- that
addition was added, at least in part, to address
U.S. EPA's decision to exclude de minimis CCR ponds, isn't that correct?

MR. BUSCHER: I can't speak to what U.S. EPA's intentions were. However, if you look at their applicability in 257, U.S. EPA defines a -- a CCR surface impoundment and then they note that if it's not a CCR surface impoundment, it's an open dump. So now that's, I think, my most useful information in this process.

MR. BONEBRAKE: What particular page or provision are you referring to, Mr. Buscher?

MR. BUSCHER: That would be in the applicability of 257.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Okay. Is there a subpart reference you have in mind?

MR. BUSCHER: I think in scope and purpose Part 257.50 .

MR. BONEBRAKE: Okay. Subpart?
MR. BUSCHER: I'm going to have to find it. Just a second.

257 -- 257.1 Scope and Purpose. It lays out facilities that fail to satisfy certain criteria are considered open dumps which were prohibited under Section 5005 of the act and

No. 2 of 257.1 further identifies those open dumps.

MR. BONEBRAKE: And you're relying upon those references then to -- for your position that U.S. EPA did not exclude from its definition of CCR surface impoundments ponds that contain only de minimis amounts of CCR?

MR. BUSCHER: As I recall, that de minimis discussion was in the preamble.

MR. BONEBRAKE: That's correct. You were looking at Page 21537.

MR. BUSCHER: I prefer -- I prefer to utilize the actual regulation because I think that's our charge.

MR. BONEBRAKE: And, in fact, if 257
is intended to exclude ponds with de minimis amounts of CCR from the definition of CCR surface impoundments, then would IEPA agree that Part 845 as well excludes such ponds from its definition of CCR surface impoundments?

MR. BUSCHER: I don't believe that's our intent, no.

MR. BONEBRAKE: So IEPA's intent would be to differ from U.S. EPA's view that de
minimis CCR ponds should be excluded, is that correct?

MR. BUSCHER: You know, we have -we have very complex systems that we work with and I don't think that you can make an across-the-board designation of what de minimis is and that \(I\) think this will be determined on a case-by-case basis and I prefer to utilize regulation as opposed to utilizing the preamble. I'm pretty sure you're familiar with how U.S. EPA 257 has changed over time. My preference is to utilize the regulation.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Does IEPA have any precedent for adopting a U.S. EPA definition, but at the same time rejecting U.S. EPA's definition of what that really means?

MR. BUSCHER: I think our charge here is to provide 845, which is a regulation that closes out impoundments, and to do it in an environmentally sound manner.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Given your
case-by-case decision-making reference, I need to ask some follow-up questions then pertaining to that decision-making process.
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amounts of \(C C R\) should be subject to regulation under Part 845?

MS. ZEIVEL: Objection. The witness already provided his answer. It's been asked and answered.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sustained.
MR. BONEBRAKE: I'd like to refer to Exhibit 2 and if we go to the back of that exhibit and these are IEPA's first response to questions.

Specifically, looking at a table at the back that has -- excuse me -- 74 rows. It appears to identify a number of different ponds and I will give IEPA a chance to look at that table. It's at Page's 181 and 182 of that exhibit.

MS. ZEIVEL: We have the table if you'd like to proceed with your question.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Can IEPA tell us what information is contained on this table?

MR. BUSCHER: These are -- this information is responsive to the Board's questions. I don't recall the number that it was. The first few, Exhibit 1 through 10, or so. Something like that.
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MR. BONEBRAKE: Does it include ponds in which CCR has not been directly placed by the owner or operator?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. Could you clarify that question, please?

MR. BONEBRAKE: Yeah, the question was, did the list include ponds in which CCR has not directly been placed by the owner or operator?

MR. DUNAWAY: What do you mean by directly been placed?

MR. BONEBRAKE: Part 845 regulations contain the term placed in the definition of inactive ponds. So I'm using that term here.

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. To the best of our knowledge, at this point in time, all these ponds are CCR surface impoundments that are defined in Part 845.

MR. BONEBRAKE: In light of the fact that they're ongoing disputes, legal and factual, about whether these ponds are subject to regulation, does IEPA agree that it would be inappropriate for the Board to include this table as a list of regulated ponds under Part 845?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine
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Zeivel. I'm going to have to object in terms of what is appropriate for the Board to do. The Board is its own administrative agency and charged with its own duties under the act. The Board requested the table and the Agency provided it and I don't think our witnesses should speak to the appropriateness of placing such a table as requested by the Board in the record.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sustained.
MR. BONEBRAKE: All right. But it is correct then that there are ongoing disputes. So there has not been a final adjudication by the Board or other tribunal about whether the ponds -73 ponds listed on that table are, in fact, subject to proposed Part 845 , correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. Yes, that is correct.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Just -- just a few more questions and then \(I\) will be done.

Ameren had asked a question and this is in Exhibit 2, it's their Question 4 at Page 143 question set 4, excuse me, and specifically Question 1.

> I'll give IEPA just a moment to
get to that particular question and answer. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Down at the bottom of Page 143.

MR. BONEBRAKE: 144. Right. The question starts at the bottom of 143 and then rolls over and then sub question 1 within that question set is what I'm interested in and it refers to the 1976 date. Effective date of RCRA.

Is IEPA ready for follow up?
MS. ZEIVEL: Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Part 257 was adopted under authority of RCRA, correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, it was.

MR. BONEBRAKE: And I think IEPA has already agreed that proposed Part 845 is meant to implement and, in fact, if approved by U.S. EPA, replace Part 257 in Illinois, right?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. BONEBRAKE: And U.S. EPA decided not to regulate units that closed before October 14th, 2015, right, that is ceased accepting CCR and no longer contain liquids in CCR after that date?

MR. DUNAWAY: Repeat that question, please.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Yes. U.S. EPA
decided under Part 257 not to regulate \(C C R\) units that closed before October 14 th, 2015 , that is ceased accepting \(C C R\) and no longer contain liquids in CCR after that date, right?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. I
believe that was what Part 257 did.
MR. BONEBRAKE: Is there any
authority under RCRA for the Board to regulate units that ceased accepting waste even before RCRA was adopted?

MR. DUNAWAY: You mean -- Lynn
Dunaway. Our authority for regulation came from Section 22.59 of the act.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Would IEPA entertain a proposal with rule language to exclude from Part 845 units that closed before 1976 , the effective date of RCRA?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The Agency would certainly consider every revision proposed by the Board.

MR. BONEBRAKE: Thank you, panel. I
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appreciate the responses to my question. That will be all my questions for the time.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you, Mr. Bonebrake. Let me check with Marie. Let's take a break here for lunch.

MS. TIPSORD: Not lunch.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Not lunch.
Let's take a ten-ish minute break. It's 11:04
right now. How about let's come back at 11:15 and we'll resume with Illinois Environmental

Regulatory Groups questions. Thank you.
(Whereupon, a break was taken after which the following proceedings were had.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We are back. It is 11:17. Is there a representative of IERG in the room or online? Jennifer Martin or Melissa Brown?

MS. BROWN: Yes, this is Melissa
Brown. Can you hear me?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. BROWN: Okay. Perfect. This is
Melissa Brown, M-E-L-I-S-S-A. Last name Brown, \(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{W}-\mathrm{N}\), for the Illinois Environmental
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Regulatory Group, or abbreviated IERG. IERG does not have any questions on 845.100 at this time.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you very much. Moving on to Ameren. Ms. Manning or Anthony Scheuring, S-C-H-E-U-R-I-N-G. If there's a representative on Webex or on a telephone. MS. ZEIVEL: It looks like they are on Webex. They're just muted.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Thanks. We'll try to unmute them.
MR. SCHEURING: This is Anthony
Scheuring.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Mr. Scheuring, I think you have speakerphone on.
MR. MORE: Ms. Manning -- you're
getting feedback from Ms. Manning.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms.
Manning, could you mute yourself?
MS. MANNING: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr.
Scheuring, Ms. Manning, sorry. I believe you're logged in twice. If you guys are all in the same room --

> MS. MANNING: Can you hear me?
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Everybody
in that room for Ameren --
MS. MANNING: Yes, can you hear me?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I can.
Yes, that works perfectly. So just leave one computer unmuted unless -- if you unmute two, then you'll get feedback, but right now it's working great.

MS. MANNING: Good morning. Thank you. I just have a few follow-up questions from the extensive questioning done by Dynegy. They asked a lot of the questions we would have asked leaving our job a bit easier.

First of all, just for purposes of the record and clarification, the definition of surface impoundment under both Part 245 and under Section 3.143 of the act are identical, is that correct?

MS. ZEIVEL: Ms. Manning, I believe you said 245. Were you meaning 257 or can you repeat the question?

MS. MANNING: Sure. Sure. I guess what I'm asking is why all the definitions of surface impoundments under federal Part 245 --
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257, I'm sorry, and this state law at Section 3.143 of the CCR Act are identical, they have different implementation dates, correct? The implementation date of the state law being June 30th, 2019. The implementation date of the federal law being October 2015, is that correct? MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Those are dates of those rules you mentioned.

MS. MANNING: That's a yes?
MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
MS. MANNING: Thank you. What I
wanted to ask is with the identification of the 73 water treatment units that you identified in your answer to Dynegy, you indicated that they were water treatment units. That particular identifier that identified those 73 units that are listed on Page 181 and 182 of your filing, the exhibit that the Board asked you to create, those water treatment units pre-existed -- the identifiers pre-existed the definition of surface impoundment either as it is put in federal law or in state law, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, those certain CCR surface impoundments existed prior to the
existence of Section 22.59 of the act.
MS. MANNING: So, in fact, they're definitions that the Agency used prior to the definition of the surface impoundment and, as such, it's the Agency's interpretation of what it believes to be a surface impoundment for purposes of Board regulations in this manner, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Could you repeat that, please?

MS. MANNING: Yes. The question is, is it the Agency's particular identifier that identified those 73 units, is the Agency's interpretation of what is or is not a surface impoundment under Section 3.13 of the Illinois Act. In fact --

MS. ZEIVEL: I think --
MS. MANNING: It's your
interpretation of what is a surface impoundment under the act?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, that is our interpretation.

MS. MANNING: And in the context of this proceeding, the Agency would agree, would it
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not, that the Board has the authority to determine in the context of this rule of general applicability which of these units that you listed as the 73 units at surface impoundment elements, in fact, are surface impoundments and entitled to be treated as such and regulated as such pursuant to new Part 845, is that correct?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine
Zeivel. I think the Agency is having difficulty answering your question as asked. The Agency is charged with enforcing Board regulations under the act and the Board has the ability to review eight -- eight determinations, but beyond that legal clarification, we would need you to further reword your question or a response appropriate for a witness without a legal interpretation of the Board's authority.

MS. MANNING: The Board is not here challenging -- the Agency is not here challenging the Board's authority to make determinations as to what is and is not a surface impoundment under these new regulations, is it?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine Zeivel. Section 22.59 of the act charges the

Agency with proposing rules and the Board to adopt such rules regulating surface impoundments.

Talking about this --
MS. MANNING: Thank you.
MS. ZEIVEL: -- proposal is
challenging the Board's authority.
MS. MANNING: Thank you. In
response to Question 7 -- Question 1 -- Question 2 posed by Ameren, the IEPA asserted that because of the court's holding in Utility Solid Waste Activities Group versus the EPA commonly known as the WAG decision which was entered by the D.C. circuit court in -- on August 21st, 2018, the IEPA's position is that any CCR surface impoundment that had not completed removal of CCR from the CCR surface impoundment prior to October 19th, 2015, the effective date of Part 257, is subject to the requirements of Part 257 , including the definition of \(C C R\) surface impoundment.

My question is, what does the IEPA mean when it says completed removal of CCR?

MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Would you
please repeat that question?
MS. MANNING: What does the EPA mean
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in response to my question that is it the Agency's position that any CCR surface impoundment that had not completed removal of CCR from the CCR surface impoundment prior to October 19th, 2015, is subject to these new rules? What does it mean when the IEPA says completed removal of CCR?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Because it is the Agency's position that under the USWAG decision that --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr.
Dunaway, can you just repeat that, the what decision?

MR. DUNAWAY: The USWAG.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thanks.
MR. DUNAWAY: That whether it be an active or inactive facility is regulated on the data of Part 257. Part 257 requires that in order for a closure to be complete as it is currently written, I should say, Part 257 requires that not only the CCR and any contaminated liners be removed, but also any areas impacted from releases by the CCR surface impoundment must also be remediated.

MS. MANNING: So where the IEPA
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approved removal of CCR pursuant to a plan that was presented prior to October of 2015 and removal had begun prior to October of 2015 it's the IEPA's position that the WAG decision drives the determination that, in fact, it is a surface impoundment, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The Agency's position is that such impoundment would be regulated under Part 257 and Section 22.59 of the act and, therefore, there would have to be a determination that the groundwater impacted by such a CCR surface impoundment had been remediated pursuant to the requirements of --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm sorry.
Could you -- sorry to jump in, but our court reporter had a hard time hearing that last bit.

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. The Agency's position is that such a CCR surface impoundment described would be regulated by Part 257 and Section 22.59 of the act and as such there is no groundwater monitoring specific to that CCR surface impoundment to demonstrate that as required by Part 257 the groundwater protection standards have been met, then that CCR surface
    impoundment --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: That last
bit. Sorry, Mr. Dunaway --
MS. MANNING: Putting aside the fact
that Part 257 did not --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms.
Manning.
MS. MANNING: -- apply to --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms.
Manning --
MS. MANNING: Yes?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Our court
reporter didn't just get that last bit that
Mr. Dunaway said. If you could repeat that.
MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: The video
cut out. Mr. Court Reporter, would you be able to tell us where we left off or --
(Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: The
groundwater protection standards have been met and then the CCR surface impoundment and then it cut off. If you can remember.
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> MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. If the -- if there is no surface impoundment monitoring demonstrating that the groundwater protection standards have been met, then closure is not complete.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
Ms. Manning?
MS. MANNING: And that's based on
your application of 2 -- Part 257.100(b)(5), is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: What section?
MS. MANNING: \(257.100(\mathrm{~b})(5)\).
MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. Can you direct us to the reference in the federal register?

MS. MANNING: It's your response to our question on Page 139. You say, "As currently written, Part 257 does not deem closure by removal until the CCR and any liner has been removed and decontamination of any area affected by releases from the CCR surface impoundment has been completed pursuant to Part \(257.100(\mathrm{~b})(5) . "\)

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. It looks like we may have had an improper citation
in our response. We will have to follow up on that.

MS. MANNING: Could it be that what you're citing is the draft rule that is not yet effective in Part 257?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We're going to have to follow up on that.

MS. MANNING: Okay. Thank you.
Could you point me to a specific reference in the WAG decision that discusses closure by removal and requires complete removal of CCR?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We'll review that and we'll respond.

MS. MANNING: Thank you. Where a company has removed \(C C R\) and pursuant to authorization and approval of the Agency and begun removal prior to any effective date of Part 257, is it nonetheless the Agency's position that now any provisions of 257 apply to declare that particular facility to be a surface impoundment?

MR. DUNAWAY: I'm sorry. Part of the last part of that question cut out.

MS. MANNING: Is it a surface
impoundment?
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MR. DUNAWAY: I'm sorry. I'm going to have to have you repeat the whole question. I can't --

MS. MANNING: Let me rephrase it a different way. Is a -- is a unit that has begun to remove CCR no longer -- and no longer contains CCR, prior to any effective date designed to -- or designed to hold CCR and, therefore, be subject to the definition of surface impoundment?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. It would be if it were a CCR -- if it were -- sorry. I'm too close.

It would be if it were designed as a CCR surface impoundment and there was no demonstration that groundwater protection standards have been met, therefore, closure had not been completed.

MS. MANNING: Your interpretation of closure not being complete, however, depends on an application of a provision that did not exist at the time the Agency authorized closure and authorized the closure plan, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Are you asking if part -- one moment, please.

MS. MANNING: Let me ask it this
way. When the WAG decision was decided in 2018, I believe, a facility that no longer contained CCR did not pose the type of risk that is discussed in the WAG decision.

> Would the Agency agree with
that? The type of this being a toxic slurry of coal residues mixed with water as identified on Page 28 of your filing, which is Page 28 of the WAG decision.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. It depends on whether the areas impacted by the CCR surface impoundment had been decontaminated.

MS. MANNING: But if there was no requirement that the area be decontaminated at the time the Agency authorized removal, how is it now applicable?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. As a point of clarification, are you talking about removal, complete, prior to the effective date of Part 257?

MS. MANNING: No, I'm wondering why
removal needs to be complete prior to the effective date of 257 if removal was done under
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the auspices of the EPA and with its authority without any application of or requirement of monitoring groundwater at the time the Agency authorized the removal?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The Agency had the authority to make those approvals. Subsequent to those approvals, Part 257 became effective.

MS. MANNING: I'm sorry. I missed that, Mr. Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Part -- excuse me.
The Agency had the authority to make those approvals and after the Agency made those approvals Part 257 became effective.

MS. MANNING: Well, in actuality, portions of Part 257 did not become effective until after the WAG decision was issued, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Repeat that, please.
MS. MANNING: Portions of Part 257
were not applicable. For example, they were not applicable to an inactive facility and they only became applicable to an inactive facility after the WAG decision was issued in 2018, is that
correct?
MS. ZEIVEL: The Agency is going to
object to the line of questioning based on requesting a legal interpretation. The Agency stands by the written responses as provided and further legal interpretation is not appropriate for the witnesses currently sworn under oath.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sustained.
MS. MANNING: That's all I have
right now. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Moving on to the Office of the Illinois Attorney General.

Any questions that you might
have on Section 100?
MR. SYLVESTER: The Attorney
General's Office doesn't have any questions on Section 100.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Is this
Steve Sylvester?
MR. SYLVESTER: Yes, I apologize.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem.
Moving on to the Board.
Mr. Rao, do you have any
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
questions on Section 100?
MR. RAO: I do have some questions. Let me just take a look at it. I have a question regarding the Agency's response to the Board's question on \(845.100(e)\). This is with regard to certain facilities that are exempted under Subsection E.

The Agency in the response to
Question 4A mentioned that the section is consistent with Section -- the federal rules 257 and the Agency noted that the exemption under the Federal Rules make up approximately 1 percent of the coal burned and I'm assuming that 1 percent of the coal burned relates to the whole country and not Illinois.

So does the Agency have any information as to the amount of coal burned by exempted facilities in Illinois?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No, we don't have any Illinois specific data.

MR. RAO: On the next part of the question that is Question 4B, the Agency stated that they were aware of two exempted CCR surface impoundments at one facility that may fall under
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]
this exemption.
For the record, could you identify, you know, who the owner of this facility is and where the facility is located and also the size of the facility that you're talking about.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The
other site we're aware of is currently called Pacific Ethanol. It's located in Pekin and I don't know the exact size of the impoundments. They're relatively small.

MR. RAO: Is this facility regulated by the Agency under an NPDES permit?

MR. LECRONE: Jeremy Lecrone. Yes, they are.

MR. RAO: Is the Agency aware of any issues with this facility in terms of any impacts on groundwater?

MR. LECRONE: This is Jeremy
Lecrone. Yes, I believe there is. I can't remember exactly the details, but they were maintaining a gradient on groundwater at the site. I believe they are no longer burning coal on the site.

MR. RAO: So is there any impact to
the groundwater -- is there any reason for not regulating the facility under 845? Is it just because the federal rules exempt these facilities, we are following the federal rules or has the Agency assigned the scope to include this particular facility within Section 845?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Section 22.59 of the act is similar to Part 257. It does say that these rules should be focused towards power generators and utilities and this is an ethanol plant that does not generate power.

THE COURT REPORTER: Generate what?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Generate power.

MR. RAO: So, what, do you think the statutory requirements kind of limit this proposal?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sorry. We're getting some feedback. Just a second.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Anand, can
you --
MR. RAO: If this facility is
impacting groundwater, will the Agency use the

NPDES provisions to regulate this facility, is that how it should be done?

MR. LECRONE: This is Jeremy
Lecrone. The facility has both an NPDES permit and a state operating permit that govern those facilities. I don't remember the status of the state operating permit governing that because they have been taken out of service, but they did have a state operating permit that also governed those operations of NPDES.

MR. RAO: Would it be inconsistent to include a facility within 845? When I say inconsistent, with the statutory requirements or can the state be more stringent than the Part 257?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, we can be more stringent than Part 257. However, we feel that including non-utilities would be beyond the scope of our legislative authority.

MR. RAO: And you mentioned that the impoundments are being taken out of service. So are they in closure right now?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No, they are not in closure. They are inactive.

MR. RAO: So if they do close, will
there be some sort of closure plan approved by the Agency?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. RAO: Okay. That's all I have on this section. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: All right. Moving onto -- are there any other individuals in the room or on the call who have questions on Section 100? Okay. Hearing none -- sorry.

MS. GALE: I have one, if I may. Kristen Gale on behalf of Midwest Generation. Oops. Hang on.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Grab your microphone.

MS. GALE: This is Kristen Gale on behalf of Midwest Generation. I have a follow-up question from the Ameren questions and I tried to write this correctly. So the Agency, please forgive me if \(I\) got it wrong.

The Agency I believe said if no CCR surface impoundment specific groundwater monitoring demonstrates that groundwater monitoring -- groundwater protection standards have been met, then closure is not complete.
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Jennifer Cassel with Earthjustice on behalf of Prairie Rivers Network again. I have some follow-up questions to Mr. Rao's questions.

The Agency answered that -well, there was a two-part question Mr. Rao asked which is would it be inconsistent with 22.59 to regulate the exempted facilities that were mentioned and there was a second portion of that which asked if they could go beyond the scope.

The Agency answered that they could go beyond the scope, be more stringent. They didn't answer specifically, as I heard, whether it would be inconsistent with 22.59 of the act to regulate those exempted facilities. I wanted to follow up with that, repeat that question, please.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, we feel that that is beyond the scope of 22.59 to go beyond utilities and independent power producers.

MS. GALE: Mr. Dunaway, I do
appreciate that. I do think beyond the scope -going beyond the scope is a little different than whether it would be inconsistent with or impermissible under 22.59 and I don't know whether
you're the right person to answer that. I welcome your thoughts or others as to whether the act barred the Agency or the Board from regulating sites such as the one Mr. Rao was mentioning.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Our authority is limited by what the legislature provided.

MS. CASSEL: Can you point me to the place where the statute limits the authority to regulate those?

MS. ZEIVEL: Give us a moment. We are still learning our hearing books and where everything is located. So I apologize for the delay.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Section 22.59(a)(3).

MS. CASSEL: So the decision for the Agency's decision that the statute limits your authority to regulate additional exempted facilities is the statement that the General Assembly finds that CCR's generated by the electric generating industry has caused groundwater contamination and other forms of pollution in active and inactive plants throughout

\footnotetext{
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the state, is that the entirety of the basis?
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. That is a portion of the basis. Also later in this same legislation it references that we should make a rule which is at least as protective and comprehensive as Part 257, which is a federal rule that regulates only the electric utilities and independent power producers.

MS. CASSEL: So that is 22.59. Are you referring to 22.59 Section G, Subsection G, Mr. Dunaway?

MR. DUNAWAY: I believe that's it.
MS. CASSEL: So the statement there that you're referencing is that "The Board shall adopt rules establishing construction permit requirements, operating permit requirements, design standards, reporting, financial assurance, and closure and postclosure care requirements for CCR surface impoundments" and it goes on to provide a time limit for that.

MR. DUNAWAY: Actually, what I thought it would be would be 259(g)(1) specifically.

> MS. CASSEL: (G) (1). So that the
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rules must be at least as protective and comprehensive as the federal regulations or amendments thereto promulgated by the administrator.

So what do you understand by comprehensive, Mr. Dunaway?

MR. DUNAWAY: Include the same things.

MS. CASSEL: And it has the preface of that, right, in that statement? MR. DUNAWAY: It does. MS. CASSEL: Is there any other basis for the assertion that the statute limits your authority to regulate these sites?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Also, the section of -- Section 3.142 of the act which defines coal combustion residual, CCR -- coal combustion residual, \(C C R\), meets fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, and flue gas desulfurization materials generated from burning coal for the purpose of generating electricity by electrical utilities and independent power producers.

MS. CASSEL: That definition doesn't include any statements specifying what the Agency
may or may not include in the rules relating to CCR, does it?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. It does not say what we can or cannot, but it does define where CCR is generated.

MS. CASSEL: The Agency has
additional authority to regulate polluting entities outside of what was authorized in the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act or what has been called earlier today as the Illinois CCR Act, I believe, is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, the Agency has that authority.

MS. CASSEL: Thank you very much. That's all my questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. As to more follow-up questions, I'm just going to proceed in the manner that we have been going through. So I will just call on each group and if you can let me know if you have follow-up questions for Section 100. So I believe we're on group number three.

City of Springfield, do you have any follow-up questions?
MS. WILLIAMS: No.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No.
Dynegy, do you have any follow-up questions?
MR. MORE: No.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No. IERG, do you have follow-up questions?
MS. BROWN: We did, but then they were covered in the line of questions. So we're okay.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: And that
was Melissa Brown?
MS. BROWN: Yes. Sorry. Melissa
Brown. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ameren, any follow-up questions for Section 100?
MS. MANNING: No, we might have questions that relate to other sections, but not at this point do we have any further questions on 100. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. That
was Ms. Manning.
All right. Office of the
Illinois Attorney General, any follow-up questions?
```
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| Page 107 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| MR. SYLVESTER: This is Steve |  |
| Sylvester for the Illinois Attorney General's |  |
| Office. We do not have any follow-up questions. |  |
| HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you. |  |
| Mr. Rao for the Board, any follow-up questions? |  |
| MR. RAO: I don't. |  |
| HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. |  |
| Great. So that concludes Section 100. Let's |  |
| begin Section 110 and we'll take a break for lunch |  |
| around 12:30. We'll just see where we are and |  |
| come to a natural stopping point around that time. |  |
| So we'll begin with 845 Section |  |
| 110 Applicability of Other Regulations and we'll |  |
| start with our first group. I believe Ms. Cassel |  |
| will be the first attorney asking questions for |  |
| Little Village Environmental Justice, |  |
| Environmental Law and Policy Center, Prairie |  |
| Rivers Network and Sierra Club. |  |
| . BUGEL: Faith Bugel for Sierra |  |
| Club. Just to be clear on a couple of points. |  |
| First, Ms. Cassel won't always be the first |  |
| attorney questioning for us. |  |
| HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sorry. |  |
| MS. BUGEL: Just to be clear. Also, |  |
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we were under the impression we were covering all of Subpart A. So initially we did ask all our questions for Subpart A Section's 100 through 170. I would just like to reserve the right for the environmental groups to ask follow-ups to other groups questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: That's
certainly fine. So moving on we'll go to Midwest Generation.

Do you have any questions on
Section 110?
MS. GALE: I do not.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: That's a no from Ms. Gale. City of Springfield?

MS. WILLIAMS: (Negative nod.)
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No.
Dynegy, Section 110?
MR. MORE: This is Josh More. I'd like to make a similar comment to what Ms. Bugel represented. As of right now, we have no opening questions for Subpart A.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
MR. MORE: So we reserve the right to ask follow-up questions, but we have no initial

[^1]questions until we get to Section 200.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Ameren?
MS. MANNING: This is Claire
Manning. We have no follow-up questions for 110. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.

Office of the Illinois Attorney General, any questions on 110?

MR. SYLVESTER: This is Steve
Sylvester. We don't have any questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Rao for
the Pollution Control Board?
MR. RAO: I don't have any questions on 110.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: All right.
Moving forward to the definition Section 845.120.
Ms. Bugel, so no questions for
this?
MS. BUGEL: I'm sorry. I just
learned I was completely incorrect on that and Jenny Cassel does have questions on 120.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem.
Ms. Cassel, then Section 120.
MS. CASSEL: All right. Thank you.
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Are you able to hear me again?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. CASSEL: Great. Okay. This is
Jenny Cassel again. This question is for
Mr. Dunaway. I believe this relates to the pre-filed answer to question -- ELPC, Sierra Club's and Prairie Rivers Network question, Question 18 on Page 34 of Exhibit 1 as well as the answer to the Board's question 49.

The Agency has testified that it proposes to define release for purposes of Part 845 as "Leaching of dissolved constituents at a concentration above the applicable groundwater protection standard as measured at a CCR surface impoundment's point of compliance." That's the first part of the definition or, I quote, "Physical movement of CCR except subject to an Agency-approved closure or corrective action from inside the CCR surface impoundment to outside the CCR surface impoundment."

Could you help me understand how the first component of the definition relating to leaching of dissolved constituents above the applicable groundwater protection standards defers
from the whole regime set out in Subpart $F$ for groundwater monitoring and corrective action under Part 845?

MS. ZEIVEL: The definition referenced by Ms. Cassel is not currently contained in Section 845.120 and perhaps this question would be more appropriately placed in the 600 section.

MS. CASSEL: I'm happy to ask it later. I mean, there are a number of questions that we have that pertain to subjects or issues that were not included in particular sections as requested. So there is not necessarily a clear section where they fall in. Since this pertains to the definition of the lease, it seemed appropriate here, but I'm happy to defer to later if there's a preference.

MS. ZEIVEL: That is the preference.
Thank you.
MS. CASSEL: Okay. I will reserve the right to save that for later. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Moving forward. Midwest Generation, any questions on definitions?
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MS. GALE: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: City of
Springfield?
MS. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of quick questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Your name?
MS. WILLIAMS: This is Deborah
Williams, City of Springfield. One quick follow up for the Agency I guess based on the previous line. I know they asked to have questions about this definition of release deferred to Section 600 and I'm fine with that. I just generally wanted to ask if the Agency was going to be submitting an errata sheet with -- I noticed several proposals for new language contained within answers and I would think it would help.

Some of those were things the
Agency has already confirmed they want to have included in the rule when it's finalized and some they sort of just suggested for the Board. So I want to know if the Agency is going to be presenting its proposed errata for the parties to review?

MS. ZEIVEL: Generally, the Agency
provides all proposed revisions in the post-hearing comments, not necessarily designated as an errata sheet, but with the same purpose of providing one space where all Agency proposed revisions are provided in writing.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
MS. WILLIAMS: So I would ask maybe the Board to think about before the close of hearing to see if it would be helpful to have that presented sooner or compiled sooner so people can provide meaningful comment on the language that is out there because it's pretty overwhelming to try to go through each question and answer and find where the new language proposals are, but we can save that for a later day. I just want to flag that for later.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Noted.
MS. WILLIAMS: And I just had one quick question on one of the definitions and it is the Board asked the question about the definition of CCR storage pile in Question 13. I would just like to clarify for the record so that definition of CCR storage pile is used $I$ believe just in one section of the rule itself and $I$ just want to for
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the record -- for the Agency to confirm that this definition and the rules in 845 generally only apply to a pile that would meet this definition as used in that section of the rule meaning piles generated by removal of CCR from surface impoundments during closure.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, that is our intent.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you very
much. That's all I have.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Moving onto
Dynegy. Do you have any questions about the definitions?

MR. MORE: We do not.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: IERG, any
questions on Section 120 Definitions? Melissa Brown?

MS. BROWN: I apologize. I was on mute. No, we do not have any questions right now. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem. Thank you.

Ameren, do you have any
questions on definitions Section 120?
MS. MANNING: We will save our
questions as to how the definitions apply in practice to other sections. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Great. AG's office?
MR. SYLVESTER: Steve Sylvester. We don't have any questions. Thanks.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
Mr. Rao from the Board, any questions on definitions?

MR. RAO: Yes, I just have a clarification on Agency's response to Board's Question 9 regarding definition of base flood. The Agency in distress ponds said the definition of base flood is consistent with the statutory definition of hundred year flood as defined in Section 3.102 of the act. I just want to clarify whether the definition of base flood is the same as the definition of hundred year flood in the act?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The base flood is essentially the same as the hundred year flood if that answers your question. If not, please repeat your question.

MR. RAO: No, I just wanted to
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
clarify whether it's, you know, the same whether it's the base flood or the hundred year flood, we were talking about the same flood?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, and the
definition of base flood it says 1 percent chance of being recurring and -- or being equaled or exceeded and 1 out of 100 , you know, is 1 percent. So it would be the hundred year flood.

MR. RAO: And also in your response you explained what significantly long period means. I wanted to know if it's acceptable to the Agency to replace significantly long period with the meaning of the --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Rao, you cut off there just at the end. To replace --

MR. RAO: Period with the actual
meaning of that phrase.
MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway.
Yes, that would be an acceptable change.
MR. RAO: That's all I have.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Well, we're right at 12:30 right now. So let's say we'll start up with Section 130 at 1:30. We'll take a break for lunch for an hour and we'll
reconvene at 1:30.
(Whereupon, a break was taken after which the following proceedings were had.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay,
everyone. It's about 1:33. We're going back on the record. We left off with 845 Section 130.

And we'll begin again at the start of our
questioners. So that would be Little Village
Environmental Justice, Environmental Law and
Policy Center, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, if you have any questions on 845.130. MS. BUGEL: Off the top of my head, I do not believe we have any questions on 130. We do not.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is a surface impoundment identification. Midwest Generation?

MS. GALE: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No
questions. City of Springfield?
MS. WILLIAMS: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Dynegy?
MR. MORE: No questions.
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[^2]Springfield?
MS. WILLIAMS: We don't have any
questions left on Subpart A unless -- we'll reserve for some follow up --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
So --
MS. WILLIAMS: -- until Section 200.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Dynegy?
MR. MORE: We have no questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: IERG?
MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. No questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you. AG's office?

MR. SYLVESTER: Steve Sylvester. No questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No questions. Mr. Rao? Did I skip Ameren? I don't think so.

MS. MANNING: You did, Madam Hearing Officer, but we have no questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm so
sorry.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
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MR. SYLVESTER: Steve Sylvester. No questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Rao at
the Board?
MR. RAO: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: All right.
170. Inactive Closed CCR Surface Impoundments. Little Village?

MS. BUGEL: Ms. Castle will be
asking questions on behalf of our groups.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Great.
Ms. Castle, Section 170.
MS. CASSEL: Thank you very much,
Hearing Officer. This is Jenny Cassel with
Environmental Justice on behalf of Prairie Rivers Network.

My question goes to
Mr. Dunaway's response to IERG's Question 1E, which is on Page 137 of, I believe, Exhibit 1, the first set of responses -- or answers. Excuse me.

Mr. Dunaway testified I quote
"That Subpart $F$ is not listed in Section 845.170 and, therefore, does not apply to inactive closed surface -- CCR surface impoundments."
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The Agency in its chart that it provided to the Board identified four inactive closed CCR surface impoundments. There were two at Venice, one at Hutsonville and one at Prairie Power.

Can you please tell me,
Mr. Dunaway, what year and month those impoundments you have identified as inactive, closed or surface impoundments completed closure or if they have not completed closure, can you please let me know that, too.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. I believe we answered that someplace. I don't remember exactly where. If -- perhaps the forms -- the chart -- I'm not positive. Yes, it is in there, in the Board -- in the table that the Board asked for Column E.

MS. CASSEL: I believe it says, "See closure date" if I recall correctly.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. Okay. Yeah, Column $H$ refers you back to Column E where it gives the month and year of completion.

MS. CASSEL: Sorry about that. I
missed that. Are there any other inactive, closed
surface impoundments that the Agency has identified that were not listed on the chart?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. None
that we're aware of.
MS. CASSEL: Okay. Thank you. And then my next question relates to the response to the Board Question 20 on Page 154 of the same exhibit.

The Board had asked if
previously approved postclosure plans may be used only if they meet the requirements of the proposed rule. The Agency answered, quote, yes, they could use the previously approved postclosure plan assuming it meets the requirements of this part.

If a previously approved postclosure plan does not meet the requirements of this section, then the applicant may be asked to supplement their plan.

So my question is, does the Agency intend to require any owner or operator of an inactive closed CCR surface impoundment that has not completed postclosure care to modify their postclosure care plan to meet the requirements of this part if the previously approved plan does not
meet those requirements?
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We will need to assess those closure plans against any potential changes that may occur to the rule.

MS. CASSEL: I'm sorry. Could you explain your answer?

MR. DUNAWAY: As it stands now as we have it lined out, I don't anticipate there will be changes made for the inactive closed CCR surface impoundments. However, the rule is not final so $I$ can't unequivocally say that.

MS. CASSEL: But when the rules are finalized, if the rules -- once they're finalized, does the Agency intend to require supplements if previously approved postclosure plans don't meet the requirements finalized by the Board for postclosure?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We would have to if they don't meet the rule.

MS. CASSEL: Okay. Great. And can you -- is there a particular provision you can point me to that sets out that requirement?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Section 845.173 shows which portions of Subpart G, which

[^4]is closure, excuse me, and postclosure apply. So
if there were changes within those Section's
$845.780(b),(d)$ or (e), then there would
potentially be changes required.

MS. CASSEL: I'm sorry. You said there could potentially be changes required? You would require changes if the postclosure plans were inconsistent with the finalized rule?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
MS. CASSEL: Thank you. Those are all my questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Thank you.
Midwest Generation, any
questions on 170?
MS. GALE: No.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm
skipping City of Springfield and Dynegy. On to IERG.

MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. Not at this time.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you. Ameren?

MS. MANNING: Claire Manning. Not
at this time. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
AG's office?
MR. SYLVESTER: Steve Sylvester.
None at this time.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
Mr. Rao from the Board?
MR. RAO: No questions. Thanks.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. We move on to Subpart B.
845.200 Permit Requirements and

Standards of Issuance. We'll again state at the top with Little Village, ELPC, Prairie Rivers and Sierra Club.

MS. BUGEL: Yes, we have two attorneys who will be asking questions. I believe we're starting with Jeffrey Hammons of ELPC.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Mr. Hammons?
MR. HAMMONS: Hello? Can you hear
me? I'm using my phone.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MR. HAMMONS: Okay. This is Jeff
Hammons from the Environmental Law and Policy

[^5]Center. So I'm going to be asking a few questions on 200, 210, 220 and 230 and I'll be passing it off to my colleague once we get to the later section of 240 and 260 Kiana Courtney.

So for 200, I only have one question for the Agency and it's a clarifying follow up to their pre-filed answers to one of Ameren's questions.

So Exhibit 2 at Page 140,
Question 4, Subpart C Ameren just asked the Agency for its interpretation of Section 22.59(e), which is the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act and particularly how it impacts closure and so in the Agency's answer you said that Section $22.59(e)$ of the act relieves the owner and operators of CCR surface impoundments who had submitted a closure plan on or before May 1st, 2019, and complete closure within 24 months from the requirement of obtaining a construction permit pursuant to Part 845 --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr.
Hammons?
MR. HAMMONS: Yeah?
MS. ZEIVEL: Can you pause just for

[^6]a second so we can catch up to where you were?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes. Let us know when you're there.

MS. ZEIVEL: Thank you.
MR. BUSCHER: Can you repeat the document, please?

MR. HAMMONS: Yes, it's Exhibit 2 at Page 140. It's Question 4(c) by Ameren and your pre-filed answer to it. It's 139. Sorry.

MS. ZEIVEL: We all have the page. Can you start your question over again, please, sir.

MR. HAMMONS: Hang on one second. I think I might have actually referred you to the wrong question. It's Page 142. My apologies. So it's page -- okay. That's where. It's Page 142. It's Question 4(c). I was confused because there were multiple questions because they were directed to witnesses. So I was looking at the wrong page. So it's Page 142.

MS. ZEIVEL: Okay.
MR. HAMMONS: So my question is just on your answer. At the end of your answer, you indicate that -- that if they submitted closure

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

plans before May 1st, 2019, and completed the closure within 24 months they don't have to get a construction permit pursuant to Part 845. So my question is, is that
construction permit only for closure or construction permits for corrective action as well?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Section E of 22.59 of the act specifies surface impoundment closure.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So just to confirm that exemption is not for corrective action construction permits?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. Those were all the questions I had on Section 200.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Certainly.
Then, Ms. Bugel, was there a second attorney for --

MS. BUGEL: No, that's later in this subpart.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. No problem. We will go on to Midwest Generation. Any questions on 200?

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

MS. GALE: No. Midwest Generation does not have any questions for the entire Part B, but reserves its right to do any follow up that may arise.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Certainly.
City of Springfield?
MS. WILLIAMS: Deborah Williams. I have one quick follow up on Section 200. We had asked the question -- a question about that section in Question 12 I think it was and the Agency was kind enough to provide some examples of permits -- or of activities that would require a permit under -- under Part 845 that are related to the surface impoundments and I guess I just wanted to clarify for the record for all these examples those activities would be also -- would be pursuant to corrective action, correct, not just in any case that any of those activities occurred, but if they occurred pursuant to corrective action, is that correct?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
Yes, that's correct. It could be any related treatment or mitigation facility.

MS. WILLIAMS: And I'm just
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interested in having as best of an understanding as we can on where the lines will be between permits under NPDES, Clean Water Act and this program.

Would you think that any of the examples that you've provided in this answer would also require an operating or construction permit under NPDES or state?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin. The construction permit requirements for this section would supersede the existing requirements of 309 that have general applicability in all the wastewater treatment systems.

So the permit requirements here are specific to CCR surface impoundments. The NPDES permit requirements there is nothing in here that takes the place of that. That's a separate program for surface water discharge, but for construction permit requirements these specific requirements that are applicable are in CCR surface impoundments only.

MS. WILLIAMS: So just to be clear, you said this would take the place of a water construction permit and you'd get a CCR
construction permit, is that correct?
MR. LECRONE: Sorry. I didn't understand.

MS. WILLIAMS: It would take the place of the water construction permit, is that what you're saying?

MR. LECRONE: Right. Under 309
Subpart B now. This would take the place of those.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. That's
helpful. Thank you. That's all I have on this section.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Thank you. Dynegy, any questions on 200?

MR. MORE: Yes. Josh More on behalf of Dynegy. I've got a follow-up question about the scope of $22.59(e)$ of the act, the requirement that a unit -- an owner/operator has submitted a closure plan to the Agency before May of 2019 and who has completed closure prior to 24 months after the effective date is not required to obtain a construction permit.

In response to a prior question, the Agency suggested that that exclusion is
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limited to a closure construction permit. In the event that the prior approved closure plan included groundwater corrective action measures and, in essence, the unit was in postclosure care, would one still have to apply for a new construction permit or does a construction permit for corrective action only arise in the situation if some physical activity were being conducted new in connection with the corrective action?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The requirement for a corrective action construction plan would be for new construction related corrective action.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sorry.
Could you just repeat the end of that,
Mr. Dunaway?
MR. DUNAWAY: The requirement for a construction permit for corrective action would be related to new corrective actions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
MR. MORE: Thank you. Does the
Agency consider compliance with a permit issued pursuant to Part 845 to be compliance with the requirements set forth in Part 845?

[^7]MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. There are other requirements of CCR surface impoundments that are not included under the permit.

MR. MORE: So would it be fair to say, though, that compliance with the provision -with your 845 permit would constitute compliance with the underlying applicable requirements in 845 that are set forth in the permit?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. Compliance with the permit would only cover those activities for which the permit was granted be it construction, corrective action or whatever.

MR. MORE: Okay. Thank you. Let's turn to 845 -- we're not there yet. That's all I have for 200.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. All right. For Section 200, IERG, do you have any questions?

MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. No questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you. For Ameren, Section 200?

MS. MANNING: Claire Manning. None at this time. Thank you.

[^8]HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thanks.
AG's office?
MR. SYLVESTER: Hi. This is Steve
Sylvester. I did have one question regarding Section $210(\mathrm{a})$. In Section $210(\mathrm{a})$, it says, "All permit applications shall be made on such forms as prescribed by the Agency" and I was wondering if that general --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr.
Sylvester?
MR. SYLVESTER: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Could we hold it? We're still on 200. That will be our next section.

MR. SYLVESTER: I apologize.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem.
All right. Mr. Rao is --
MR. SYLVESTER: So --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm sorry.
Go ahead.
MR. SYLVESTER: Yeah, I just wanted to clear up the record. No questions on 200.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Sounds good. Mr. Rao, any questions on Section
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200?
MR. RAO: I have no questions on 200.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Any
follow-up questions in the room on Section 200?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes, this is Jeff
Hammons. I have one follow-up question for the Agency and this is following up on counsel for Dynegy's question.

Just to understand the
applicability of Section $22.59(e)$ 's exemption for those that have submitted closure plans before May 1st, 2019, and completed closure within 24 months those impoundments would still be covered by the rule including in the event of corrective action being needed under the rules, right?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. That's correct.

MR. HAMMONS: So in the event there is corrective action at one of those impoundments, they would still need a construction permit for that corrective action?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. If

```
construction --
```
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm sorry.
MR. DUNAWAY: If construction was
required for the particular corrective action, a permit would be required, a construction permit.

MR. HAMMONS: Can you just give me a type of corrective action that doesn't require some sort of construction?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. An
example might be a change in monitoring frequency. That would be one example.

MR. HAMMONS: So if the rules
require corrective action at an impoundment, it's possible that a facility could propose just the change in monitoring to resolve the groundwater contamination?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No, that's not what I said. It was -- you asked for an example of what change in corrective action might not need a construction permit. Anything that doesn't involve construction of something physical, that was an example. A change in statistical analysis, if we found it wasn't appropriate, would be another example.
It's -- it's hard to sit here

[^9]and envision scenarios where you might have something that didn't require construction, but it is -- if they don't require construction, obviously there couldn't be a construction permit issued.

MR. HAMMONS: Okay. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
We'll be moving onto Section 210. General Provisions.

Our first set of questioners is Little Village Environmental, ELPC, Prairie Rivers and Sierra Club. Any questions?

MS. BUGEL: Yes, Mr. Hammons has
questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay
Mr. Hammons?
MR. HAMMONS: Hi. This is Jeff
Hammons, Environmental Law and Policy Center.
So my first question for the
Agency has to do with their pre-filed answer to one of the Board's questions on this section. So this is Exhibit 2, Page 156 and I promise that is the right page this time.

This is particularly Board
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

Question 19. Once the Agency has gotten there, just let me know.

MS. ZEIVEL: We're ready,
Mr. Hammons.
MR. HAMMONS: Okay. Thank you. I'm just trying to understand the response to this question a little more. The use of previous assessments is allowed under proposed rule 845.210 and in this answer can you confirm that those previous assessments still have to meet the requirements of Part 845 rules?

MR. LECRONE: It's Darin Lecrone. Yes, that's correct.

MR. HAMMONS: And then one follow up. If the proposed Rule 210 specifically stated that, would it adversely affect the Agency's ability to administer the permitting program?

MR. LECRONE: Darin Lecrone. No, it would not.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So the
next set of questions that -- I'm done with questions on that pre-filed answer.

So the next pre-filed answer
that I have some follow-up questions on is
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

Question 13 to Darin Lecrone by the environmental groups and this is on Page 78 of Exhibit 2. And this question just isn't for Darin. It's for the Agency. It's just on his pre-filed answer that we're following up on.

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine
Zeivel. For clarification of the record, if you look at Darin Lecrone's responses to the ELPC environmental groups, you'll notice that one of the numbers -- one of the questions lost their number. So on Page 77 what is No. 11 should be No. 12 in the pre-filed questions. So the question above No. 11 is missing a number. That number should have been 11.

So in our filed responses, No.
11 is actually response No. 12. No. 12 is actually response number 13 and so on. I just wanted to clarify for you all in the record that we recognize there was a numbering error.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So the pre-filed question -- pre-filed answer I have a question on is what is on Page 78 and labeled Question 13 in the pre-filed answer.

MS. ZEIVEL: Right. That would have
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been No. 14 in your filed questions just for your clarification.

MR. HAMMONS: Okay. Thank you.
That makes sense.
MS. ZEIVEL: We're ready.
MR. HAMMONS: All right. So my question about this is a reference to another answer you provided, but isn't it the case that the Agency relies on certifications by qualified professional engineers to ensure that the various plans and site assessments that are conducted pursuant to Part 845 meet the requirements of Part 845.

MR. LECRONE: Darin Lecrone. That's correct.

MR. HAMMONS: So if the proposed rules were changed to require any use of previous assessments to be accompanied by a certification by a qualified professional engineer that those previous assessments or plans meet the requirements of Part 845, would that adversely affect the Agency's ability to administer a permitting program?

MR. LECRONE: We don't think it's

[^10]necessary that this section -- primarily because whatever the previous assessment, plan, study, whatever the case may be as being requested to be used we're going to look at it on a case-by-case basis. Some previous, you know, studies or hydrogeologic investigation work may be certified by a professional geologist and chances are we would be okay with that work assuming it meets all the other requirements of this. So we don't see the need for kind of that blanket certification requirement.

MR. HAMMONS: What if the proposed rule required certification by either a licensed geologist or a qualified professional engineer, would previous assessments and plans meet the requirements of Part 845?

MR. LECRONE: I guess the bottom line is we don't see the need to require a certification on these previous assessments because we intend to review each one as the request is made for that previous assessment or plan or whatever to be used. We intend to review each of those on a case-by-case basis. So we don't feel the need for a specific certification.

[^11]MR. HAMMONS: Okay. One more question. Would that case-by-case review be made easier for those assessment and plans that Part 845 requires to be accompanied by a certification if those previous assessments were also accompanied by certification?

MR. LECRONE: Can you kind of clarify what you're asking? Are you asking if the old previous assessments are now accompanied by a certification that they meet 845, would that be better? Is that what you're asking?

MR. HAMMONS: Yeah. Yeah. So I can give you an example. One of the -- one of the types of assessments that a facility can use that was previously conducted is a structural stability assessment. So under your proposed rules if they were to submit that and it not be previewed, it would be required to have a certification by a qualified professional engineer.

So the question is for
assessments that have that requirement if they were to be submitted with an application and not be a previous assessment if those previous assessments had to have a similar certification
where it's already required if there wasn't a previous required assessment -- so, in other words, if $I$ submit a new structural stability assessment, I have to provide certification, but right now under the rules if I submit a previous one I don't have to submit a certification.

My question is, is your
case-by-case review made simpler if that is required?

MR. LECRONE: The Agency would not be opposed to you suggesting some language for consideration by the Board.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. Those are all the questions I have on 210.

MR. MORE: Can I ask a follow up?
MS. GALE: Me, too. Go first.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Certainly.
So Dynegy had a follow up to that question.
MR. MORE: Yes. Josh More on behalf of Dynegy.

In response to maybe two
questions before, $I$ understood the Agency to say that it was not necessary to provide a certification in connection with a previously

[^12]performed assessment that is submitted with a permit application because in that instance the Agency is going to review the underlying assessment, is that correct?

MR. LECRONE: In general, that's correct. The example Mr. Hammons gave of the structural stability assessment is one example that is kind of a little more complicated in that in Illinois damn safety is regulated by another Agency and the -- our Agency intends to consult with them on issues of structural stability. So, for that reason, a certification accompanying that assessment would be useful to our Agency.

MR. MORE: Thank you. Mr. LeCrone, can you think of any other assessments where it would be useful given the burden on the owners and operators to go back and recertify all of these assessments? I'd like to understand if we could limit the applicability of a recertification?

MR. LECRONE: I guess the issue if
you're talking about using a previous certification of that earlier assessment, that certification may have been that it was compliant with Part 257 and any new certification that we
would receive or, you know, we would expect it to be certifying in compliance with 845 and, you know, there are, as you know, some minor differences here and there. So use of a previous certification would only be useful to us if it maybe had an addendum that, yes, it also complies with 845.

MR. MORE: No more questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. I
think I went out of order there for a bit. So Midwest Generation.

MS. GALE: Yes, I have a follow up to Mr. Hammons' question and it's back to his first question. Page 156 of Exhibit 2, so the answers to the Board's questions, and looking back at Question 19. I'll wait. I'll let you get there.
My follow-up question is really
along the lines of if a hydrogeologic site investigation or assessment doesn't completely comply with Part 845, would the Agency accept a supplement or would the Agency require an entirely new investigation? For that, I mean a lot of these sites have a lot of data to it, but may not
have every detail because these are new regulations. So would the Agency just allow a supplement?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
Yes, the Agency would allow a supplement.
MS. GALE: Thank you. Nothing
further.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Moving on. City of Springfield, did you have any questions on 210?

MS. WILLIAMS: No, not at this time.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We asked
Dynegy. Next up is IERG.
MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. No
questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
Ameren?
MS. MANNING: Claire Manning. None at this time. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thanks.
Then I know the AG's office has questions. We're on 210, right? Yes. Go ahead.

MR. SYLVESTER: Steve Sylvester. My
question did get answered during the previous
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
questioning. So no further questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Mr. Rao for the Board. Any questions on 210?
MR. RAO: Yeah, I have a
clarification regarding the issue of investigations are using monitoring wells from which have already been installed. I think it goes to the Board Question 19 and the Agency responded saying that they will allow such information as long as the information meets the requirements of the proposed rules, the 845 rules, and if the 845 rules require certification by a professional engineer, does that mean that, you know, any information submitted from final investigations has to be recertified or certified for the time, for the Agency to accept that information?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. Yeah, we're trying to be as flexible as we can, you know, in allowing this -- these -- whether it's a previous assessment, you know, study, monitoring plan, or whatever dataset to be used some of them may be certified, some of them may be certified by a geologist, engineer, you know,

[^13]whatever.
We're just going to have to kind of go on a case-by-case basis and see what it is and have to review it and, you know, if they certify that, yes, this previous assessment does meet the requirements of 845 , great, we're going to have to verify that. And if it's not certified, we're going to have to verify it anyway. So we're just trying to be as flexible as we can and not require people to reinvent the wheel if there is a previous assessment or study that can serve the purpose and meet the requirements of the proposed rule.

MR. RAO: For the flexibility that you want to provide, would that be consistent with the Federal Rules under Part 257? For example, I don't think 257 allows certification by a professional geologist. Is that because the Agency accepts information that is certified by a geologist rather than a professional engineer?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. You know, I think part of the reason why the U.S. EPA didn't address the professional geologist issue is because all states don't have licensed
geologists. Illinois does. And we want to be able to recognize that work that they have already done and certified under a previous assessment.
So we want to allow that to
happen and not have owner/operators have to go out and re-do quality work or data collection that has already been completed. So that's why we want to have that ability to review those previous assessments or studies on a case-by-case basis and make that determination whether it's still applicable and we think in most cases if a professional geologist signed off on a hydrogeologic study that that's probably going to be acceptable to us.

MR. RAO: If that's the case, it
would be helpful if you can add language to the rule under the Section 210 that allows the Agency to do that.

Would that be something that you'd want to take a look at and get back to?

MR. LECRONE: We're only talking
about on these -- on previous assessments, some completed before the rule, right?

MR. RAO: Yes.
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MR. LECRONE: We'll consider it and see if we can come up with something.

MR. RAO: Okay. Thank you very
much.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I think that concludes Section 210 as long as there are no follow-up questions. Seeing none, we move on to 220. Sorry. I think $I$ was on mute there. That concludes Section 210 as long as there are no follow-up questions. Okay. Seeing none, we move on to 220 Construction Permits.

And we'll begin with our first group of questioners Little Village, ELPC, Prairie Rivers, Sierra Club.

MS. BUGEL: And I believe
Mr. Hammons has questions of this section.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
MR. HAMMONS: Yes, this is Jeffrey
Hammons, Environmental Law and Policy Center. I only have two questions for the Agency and both of them concern pre-filed answers to one of our questions, which is on Exhibit 2 at Page 80, specifically the response to $16(\mathrm{~b})$ as it appears on Page 80.

So the pre-filed answer here
indicates that under closure alternatives, seasonal variation of groundwater modeling will be taken into account.

So my first question is, is the Agency anticipating the data that informs the seasonal variation to be the monthly groundwater elevations required by the rule?

MS. ZIMMER: This is Amy Zimmer.
Can you hear me?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes.
MS. ZIMMER: I think part of it will be the groundwater elevation required by the rule. Part of it will probably also be past data.

MR. LECRONE: Okay. So other than the monthly elevations required by the rule and any past data for facilities that have ongoing groundwater monitoring, do you anticipate any other inputs for that seasonal variation?

MS. ZIMMER: I can't anticipate what all they'll do. Modeling required, precipitation data, Evapotranspiration data, so there's a lot of data required by modeling. There is usually a limit as to how much data is available. So you
take the nearest available data and what data you have and you try to put a model together that is accurate.

MR. HAMMONS: One follow-up just acknowledging that the data is not perfect. You would envision that the
modeling that you do conduct at least uses all of the data that is available?

MS. ZEIVEL: Yes.
MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. That's the only question $I$ had for 220.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Moving on
to Midwest Generation 220? No questions.
MS. GALE: None.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: City of
Springfield?
MS. WILLIAMS: (Negative nod.)
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No
questions. Dynegy 220?
MR. MORE: Yes, Jeff More on behalf
of Dynegy.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We're
getting some -- okay. I think we got it.
MR. MORE: I'd like to turn the

[^14]Agency's attention to $845.220(a)(2)(a)$.
Why is the Agency requiring a chemical analysis of each type of CCR expected to be in the impoundment?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The purpose of asking for that is to have a full characterization of the materials that are in the impoundment both for protection of the environment and for public health purposes.

MR. MORE: Can you explain how that information would influence how the impoundment is closed?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. The overall classification of material is in your folder and it would go into the chemical analysis or removal versus closure in place for different closure alternatives.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We're
having a little hard time hearing you, Ms. Martin. Could you repeat your answer? Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Sorry about that. Yes. So the chemical analysis will play into the -- can you hear me or should I just take my mask off for a second?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I think we hear you much better.

MS. MARTIN: So the chemical analysis will help with the overall cost analysis for the closure alternatives for each CCR impoundment.

MR. MORE: I'm sorry. Did you say
cost?
MS. MARTIN: Yes.
MR. MORE: And can you explain how the chemical analysis will be a factor in evaluating the cost of closure?

MS. MARTIN: Yes. Lauren Martin here. So different chemicals that are in there are regulated by OSHA for worker safety, but also could cause a public health issue in the surrounding community if the dust were to get out and also cause issues with the groundwater monitoring.

So as a whole picture kind of alternatives analysis in which way we can actually -- I guess the owners or operators will actually be able to close the site without -- with a minimal amount of effect to the public for air,
land and groundwater.
MR. MORE: I'd like to turn your
attention now to $845.220(\mathrm{a})(2)(\mathrm{c})$.
Will collection of the rate at
which CCR and non-CCR waste streams currently entering the surface impoundment influence how the impoundment is closed?

MR. LECRONE: It could affect, you know, whether the impoundment may be closed or retrofit or replaced. C kind of goes with D. I mean, the rate that it's being generated and the estimated time impoundment would stay in service, those are kind of related.

MR. MORE: But that's all
information that the owner would take into account when selecting those options that you just mentioned, for example, a decision to retrofit, how does it inform the Agency's approval of the ultimate closure?

MR. LECRONE: It would allow us to see that type of data that the owner/operator used in making that determination. They're going to have to look at useful life of the existing facilities, whether retrofit or rebuild is

[^15]necessary, whether closure in a different method of disposal is warranted.

So, you know, all this is data that the owner/operator, yes, is going to be using when making their alternatives analysis, but that's the same reason that the Agency would want that data as well.

MR. MORE: Well, I have to admit, I'm not aware of any utility that is measuring the rate of flow which water is discharging to its impoundment.

So my next question to you is are you aware of any technology that allows one to make that measurement on a gallons per day and at the same time calculate the dry tonnage of the material that is sleuthed wet to the impoundment on a daily basis?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. They should be able to calculate the amount of ash generated based on combustion chemistry and the tonnage of coal going in, you know, the $B T$ value and how much coal may need to burn to produce X amount of steam. So they aught to be able to calculate, you know, ash generation tonnage from
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that and then they should know the rate or the amount of water that they use to sleuth that. Most of their NPDES permits have design average flow rates for those sleuth waters. So they, you know, should be able to calculate the amount of ash generated and they should know the water used to sleuth that material through the impoundment.

MR. MORE: And it's your opinion that this information in 2 C is important for the utility to consider when deciding when to close or how to close?

MR. LECRONE: This information is also required for new facilities as well and it can go into that analysis of, you know, closure, what are you going to replace it with, is there other limitations on the site that influence a closure choice. You know, it's part of completing the data that the Agency wants to see on what was used to evaluate those options and alternatives and what is chosen for potential new impoundment and the sizing of that new impoundment based on past generation.

> MR. MORE: Okay. I'd like to turn

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

your attention to 220 (c) (2) (e) and the Agency's response to Dynegy's question to Question 22 which I believe is Exhibit 3 on Page 41. Can you identify for us the specific requirement under the landfill program authorizing the Bureau of Land Permit Section to require an applicant to submit a fully licensed copy of a groundwater computer model?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine Zeivel. We don't have any sworn-in witnesses from the Agency within the Bureau of Land Permit Section that would be able to provide a response right now.

MR. MORE: Understood. Would you be willing to follow up with an answer?

MS. ZEIVEL: Yes.
MR. MORE: Thank you. I'd like to now turn your attention to 845.22(f), the duration of construction permits.

Is the Agency aware that U.S.
EPA's proposed federal permit program allows for permits to be issued without an expiration date?

MR. LECRONE: The Agency is aware of EPA's proposed permit program, but we are not
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aware of all the specifics of it. So I don't know anything about what they have proposed as far as permit durations.

MR. MORE: Okay. I'd like to then move to admit into the record Dynegy's proposed Exhibit 1 as Exhibit 6, which is the United States Environmental Protection Agency's CCR rule permit program dated February 20th, 2020.
(Document marked as Hearing
Exhibit No. 6 for
identification.)
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: So moved.
So that will be Exhibit 6 and that's your first exhibit in your exhibit packet?

MR. MORE: Yes.
MS. BUGEL: Okay.
MR. MORE: I'd like to direct your question to Federal Register Page 9978.

MS. ZEIVEL: This is going to be a bit complicated because the Agency does not have the ability for everybody to have a printed copy of these exhibits considering the timeframe. I think we have one in the room. So I just ask your patience as we try to catch up with you.
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MR. MORE: Yes, take your time and let me just direct you to where I want you to go so maybe we can make it easier. It's the middle column at the top after Item 7. I'll just read it into the record for you.

MS. ZEIVEL: Can you repeat the page number again?

MR. MORE: 9978.
MS. ZEIVEL: Okay. We're there.
MR. MORE: Item 7 will not have an expiration date. Permit terms will remain in effect until modified or until the permit is revoked and reissued or terminated and that is proposed Section $257.120(\mathrm{~b})(7)$. And I'd like to turn your attention to Dynegy's Question 98 on Exhibit 4, Page 7 through 8. Is there anything in the

Illinois Environmental Protection Act requiring the duration of construction permits issued under Part 845 to be consistent with the term for construction permits issued under different programs?

MR. BUSCHER: The Agency is not aware of that, no.
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MR. MORE: And when companies submit an application for closure, do you anticipate that application will contain a schedule setting forth the expected date by which the construction activity will be completed?

MR. LECRONE: Yes. This is Darin Lecrone. Yes.

MR. MORE: And if the approved closure activity was expected to take longer than five years, would setting the term of the construction permit consistent with the approved closure activity be detrimental to human health and the environment?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The answer is it could be if a construction project takes longer than necessary. I guess that would be my answer.

MR. MORE: Right. In that instance, the permit would set forth the deadline by which the project must be performed and if it couldn't be performed in time, wouldn't the owner or operator have to go in for either an amendment or, in fact, be in violation of its permit?

MR. LECRONE: Well, that's kind of
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how it is setup now. Construction permits can get renewed or extended. So any timeframe is kind of arbitrary.

MR. MORE: And, in fact, what the -let me set this aside. The renewal process and the entire construction permitting process set forth in 845 is pretty onerous. So the question is, if at the front end you're going to approve a construction schedule that sets a six-year deadline to complete the activity and it's going to be written in the permit, why do I have to go in for a renewal six months before year five when you've already approved I have the construction activity that is going to take six years?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
I guess the eight proposed timeframes that we thought was appropriate, especially given the timeframes associated with existing construction permits, if the other participants or the Board feels another timeframe or another option is appropriate, the Agency would be willing to consider it.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Did you say consider it at the end there?
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MR. LECRONE: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
MR. LECRONE: We'd be willing to consider another proposal.

MR. MORE: Thank you, Mr. Lecrone. I have no more questions on 220.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. I
see it's 3:00. I propose taking a ten-minute break right now and coming back at 3:10, continuing on with 220 and IERG's questions. So we'll pause for a little bit and be back at 3:10. Thank you.
(Whereupon, a break was taken after which the following proceedings were had.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Welcome back. It's about 3:14. A little bit late. We are resuming here. We have had a suggestion in the room from Dynegy's representatives to perhaps stay until 6:00 p.m. today and start tomorrow at 8:00 a.m. knowing that we will have -- hard end tomorrow for testimony because of our public comment section and hopefully be able to complete all the testimony and questions for this hearing
on Thursday.
So the Board is -- the Board's representatives here are available to do that. Are there any questions or complaints from people in the room?

MS. BUGEL: Agency counsel is not present.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Agency counsel is not present in their room. So I'll hold off on this question. We'll just wait a few minutes here for the Agency to get back. Okay. Just checking in the Agency's room, are the attorneys back?

MR. BUSCHER: We're just discussing real quick.

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine
Zeivel. The Agency doesn't -- isn't opposed to going until 5:30 tonight. We're not able to go until 6:00. We can also agree to start in the morning. However, with the caveat, we may have -certain witnesses may have to leave early or may be slightly late due to childcare and other obligations.

> If there are questions posed
during that timeframe for the appropriate witness, you may have to punt that question until they are back.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. That sounds good. So we will continue to 5:30 today and begin at 8:00 tomorrow. Sounds good. Moving on we were at Section 220 and we were at IERG.

Do you have any questions for
Section 220?
MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. Not at this time.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
Ameren.
MS. MANNING: I do. Thank you. I have a couple of general questions.

First of all, as to surface impoundments that have closed where the Agency has accepted closure and are and have been in postclosure care, but because of the Agency's rule proposal the date October 19th, 2015, and the closure was not done by that date, does the Agency intend that the entirety of this section apply to those closed facilities that are effectively closed and in postclosure care?
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[^16]MS. MANNING: This -- any surface impoundment in the category I described which are those that closed or postclosure care, have been recognized as such, but the closure did not occur prior to October 19th, 2015.

So the Agency's proposal would have that surface impoundment that $I$ just described reclose?

MR. DUNAWAY: Those that you're describing would fall under the exemption under 22.59. I don't recall the -- E, I believe. If they had a motion plan submitted to approve -closure plan submitted by May of I believe it's 2019 and they finish their closure they would not need a construction permit for a closure.

MS. MANNING: Otherwise, the
Agency's testimony is that the rest of 845.220 would apply to that facility or would $22.59(e)$ effectively exempt out that surface impoundment that I just described from this construction permit as described in 845.220?

MR. DUNAWAY: They would be -- those CCR surface impoundments would be exempt from the construction permit requirements.
MS. MANNING: Thank you. And as to Page 170
any ash pond that has had its CCR removed pursuant
to the Agency's authority oversight and approval,
but the Agency is not recognizing it as closed
because of the groundwater monitoring requirement,
three-year monitoring requirement that is proposed
in the Federal Rules, does the Agency intend that
this section apply to those ash ponds where the
CCR has been removed?
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. To the
extent that they are not exempt by 22.59 for
having completed closure, yes.
questions on $220 ?$
Thank you. Moving on to the AG's office. Any
questions on Section $220 ?$

[^17]Moving on to Section 230 Operating Permits.
MS. GALE: I'm sorry.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sorry. I
forgot about follow-up questions. Midwest
Generation.
MS. GALE: I need my mic.
MR. HAMMONS: This is Jeff Hammons,
Environmental Law and Policy Center. We have a follow-up question.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sorry about
that. I forgot about that. We'll go with
Ms. Gale. Go ahead, Ms. Gale, and then
Mr. Hammons.
MS. GALE: I just have a follow-up question related to the modeling on Section 220 (c) (2).

So where it says modeling
required under corrective action construction, does this require only numerical modeling or will detailed analytical modeling also be acceptable?

MS. ZEIVEL: Amy, are you speaking?
Because you're muted.
MS. ZIMMER: Up --
MS. ZEIVEL: I can hear you.
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MS. ZIMMER: Can you hear me?
MS. ZEIVEL: Yes.
MR. BUSCHER: Start over.
MS. ZIMMER: Okay. I will. Sorry.
It didn't show that I was muted. I apologize.
This is Amy Zimmer.
It would be -- the Agency would
view some kind of numerical modeling as the appropriate modeling here, not an analytical
model. It would have to be some kind of numerical
modelling from a 2D/3D modeling, probably some combination thereof.

MS. GALE: And in the Agency's answer I guess we were going with is, does the Agency understand at times it can be a consuming exercise to do a numerical model? For instance, I know one location that took almost over a year to conduct a numerical model.

MS. ZIMMER: Yes, it can be very time-consuming. I agree.

MS. GALE: So that relates to the other time questions we have related to a construction permit, would the Agency take that into consideration of allowing permitting to go
beyond the time that it allows under the regulations?

MS. ZEIVEL: Ms. Gale, can you clarify the timeframe you're referencing? MS. GALE: I was just trying to piggyback on what Mr. More was talking about related to the construction permitting in five years and I'm just trying to add on that about the time of doing a numerical model, you know, and would that -- I guess the Agency already answered that question.

They would consider it, but would that help in their consideration of adjusting its timelines so that we can get these modeling -- modeling done well and in a timely fashion?

MS. ZIMMER: This is Amy Zimmer.
Can you all hear me?
MS. GALE: Yes.
MS. ZIMMER: The Agency is not
inclined to consider extensions at this time.
MS. GALE: Okay. Then let's turn to
$220(\mathrm{a})(2)(\mathrm{a})$. This is related to types of CCR expected in the CCR surface impoundment, including

[^18]the chemical analysis.
What range of chemical
constituents does the Agency expect in CCR and how does that influence closure since we already have fugitive dust parameters and groundwater parameters?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Will
you clarify what you mean by range of chemicals?
MS. GALE: I guess the question is how different does the Agency think CCR is?

MR. LECRONE: It matters. Darin Lecrone. Sorry. It matters because ash quality and -- and the quantity of potential pollutants in the ash is going to depend on the coal source and whether there's other waste streams such as scrubber wastewaters or sludges or metal or chemical or non-chemical metal cleaning waste, those sort of waste streams that could end up in the ash as well. So that's why, you know, there is potential variation in ash quality.

MS. GALE: And does the Agency believe that variation is significant?

MR. LECRONE: We don't know, which is part of why we're asking for the data.

MS. GALE: I see. Nothing further.
Thanks.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. I
believe Mr. Hammons had questions -- follow-up questions on 220.

MR. HAMMONS: Yes, Jeffrey Hammons, Environmental Law and Policy Center. I had a couple follow-up questions in response to the Agency's questions, some of Dynegy's questions. That was a mouthful. I apologize.

My first question for the Agency is whether they can confirm that Exhibit 6 is a proposed rule and not a final rule by the federal EPA?

MR. MORE: This is Josh More. I represented in the questioning when I moved to admit it that it was a proposed rule.

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The Agency agrees.

MR. HAMMONS: Sorry. The Agency
agrees that it's a proposed rule and not a final rule?

MR. LECRONE: Yes, correct.
MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So it's
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possibly the federal EPA permitting program could change when it becomes a final rule?

MR. LECRONE: Potentially, yes.
MR. HAMMONS: My second question is,
is there any requirement that you know of in the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act that requires the Agency's permitting program to mirror the federal EPA's permitting program?

MR. LECRONE: There was no federal
permitting program in place when the act was amended.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. And my last question has to do with the five-year timeline on construction permits.

Isn't it possible that during
the five years since the permit is issued that circumstances could change that would warrant changes to those permits?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. That is possible, yes.

MR. HAMMONS: So the five-year
renewal timeline does provide revolving opportunity to ensure those permits and their implementations still comply with Part 845,
correct?
MR. LECRONE: It would in those types of circumstances, yes.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. That's all.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Follow-up question from Dynegy.

MR. MORE: Yes, I apologize for
having to go back and forth on this. Under that fact pattern, if the permit term remained at five years if a change in condition happened in year two, would that trigger an obligation to likely amend the permit to recognize that change in condition?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. It could -- after issuance of any construction permit either under existing Agency programs or under this proposal, if some change needs to occur, a revised design, you get into construction, you run into an issue, you have to revise a design of what you're building, then you would need to come in for either a modified or supplemental construction permit.

MR. MORE: Thank you, Mr. LeCrone.
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And that's independent of the term of the permit whether we made it two years or 25 years, correct? MR. LECRONE: That would be correct, yes.

MR. MORE: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Any other
follow-up questions on Section 220?
Ms. Williams from the City of Springfield.

MS. WILLIAMS: Deborah Williams.
Just a quick follow up. Mr. Hammons asked about whether there was a requirement in the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act that the state permit program mirror the federal and I guess I would just like the Agency to let me know if they agree for the record that that act does require the Agency to propose a program that is approvable to stand in place of the federal program in Illinois, is that correct?

MR. LECRONE: Can you restate the question, please?

MS. WILLIAMS: Does the Coal Ash
Pollution Prevention Act require the Agency to propose and the Board to adopt rules establishing
a permit program that is federally approvable for Illinois in place of a federal permit program? MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Will you repeat your question, please, so I answer correctly?

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm not trying to trick anybody so if $I$ didn't word it artfully, please feel free to ask a clar- -- what I mean, but I meant it to be a very simple question. If the court reporter will go ahead.

MR. DUNAWAY: I would like to hear the question again so I answer what you asked. MS. WILLIAMS: Are you able to do that? Is that doable that you can read it back? (Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, I think I got that. The -- no. When Section 22.59 was proposed, there was no federally proposed permit program. Therefore, it could not -- could not recognize it had to be -- had to have a permit program approved for that nor does 22.59 say that we must get federal approval for Part 845. It simply requires that we be as protective and -- at
least as protective and comprehensive.
MS. WILLIAMS: So is it the Agency's position after 845 is adopted the Agency is not required to submit it for federal approval?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. There is not a requirement in Section 22.59 of the act that requires us to get federal approval for this program.

MS. WILLIAMS: And have you looked at whether there's any other sections of the act that might require that?

MR. DUNAWAY: No.
MS. WILLIAMS: I don't have anything further right now.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Any
other further follow-up questions on Section 220?
Hearing none, we move on to 230 Operating Permits and we'll begin with our first questioners of Little Village, ELPC, Prairie Rivers and Sierra Club. Any questions on Section 230?

MS. BUGEL: I believe Mr. Hammons has questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Mr. Hammons?

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. Jeffrey
Hammons, Environmental Law and Policy Center. So my first question for the Agency is in reference to $230(a)(1)$ to $230(a)(11)$ and it's also a follow up to our question to Darin Lecrone. Question 18(b), which is Exhibit 2 at Page 81. So I'll continue, but if the Agency isn't there, just let me know. This is pre-filed question to answer 18 -- 18 (b).

MR. LECRONE: Thank you.
MR. HAMMONS: In your pre-filed answer, you noted that the -- this has to do with certifications of plans and assessments and that documents supporting those certifications will be placed on the facility's operating record, but are not required to be submitted as part of an operating permit application.

So my question for the Agency is
whether if the rules did require supporting documentation of those certifications to be submitted alongside the certifications themselves for operating permits if that would harm the Agency's ability to administer its permitting program.

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The Agency intended to rely on the certifications kind of to avoid a duplication of effort and to avoid, you know, having to handle documents that are already intended to be available for the public.

MR. HAMMONS: But would the Agency be opposed if the proposed rules did require those supporting documents to be filed alongside the operating permit applications?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. We stand behind the rule as we drafted it.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So my next question is a clarifying question to one of your pre-filed answers. This is a pre-filed answer to another question for Darin Lecrone. Question 7, which is on Page 75 of Exhibit 2.

So the question asks the Agency
how they will ensure that surface impoundments have developed plans and assessments that meet the applicable requirements if those plans and assessments are not required to be submitted to or approved by the Agency and your answer noted that you rely on those certifications by qualified
professional engineers to ensure that those plans and assessments do meet the requirements of Part 845 and that issues may arise that warrant Agency review of a relevant plan such as on the occasion of complaints received.

My question is specifically when you're talking about complaints received, are you referring to complaints made by the public after that plan and permit have already been approved?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. It could be. It could be operational concerns or issues that are brought to the Agency's attention. It could be any number of things that would cause us to go back and take a look at that documentation to make sure that the owner/operator or the permittee is complying with what they committed to, what they certified they would be doing and the permit that was issued.
So, yeah, we are relying on those certifications and the $P E$ signature and stamp on them and, you know, would only intend to review those if those issues mentioned do arise.

MR. HAMMONS: So in the event that the public has concerns with the sufficiency of
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the plan that is submitted, if those plans and assessments were submitted as part of an operating permit application, then the public could raise those concerns in part -- as part of the permitting process?

MR. LECRONE: The information should be available, you know, on the owner/operators website. If they want to raise those issues or concerns during the permitting process, they can do so.

MR. HAMMONS: Okay. So I did have a question related to that, but it is more of an operating record question, but since it is sort of intermixed between these two, is there an explicit requirement anywhere in the rules for when the documents are required to be posted on the facility's operating record, have to be posted on their website?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. $845.810(d)$ requires that it be placed on the website within 30 days of placement in the operating record.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. One additional question. So my concern is there --
that 30 -day delay of when it is placed in the operating record from when it's actually posted on the website, I'm not clear and if you can provide me, you know, some assurance in the rules, but when it is actually placed in that operating record there is not a time requirement. The concern being if you have an operating permit application and there is no requirement for when they actually have to post the supporting documents for the assessments and the certification of the plans when the public is able to actually comment on that in a meaningful way. So my question is if those assessments and plans are required to be part of the operating permit application, would the public be able to comment on them in the permitting process?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. Any construction permits for new impoundments, for corrective action or closure, that information is required to be posted on their website 14 days prior to any pre-application public meeting. So that would make that
information available to the public prior to the
pre-application public meeting so they could participate in those as well as be informed once an application is filed.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So that helps me understand how it will work for construction permits, but my question is for $230(a)(1)$ through (a) (11), which are operating permits which require, you know, structural stability assessment, safety factor assessment and emergency action plan and $I$ won't read them all, they're all there, those are also supposed to be in the operating record, but is there any requirement for when those have to be posted for operating permit applications?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. You're correct. The answer is no except for in $845.700(c)$ where it requires no later than 30 days after the effective date of the part the owner/operator must send a category designation including justification for that for each surface impoundment to the Agency.

So, you're right, other than
that exception in 700 (c) for the category designations, there is no deadline.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So I'm going to move on now to a different subject and it's -- well, it's a related subject and it has to do with the timing of initial operating permits for existing surface impoundments and their annual inspection report.
So this is in reference to
pre-filed answers to questions on Exhibit 2, Page 70, Question 3. Question No. 3 has a bunch of subparts. So Question $3(\mathrm{~b})$ which has to do with hazard potential classification, assessment certification. I'll wait until you get to Page 70.

MR. LECRONE: We've got it.
MR. HAMMONS: So this is a question about timing. Existing surface impoundments are required to have operating permit -- permits and so my question for the Agency is what do you envision comes first for the existing impoundment, the annual inspection report or their operating permit application?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
The first annual reports would be due January 31st, 2022, and the initial operating permit
applications would be due in September or July of 2021.

MR. HAMMONS: So for existing surface impoundments that are required to provide hazard classification, assessment, certification, that certification will be made available after the operating permit applications, correct?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. They would be available after the application. MR. HAMMONS: And should the public want to comment on those hazard potential classifications, assessments, certifications and the supporting documents, would they be able to do that as part of the permit comment process for their operating permit?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
Is the question -- can -- can you state your question again so I'm sure $I$ answer it correctly?

MR. HAMMONS: Yes. As the proposed rules are currently written, hazard potential classification, assessment certification, structural stability assessment certification, safety factor assessment certification and in-flow design flood control plan -- in-flow design flood

[^19]control system plan certification for existing surface impoundments are all required to be posted as part of their annual inspection and as we have previously discussed the annual inspection is going to occur after the operating permits for those existing surface impoundments.

So when is the public able to
comment on the adequacy of those assessments if they're not part of the operating permit application?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. As it is drafted, there is no opportunity for the public to comment on those certifications and assessments that were part of the annual report.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So I'm going to change subjects slightly and talk about the plans. So, in particular, the emergency action plan, the fugitive dust control plan and the safety and health plan that are required for operating permits.
Right now -- I guess I'm asking you to confirm my understanding. Right now those plans are not required to be submitted as part of an operating permit application, only a

[^20]certification that those plans meet the requirements of Part 845?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
As drafted, the application only requires submittal of the certifications.

MR. HAMMONS: And since the plans are not required to be part of an operating permit application, at what point can the public comment on the adequacy of those plans and their compliance with Part 845?

MR. LECRONE: The way it is currently drafted, only the certifications are required to be submitted and there would be no opportunity for them to review those.

MR. HAMMONS: And just for the record, those are the plans, the emergency action plan, the fugitive dust control plan and the safety and health plan?

MR. LECRONE: Yes. Sorry. That's correct.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So my next question also has to do with plans, but slightly different topic and it's just a clarification of one of your pre-filed answers to our Question 12

[^21]that was directed at Darin Lecrone, but it's more a question for clarification of the Agency generally.

So this is on Page 77, the bottom of Page 77, the top of Page 78 for Exhibit 2.

So our Question 12 asked whether
compliance with the plans that we -- that I just recently listed, the three plans, would be a condition of a permit and in your pre-filed answer you said that whether or not a plan or a portion of a plan would be part of a permit would be determined on a case-by-case basis.

So my question is whether the Agency's ability to administer the permitting program would be harmed if the rules just required as a default that those plans are enforceable conditions of permits?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The Agency is opposed to making those plans all enforceable permit conditions, primarily due to potential jurisdictional overlaps between other -our agency and other state and federal agencies.

MR. HAMMONS: Can you give me an
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example of that overlap and why it affects whether a plan is a condition of a permit or not? MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. Two examples would be the IDNR damn safety program and OSHA requirements.

MR. HAMMONS: I'm just trying to
understand a little bit more. So for the emergency action plan, fugitive dust control plan and safety and health plan, there is potential jurisdictional conflict with either IDNR or OSHA, is that what you're saying?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin here.
There is a jurisdictional overlap with OSHA. EAP's, or emergency action plans, are required under 1910.120, which is for all RCRA corrective action which this falls under.

THE COURT REPORTER: Which is for what?

MS. MARTIN: 29 CFR 1910.120.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Could you
repeat? Our court reporter didn't hear. For all what action?

MS. MARTIN: That emergency action plan is required under OSHA 29 CFR 1910.120.

MR. MORE: She said for all RCRA
corrective action.
MS. MARTIN: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
MR. MORE: RCRA.
MR. HAMMONS: So one follow up to
that.
Does the federal CCR rules
require emergency action plans?
MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin here. So the fugitive dust plan and the EAP are required on 257. However, the safety and health plan is not in 257. It is required by 29 CFR 1910 and 29 CFR 1926.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So for the emergency action plan and the fugitive dust control plan, would the Agency's ability to administer its permitting program be adversely affected if the rules might make those two plans enforceable conditions of permits?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The Agency is not prepared to be able to answer that question today, but we can follow up.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. And I just
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have one more question on that topic.
If the emergency action plan is
not made a condition of a permit, how can the Agency or how does the Agency plan to enforce that plan in the event that the facility doesn't follow it?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The Agency's only role here at this point is to ensure that a plan is developed and that it meets the requirements of 845. Implementation of that plan and/or failure to implement that plan kind of falls outside the scope of the 845 rule as drafted.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So my next question, and I promise $I$ only have a few more, has to do with a pre-filed answer to Question 9 (b) and that's on Page 76 of Exhibit 2.

Specifically, the pre-filed answer referred to the Illinois DNR which is the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. My question is just generally what role do you see the Illinois DNR playing in the CCR impoundment permitting program?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
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As I stated here, IDNR has existing -- has an existing damn safety program that they are responsible for and it's not our intention in Part 845 to interfere with that existing program.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So my last
set of questions has to deal with liner certifications and this is also follow-up to a pre-filed answer of yours on Page 81 of Exhibit 2 and the question that it was in response to was Question 20, Subpart A which asks about liner certifications.

In particular, your answer -the pre-filed answer stated that surface impoundments closing prior to July 30th, 2021, are not required to submit liner certifications to the Agency.

> So my first question is, are
those impoundments still subject to the groundwater monitoring and corrective action subpart of the Part 845 rules?

MR. LECRONE: Can you repeat your
question, please?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes. I'm trying to
figure out the applicability of Subpart $F$, which
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is groundwater monitoring corrective action, as it relates to those surface impoundments you're referring to in the answer. So this is surface impoundments closing prior to July 30th, 2021.

So are those surface
impoundments still subject to Subpart $F$, groundwater monitoring and corrective action?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The answer is, yes, those impoundments closed prior to July 2021 that are not inactive, closed would be required to comply with Subpart F.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So one follow-up question.

In the event those surface impoundments are required to conduct corrective action under Subpart $F$, would a liner certification for those impoundments be useful as part of that corrective action application?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The answer would be no. The site would have to develop appropriate corrective action based on those unique site characteristics.

MR. HAMMONS: So whether or not that impoundment has a liner that meets the

[^22]requirements of 845.400 Subpart $B$ or $C$ is not relevant or useful in determining whether or not the corrective action application complies with the rules?

MR. LECRONE: Are you asking about the impoundments that closed prior to July 30th, 2021?

MR. HAMMONS: Yes.
MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. If either of these impoundments closed under an Agency-approved closure plan prior to July of 2021, a liner certification at a later date based on a corrective action assessment wouldn't -wouldn't necessarily do any good.

MR. HAMMONS: All right. Thank you.
Those are all my questions for 230.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Thank you, Mr. Hammons. Moving on for Section --
MS. ZEIVEL: Vanessa, we've been at
this for over two hours. Are we planning on
breaking again before 5:30 or are we going
straight to 5:30?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Oh, sure. We can take a ten-minute break. Sure. It's 4:40
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right now. So let's break until 4:50.
MS. ZEIVEL: That would be
excellent. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem.
(Whereupon, a break was taken after which the following proceedings were had.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Hello,
everyone. We're at 4:51. Okay. I think we're at Midwest Generation for questions for Section 230. MS. GALE: At this time, I reserve the right for follow up.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: For follow up. City of Springfield, any questions on 230? MS. WILLIAMS: I think I have to go back and follow up if that's okay. I'm pretty sure it's from this section, but if it was from 220, I apologize, but I really want to follow up on Mr. Dunaway's answer earlier about whether it was required to submit these rules to U.S. EPA for approval.

So I guess I would just like to have the Agency witnesses take a look at Page 10 of the statement of reasons. And I would just
like to read from the first sentence in the last paragraph that goes on to the next page.

The third purpose and effect of the proposed rule is to adopt the federal CCR rules in Illinois and obtain federal approval of Illinois CCR -- Illinois CCR surface impoundment program.

I just want to make sure based on the previous answer to clarify that this is still the position of the Agency of the purpose of why these rules were submitted to the Board?

MS. ZEIVEL: Okay. We were muted.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. We can hear you.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. It is
the Agency's intent to have 845 operate under Part 257, but there was no requirement that we do so.

MS. WILLIAMS: I appreciate that
answer. I think I would ask the Agency to go back and look or ask the Board to consider whether 4 (l) of the act would require it also, but $I$ just appreciate clarifying for the record that it's the Agency's intent to do so. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
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Dynegy, questions on Section 230?
MR. MORE: Yes, this is Josh More.
I have some follow-up questions to those presented by Mr. Hammons. The Agency may recall that Mr. Hammons asked a number of questions about the emergency action plan, the safety and health plan and the fugitive dust $p l a n$ and whether or not those plans would be available for public review and comment and I want to explore that a little bit.

Is it the Agency's understanding that those plans all have to be posted to the company's website and made available to the public?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
Yes.
MR. MORE: At that time, would the public then have an opportunity to review the plans?

MR. LECRONE: Once they are posted to the company's website, yes.

MR. MORE: And should a member of the public have a comment on those plans, can they send that comment to the Agency at any point in
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
time?
MR. LECRONE: Yes.
MR. MORE: And should the Agency in response to that comment determine that the plan doesn't meet a requirement of Part 845 , can the Agency bring an enforcement action at that time?

MR. LECRONE: Yes.
MR. MORE: And when these plans are posted to the website and made available for everyone to review, should the Agency on its own accord determine that a plan is insufficient to meet the requirements of Part 845 , can it bring an enforcement action at that time?

MR. LECRONE: Could you restate your question, please?

MR. MORE: Yeah, it's just a variation of a prior question. Once the plans are made available to the Agency and the public on the website, should the Agency on its own accord decide to review a plan and determine it is insufficient to meet the minimum requirements of 845, it can bring an enforcement action, correct?

MR. LECRONE: Yes.
MR. MORE: Okay. Now, let's turn to
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$845.230(e)$, excuse me, the term of the operating permit. I'm sorry. Before we go there.

There is a concept under Section 230 called a postclosure care permit which is 230 -- $230(c)$, do you see that postclosure care operating permit?

MR. LECRONE: Yes, we see it.
MR. MORE: Okay. And then
845.230(e) sets forth the term of all operating permits at five years.

When a unit is approved to close in place in accordance with Part 845, there is a minimum of a 30-year postclosure care period, correct?

MR. LECRONE: I'm sorry. You cut out there. We didn't hear the entirety of your question.

MR. MORE: Thank you. When a unit closes in accordance with the closure in place requirements, it is then subject to a minimum of a 30 -year postclosure care period, correct?

MR. LECRONE: Correct.
MR. MORE: Now, when a facility closes in place, enters that postclosure care
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period, would setting the term of the operating permit at that point in time to 30 years to coincide with the postclosure care period -- the minimum term of the postclosure care period be detrimental to human health and the environment?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The Agency believes the 30 -year operating permit term for those in postclosure excessive and the reason for that being it would not allow the Agency an opportunity to rebid permit conditions based on monitoring and inspections during that permit term.

A five-year permit term would allow the Agency to reissue a permit and update operating conditions based on the reporting and monitoring during that five-year term.

MR. MORE: And is there a limit to what is a minimum or $I$ should say maximum permit term that the Agency would view as being acceptable to allow it to review ongoing monitoring data and evaluate whether changes were necessary?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. The Agency believes the five-year permit term as
proposed is appropriate.
MR. MORE: Okay. No further questions on 230.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on to IERG. First, any questions on Section 230?

MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. No
questions at this time.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
Moving on to Ameren.
MS. MANNING: Yes, thank you. As to surface impoundments that have been closed where the Agency has approved and accepted the closure and they are now and have been in postclosure care, but since closure occurred after the effective date of part of the federal rule, but before July 30th, 2019, they are not considered closed by the Agency in terms of its proposed rules.

So I'm wondering what, if any, provisions in the operating permits these closed facilities that are in postclosure care would need to -- would need to -- would apply to those situations.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: The Agency
can continue if they're ready.
MR. BUSCHER: Certain aspects of the operating permits would be applicable. This is Bill Buscher, by the way.

MS. MANNING: I'm sorry. Can you
repeat that?
MR. BUSCHER: Sure. This is Bill
Buscher.
Certain aspects of the operating permit would be applicable.

MS. MANNING: Could you identify which ones, Mr. Buscher?

MR. BUSCHER: Certainly. Four -that is 845.234 Evidence That Permanent Markers Have Been Installed, a groundwater monitoring program would be applicable.

MS. MANNING: What particular section is that? E of --

MR. BUSCHER: That is 845.230(a)(12). These are the ones that are, you know, striking me now. This may not be an all-inclusive list. Those are the ones that seem applicable at this time.
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ready not necessarily tomorrow morning. If you could get back to us, I would appreciate knowing what amendment you're referring to.

MS. ZEIVEL: Ms. Manning, you said
247. Did you mean 257?

MS. MANNING: Yes, I'm sorry. I
meant 257. Thank you.
MS. ZEIVEL: And then regarding your
most recent question, we were still considering a response. There was confusion as to whether you were referring to a postclosure construction permit or, I'm sorry, an initial operating permit. MR. LECRONE: Postclosure care operating permit.

MS. ZEIVEL: A postclosure care
operating permit.
MS. MANNING: So, Mr. Buscher, are you saying the postclosure care operating permit will be required for a surface impoundment that has --

MR. BUSCHER: My --
MS. MANNING: Go ahead.
MR. BUSCHER: Go ahead and finish.
MS. MANNING: For a surface
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impoundment that has closed under the Agency's authority, but has not closed prior to October 2015, are they going to need a postclosure operating permit when they're already in postclosure care?

MR. BUSCHER: Yes.
MS. MANNING: That's it for now.
Thank you.
MS. ZEIVEL: Another point of clarification on your ask for the Agency to respond to you. It seems as you were asking us to respond to you first thing tomorrow morning.

MS. MANNING: No, whatever -- I
would like you to respond if you could so we can ask questions to you, follow-up questions.

MS. ZEIVEL: Okay. I just wanted to note that we are going late this evening. We also have Agency staff who have family and childcare situations and we are starting at 8:00 a.m. in the morning which does not allow for the Agency to put in additional time outside of the hearing due to the extended hearing hours. So it is going to be problematic and difficult considering we are going until 7:30 tomorrow night as well.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

MS. MANNING: At some point,
Ms. Zeivel, I'd like you to put on the record the amendment that you referred to that you base Section 845.740(b) upon.

MS. ZEIVEL: Absolutely. We will commit to doing that.

MS. MANNING: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Moving on to the AG's office. Questions on Section 230?

MR. SYLVESTER: This is Steve
Sylvester. We don't have any questions. Thanks. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.

Mr. Rao for the Board?
MR. RAO: No questions. Thanks.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. I
think we can move on to Section -- sorry.
Follow-up questions on Section 230?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes, Jeffrey Hammons,
Environmental Law and Policy Center. I know we're getting close to time. I have two real quick follow-up questions for the Agency. These are following up on a couple of Dynegy's follow-ups to my previous questions.
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[^23]$240 ?$
MS. COURTNEY: Yes. Hi. Can you
hear me?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. COURTNEY: Hi. This is Kiana
Courtney for the Environmental Law and Policy Center.

My questions primarily refer to page -- a question that was responded to by Chris Pressnall on Page 96 of Exhibit 2. If the Agency is there --

MS. ZEIVEL: We have Page 96.
MS. COURTNEY: So in response to question 10A, you recognize that the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act requires that the rules must specify meaningful public participation, right?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
Yes.
MS. COURTNEY: And this line of
questioning is in relation to Section 845.240(e). So that part of the rule states that there are 14 days to review the documents before a pre-application meeting, correct?
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MR. LECRONE: This is Darryl
Lecrone. Correct.
MS. COURTNEY: And those materials, so construction permit applications, include complex technical documents and analysis, right?

MR. LECRONE: Correct.
MS. COURTNEY: This is generally
speaking. So taking -- taking all of that into account, could the public engage more meaningfully with more time to review those complex documents?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. Additional time would always be better. The Agency, you know, kind of has to balance the needs of -- each of the participants in one of these to keep things moving, move, you know, ponds that need to close, towards closure, and this is just kind of step one in the process. So we thought 14 days initially would be adequate for this first step in the public participation process. So then those materials would be still available. Once an application is filed, we're going to provide notification we received the application and there's going to be a 30-day public notice period that will allow for the
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public to raise any questions and issues that they have identified even for those materials that they first became aware of prior to that public meeting.

MS. COURTNEY: So just to clarify, would giving more time to the public generally allow for more meaningful public participation?

MS. ZEIVEL: The question has been asked and answered.

MS. COURTNEY: Thank you. Would it harm the Agency's ability to execute this program if the public received more than 14 days in advance of the public meeting to review documents?

MR. LECRONE: The Agency is of the position that it could affect our ability to -- to move this program. The timelines are already going to be tight for when applications are due and if we allow too much time prior to this initial public meeting, the pre-application public meeting, it may affect when those application filing deadlines can happen because of the timeframes associated with the meeting requirements prior to them filing an application with the Agency.


[^24]applications, public notice requirements and the opportunity for a public hearing make it difficult to complete the process with a defined timeframe. Like the NPDES program, robust public participation is an essential part of this proposal. Not having a specific decision deadline allows for the maximum flexibility during the public notice and hearing processes. That's what it says, correct?

MR. LECRONE: That's what it says, correct.

MS. COURTNEY: And so in giving the public more time than, say, the 30 days to be able to meaningfully participate, would that align -would that concept align with that answer?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
That answer really has to do with how long the Agency's decision-making process is once it receives an application. So it had more to do with that than what happens prior to receipt by the Agency.

MS. COURTNEY: Okay. I want to go
back to Page 96, Question $10(a)(a)(1)$.
MR. LECRONE: We've got it.
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