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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is Vanessa Horton in Chicago. Can $I$ ask the IEPA Springfield group if you could hear us okay?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, we can hear you fine.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: So we're going to get started here. Thank you for your patience. Just had some technical difficulties here, but I think we're up and going.

Good morning. It is 9:16. And welcome again to the resuming of the hearing in this matter for R20-19, Rulemaking for Proposed new 35 Illinois Administrative Code 845: Standards for the Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals in Surface Impoundments.

I'll remind the witnesses that they are still under oath and that we will be resuming with 845.700 . And I also remind all the questioners today that we are spending today on true follow-up questions only, as the Agency has done significant work in responding to the initial questions. So I believe at the end of the last hearing, questioners presented to us that there would be about an hour and a half or two hours left of questions. So hopefully we can stick to that this morning.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
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All right. Let's begin. So we'll begin with 845.700. And I'm just going to start again on our order of questioning. So that would be with Little Village Environmental Justice, Environmental Law \& Policy Center, Prairie Rivers Network, and Sierra Club, if you had any further questions on 845.700.

MS. BUGEL: Yes. Faith Bugel representing Sierra Club and, collectively, the environmental groups. I have no further questions on 845.700 , but 1 would also ask Ms. Kiana Courtney if she has any further questions?

MS. COURTNEY: Yes, I have three follow-up questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Please proceed.
MS. COURTNEY: So my questions are mostly directed to Chris Pressnall. So my first question is: For facilities that are located along or near water bodies, did the Agency take into consideration the demographic of people that have to frequent that area around the facility, for instance, if low-income or minority communities travel outside that one-mile radius due river for fishing?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris Pressnall of the Illinois EPA. No, we did not.

MS. COURTNEY: My next question: For coal plants located in industrial areas, so not residential neighborhoods, did the agency take into account consideration of the demographics of people who come to those industrial areas for work?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris Pressnall of the Illinois EPA. No, we did not.

MS. COURTNEY: And my last question is
related to a DWLP Question 16 on Page 132 of Exhibit 2.

MR. PRESSNALL: Okay.
MS. COURTNEY: So it mentions that facilities to be defined as being within an EJ area but still located greater than one mile from a residential home in a low-income or minority area, does that facility still disproportionately impact that community?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris Pressnall of the Illinois EPA. Yes.

MS. COURTNEY: That is all for my questions. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you very much, Ms. Courtney.

This is Vanessa Horton again, and I neglected to mention on Webex, we have our chair of the Board,

Barbara Flynn Currie, and also on Webex in Springfield we have member of the Board Brenda Carter. And I'm Vanessa Horton, Hearing Officer. And Marie Tipsord, General Counsel, is also here in the Thompson Center.

So we'll move forward with Midwest
Generation, any questions on 700?
MS. GALE: Yes, just three or four.
Turning to Exhibit 3, the Agency's Answers to Midwest Generation Page 29, and I'm going to be looking at the Agency's answer to Question 78.

MS. COURTNEY: Okay.
MS. GALE: The Agency, in response, said it believes it would be extremely changing for owner or operator to meet the burden of proof required to meet ultimate capacity demonstration under 757.103(a) (1) (I).

And my question is: Why does the Agency believe that to be true?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Because Part 257 does not specify that the Agency does not consider inconvenience or cost.

MS. GALE: I'm sorry. Do you mean the USEPA or do you mean the Illinois EPA?

MS. ZIMMER: USEPA.

MS. GALE: So that's based upon what you think the USEPA is looking at.

Did you conduct or review any owner or operator's alternative capacity demonstrations to come to that conclusion?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. In looking at Part 257, since neither inconvenience nor cost can be considered, and since our 845 has to be at least stringent, the Agency -- it was the Agency's opinion that since these demonstrations of no alternative capacity would have to be reviewed every six months and we were not allowed, under part 257 or would not be allowed under part 257, to consider inconvenience or cost, that we would not be able to approve any of those, but we would have to review those demonstrations every six months, and it would consume our time reviewing demonstrations that we couldn't approve.

MS. GALE: I'm sorry. The original question was is, you believe it to be extremely challenging to meet the burden of proof under 257.103.

And just so I understand, your explanation is because you understand USEPA says that you can't consider inconvenience or cost and that you also don't
want to review them every six months. Is that it?
I'm just trying to understand you.
MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. Since we can't -- since we would not be able to consider cost or inconvenience, that means that if there would be any capacity anyplace within the world that you could find capacity, then you would have to do that.

Therefore, it would be, as an example, you might say, well, we couldn't find anything in Illinois in that six months. We would have to deny it. We would have to say, did you look in the other states. The next six months you might say, we looked in Indiana, we couldn't find anything. Did you look at any other states? And it would go on cyclically like that, or could, potentially, go on cyclically like that, that it would be a waste of the Agency's resources for something we couldn't approve.

MS. GALE: Okay. All right.
And a follow-up to that, because this is related to the extension to October 15, 2023, is the Agency aware that under the pre-publication new federal rule that will be issued any day now, online impoundments would be all locations' restriction and the safety factor assessment that has not detected an

SSI above an applicable groundwater protection may close by October 15, 2024?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. Could you repeat that question? I'm not sure we got all the particular time frames and everything.

MS. GALE: I know. It was long.
So are you aware that under the -- there's a new pre-publication federal rule that will be out any day now, and in that new pre-publication federal rule, online impoundments that meets all locations' restrictions, the safety factor assessment, and have not detected an SSI above an ethical groundwater protection standards may close a year later, on October 15, 2024?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. No, we were not aware of that.

MS. GALE: Okay. Should you become aware, would you follow that change in the federal rule?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We've made our proposal to the Board, and any changes to the rule would now have to originate from the Board.

MS. GALE: Okay. Just two more questions. I want to turn to Page 52 of Exhibit 3, and it's the Agency's answers to Question 68. It's a Dynegy

[^0]Question 68, and then the answer on Page 53.
The answer actually is on Page 53. And in your answer, and it's about Category 2 or the Category 2 in Section 700, the Agency said that it will make a determination on the Category 2 circumstances when it becomes aware of information that leads it to believe an impoundment is imminent threat.

So my question is, is the Agency's determination a final decision that could be appealed pursuant to part 105 of the Board's rules?

MS. ZIMMER: This is Amy Zimmer. Basically the facility will be categorizing their facilities. The Agency will look at those categories. If and when the Agency disagrees with a facility's placement in a category, places it in another category, that decision will be an agency decision that will then be appealable.

MS. GALE: Great. I do have one more follow-up about the alternative disposal capacity questions. And I want to turn to the exhibit for the 2015 Rule, which is Exhibit 5.
(Technical difficulties.)
MS. GALE: So Exhibit 5, which is the 2015

[^1]Rule, let's turn to Page 21.423. And this goes to Mr. Dunaway's answer about looking for alternative capacity. So in the middle column at the bottom, under 1, I'll just read into the record:
"As a result, the facility may be faced with either violating the closure requirements in 257.101 by continuing to place $C C R$ in a unit that is required to close, or having deceased generating power at that facility because there's no place in which to dispose the resulting waste.
"For example, while it is possible to transport dry ash off-site to alternative disposal facility, that simply is not feasible for what generated CCR. Nor can facilities immediately convert to dry handling systems.
"As noted previously, the law cannot compel actions that are physically impossible, and it is incumbent on the EPA to develop a regulation that does not, in essence, establish such a standard."

So my question is: Based upon the Agency's evaluation of alternative CCR disposal capacity, does that change your answer about finding alternative locations for where to place the CCR and the difficulty of establishing an alternative disposal
capacity.
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Subsequent to the Federal Register that you were reading from, the USWAG, U-S-W-A-G decision, the petitioners made essentially the argument that you're making, that there would be -- there could only be capacity somewhere. And the court determined that, based on my non-attorney reading here, that while that might be the case, it's contrary to RCRA's requirement that there not be a consideration of the cost.

So I believe the USWAG decision makes that part of the preamble somewhat moot and supports the language within the rule.

MS. GALE: Mr. Dunaway, what you're referring to is the court's opinion on cost. What I'm referring to is feasibility of moving the material. So my question relates to feasibility of moving wet CCR material, which is referenced in the preamble that I just read into the record.

So, again, to the Agency's statement that it believes it would be extremely challenging, that is USEPA's opinion on the feasibility of moving wet CCR, change its opinion on making an alternative capacity demonstration.

| Page 16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| information suggesting it is feasible to transport |  |  |
| wet-generated ash off-site? |  |  |
| MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. An owner |  |  |
| operator can dry out wet ash, transport it. |  |  |
| MS. GALE: So you disagree with the USEPA's |  |  |
| conclusions in its preamble that it may be infeasible? |  |  |
| MR. DUNAWAY: I think it's a process that can |  |  |
| be done. |  |  |
| MS. GALE: Okay. But I guess, to that end, |  |  |
| doesn't having a hard deadline of October 23, in light |  |  |
| Of the somewhat infeasibility of driving out CCR ash |  |  |
| in some length of time, create a physical |  |  |
| impossibility? |  |  |
| MR. DUNAWAY: I don't -- I can't honestly say |  |  |
| whether it is or is not impossible in that time frame. |  |  |
| MS. GALE: And you don't know how long it |  |  |
| takes to dry out CCR, do you? |  |  |
| MR. DUNAWAY: No, I don't. |  |  |
| MS. GALE: Thank you. Nothing further. |  |  |
| HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on. |  |  |
| It would be the City of Springfield, Ms. Williams, do |  |  |
| you have any questions on 700? |  |  |
| MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. I have one quick |  |  |

[^2]question on 700. It'll be my practice question. Can you hear me?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. WILLIAMS: This question is about the priority categories in $700(\mathrm{~h})$. And in response to one of the questions, I can refer you back if I need to, but I think it's pretty basic. The Agency has testified that these dates for submittal of permit applications were "no later than" dates, and if a facility wanted to submit applications earlier, that that was encouraged.

Is that --
MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes, that's true.
MS. WILLIAMS: So my question is, if a facility wanted to submit an application early, putting aside the practicality of whether the forms will be available, the meeting can be done, but, hypothetically, if you wanted to submit the application as early as possible, would that result potentially in a lower priority facility jumping ahead of -- before a higher priority facility?

So my question is how would an agency be prioritizing internally?

Will the time that you submitted it would be
first-in/first-out kind of thing?
MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.
Generally, we do applications on first-in/first-out. I think with these, if we receive several in different category groupings around the same time, we'll just have to take a look at what we have and internally prioritize which ones can get done first. I'm not really sure how many we expect to receive at different time frames from different categories.

So it will be kind of having to deal with that as we have to and see what applications we get and make that decision on workload, who it's assigned to, which one is going to get done first, and what the schedules are for each facility, what the plans are, whether it's waste removal, whatever. We're just going to have to evaluate those applications and see where they lead us.

MS. WILLIAMS: And will issues like complexity of the review affect the priority with which a permit is finished?

MR. LECRONE: It may affect when a permit is finished, not necessarily when the review starts. If we assume that every one of these is going to go to a public hearing, then you look at, okay, how many

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

comments do we receive, all that factors into how long it takes to formulate a final decision document.

And so we're going to try to start all of them right away when they're received. The final issuance date will depend on the specifics of each individual application.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Moving onto Dynegy, did you have any questions on 700?

MR. MORE: Yes. Just one question. I have a follow-up question to Mr. Gale's line of questioning and Mr. Dunaway's response that one could dry out the ash before transporting it off-site.

Mr. Dunaway, how would you propose that the sluice water be managed at that time?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Without a specific proposal in front of us, we can't speculate on how that might work.

MR. MORE: You recognize that you have to manage both the physical material and the water for a period of time prior to ceasing operation, right?

MR. DUNAWAY: If you are sluicing ash, yes, they both have to be managed.

MR. MORE: And until you convert potentially

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

to a dry ash handling system, you'll have to manage both those waste streams during that period, correct? MR. DUNAWAY: Correct.

MR. MORE: I have no further questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on to IERG, the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group. Melissa Brown, did you have any questions on 700? MS. BROWN: Yes, I do. Can you hear me all right?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. BROWN: Perfect. This is Melissa Brown on behalf of IERG. We do have a few short lines of questioning regarding $E J$ as it relates to this section. My first line of questioning deals with the Agency's pre-filed response to Board questions, so Hearing Exhibit 2, and starting on Page 149.

If the Agency can please let me know when they get to that page.

MR. LECRONE: Okay. We got it.
MS. BROWN: I believe all these subquestions are part of the Board question 1, but I'm looking at specifically at question "I," as in igloo. And in response to this question, the Agency references, quote, EJ starts 2019 data when identifying 29 out of
the 73 impoundments as being in areas of environmental justice concern.

I guess my first question is, is this EJ start 2019 dataset, is this specifically referenced in the proposed rule language anywhere?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris Pressnall. No.
MS. WILLIAMS: And this is not to specifically reference this dataset in the proposed rule language?

MR. PRESSNALL: Is the question -- I'm sorry. Could you please repeat the question?

MS. BROWN: Sure. I was asking why the Agency chose to not reference the EJ start 2019 dataset specifically in the proposed rule language?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris Pressnall. One of the reasons is that the Illinois EPA updates its dataset on a yearly basis for the EJ start demographics screening program. So the rules, the proposed rules, call out areas of environmental justice concern, and then the way we do that is -- in practicality through or environmental justice program, is through the use of Illinois EPA's EJ start program, and, like I said, which is updated on a yearly basis. MS. BROWN: So the stuff that's updated on a

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

yearly basis, that assumes that the data and the dataset changes or could change from year to year, correct.

MR. PRESSNALL: That is correct.
MS. BROWN: Is it conceivable then that a facility's status as being located in an area of EJ concern could change?

MR. PRESSNALL: Yes.
MS. BROWN: Does the Agency think its required or should it be required that this dataset be incorporated by reference into the rule?

MS. ZIMMER: This is Amy Zimmer. The EJ start data, the use of it is going to be tied to prioritization. So whenever a facility is required to prioritize their impoundments, the date of the prioritization, the applicable EJ start dataset that is used at the time of prioritization, is going to be the dataset that applies that year for that -- like, for instance, if a facility -- many facilities are going to prioritize next year. So 2021 data is going to apply.

If there, for some reason, a new facility comes online in, you know, 2025 and they're required to prioritize that year, then 2025 data will be
applicable.
So it's kind of -- it's not static in that we will never use updates. But it is static in that when the facility prioritizes the dataset for that year, it's going to be applicable for that prioritization to that facility and that impoundment for that facility.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.
Sticking with Exhibit 2, referring to
Page 176, please let me know when you get to that page.

MS. ZIMMER: Okay.
MS. BROWN: Thank you. This is Board's Question 64, but on Page 176 we're looking at subsection "C" as in Charlie. And in response to this question, the Agency responded that its data source is the American Community Survey Five-Year Average, or the ACS.

Can the Agency provide any examples in any of its other programs or in any agency program where this ACS dataset is used for regulatory purposes?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris Pressnall. I'm not aware of any other agency program to use that dataset. But what $I$ can point to is we modeled it after the USEPA, Environmental Justice screen, and
that's where they obtained their demographic data. So that's why we chose it.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Just a few follow-up questions on the rule language itself, specifically 745.700, subsection "G" as in golf, 6. So this subsection $G(6)$ and the next subsection $G(7)$ use the term "Census Block Group."

Is it correct that Census Block Group is not defined in this proposed regulation?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris Pressnall. I believe that's correct.

MS. BROWN: How does the Agency define Census Block Group?

MR. PRESSNALL: A standard definition used by the U.S. Census, so the United States.

MS. BROWN: Can you provide or do you have that definition of Census Block Group handy?

MR. PRESSNALL: No, I do not.
MS. BROWN: Is that something that the agency would be willing to follow up on an post-hearing comments and provide that physical definition of census block group?

MR. PRESSNALL: Yes.
MS. BROWN: Thank you.

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

Sticking with the same section, so, again, "G" as in golf, 6, getting into 6(a), 6(a) starts or states: "Any area within one mile of a census block group where the number of low-income persons is twice the statewide average."

So my question is: How is that statewide average of low-income persons determined for purposes of this section?

MR. PRESSNALL: By using the American Community Survey data that on the table that tells us white alone, not Hispanic. So we take that number for the State of Illinois and then double it.

MS. BROWN: And so that number, is that the entire statewide average of low-income persons, or is that the average of low-income persons in a census block group and that's what you use to compare for purposes of this section?

MR. PRESSNALL: If I'm following your question, we are comparing each census block group to the statewide average.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Do you have the statewide average number of low-income persons for 2019 handy today?

MR. PRESSNALL: I may or I may not.

This is Chris. I don't think $I$ know it off the top of my head.

MS. BROWN: Would the Agency be willing to follow up with that in post-hearing comments for both 2019 and 2020?

MR. PRESSNALL: This is Chris. We can't do 2020 because that won't be released until next year. It's always a little bit confusing, but it's always trailing one year because we're using -- you're using the five-year rolling average. And so the 2020 data doesn't come out, 2020, 2019, '18, '17, '16, doesn't come out until 2021.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Can the Agency follow up on just 2019?

MR. PRESSNALL: Yes.
MS. BROWN: Thank you.
So sticking with the same section, it goes on to state that where low-income means the number or percent of a Census Block Group's population and household where the household income is less than or equal to twice the Federal Poverty Level.

How is the Federal Poverty Level determined?
MR. PRESSNALL: I can't answer that question at this time.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$
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MS. BROWN: Is that something you could follow-up on?

MR. PRESSNALL: Yes, it is.
MS. BROWN: Thank you.
And along with that, if you could also follow up with what that number was for 2019 , that would be appreciated.

Then my last question is similar, but concerns subsection "G" as in golf, 6(b), and here it states that: "Any area within one mile of a Census Block Group or the number of minority persons is twice the statewide average."

So then your answer would be similar for this subsection with regard to how the statewide average is determined for the number of minority persons; would that be correct?

MR. PRESSNALL: Could you please rephrase your question or state the whole question?

MS. BROWN: Yeah. Not a problem.
So my question here is, how is the statewide average of number of minority persons, for purposes of comparing to the number in the Census Block Group determined?

MR. PRESSNALL: Okay. So you're asking the
same thing only instead of low-income minority?
MS. BROWN: Uh-huh. Correct.
MR. PRESSNALL: Yeah, we would have to follow up on that. But it's the same -- same process as the low-income.

MS. BROWN: And then can you please also follow up on what the statewide average number of minority persons would have been for $2019 ?$

MR. PRESSNALL: Yes.
MS. BROWN: Thank you. That's all I have at this time.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you.
Next up would be Ameren, Ms. Manning, do you have any questions on Page 700?

Ms. Manning?
MS. MANNING: We're having trouble with audio I think.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We hear you now.
MS. MANNING: Yes. I have a few follow-up questions.

Number one, a follow-up question related to the definition of -- in response to questions from IREG contained on Page 137 of the Agency's responses to questions, on Page 137, if you have that page
available, I'll go ahead and ask the question.
IERG asked the question: "If a closed inactive surface impoundment has a post-closure plan arrived by the agency prior to the effective date of these rules, would it be appropriate to add clarifying language to Section 845.780 as laid out below?

And then they lay out language saying that unless the owner/operator of a CCR surface impoundment has a post-closure plan approved by the Agency, the owner or operator of the CCR surface impoundment (inaudible).

One of the things the Agency said in response to this question is, as a point of clarification, quote, "inactive closed surface impoundments and closed inactive CCR surface impoundments are defined differently in 845.120 and, accordingly, have different requirements under Part 845."

I see, of course, that inactive closed surface impoundments are defined in Section 845.120. But I don't see a definition for closed inactive CCR surface impoundments that's different than that.

Is this just a typo on the part of the Agency, or is there a difference between those two things, inactive closed surface impoundments and
closed inactive CCR surface impoundments? And if so, what is that difference?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Inactive CCR surface impoundments are defined as a closed inactive CCR surface impoundment as an inactive CCR surface impoundment that meets the definition of closed.

MS. MANNING: But an inactive closed CCR surface impoundment has to meet two parts of the definition of inactive closed surface impoundment. That is, it has to close before October 19, 2015, and also pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan. Correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: For inactive closed, that's correct.

MS. MANNING: And looking at the Agency's exhibit that you attached to the Board's questions, in response to the Board's questions, on Page 181 and 182, out of the universe, you've identified water treatment units that the Agency has identified for the Board, there are only four former funds that would fit the definition of inactive closed surface impoundment; is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: That's correct.
MS. MANNING: Three of Ameren's, Venice North

Pond, Venice South Pond, Pond D in Hudsonville, and also a pond owned by Prairie Power. Correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Correct.
MS. MANNING: So the second part of the definition of "inactive closed surface impoundment" that the ash pond has closed pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan, could you define the universe of entities on your list of 73 as to which of those ponds that that definition they were closed pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We'll identify those in post-hearing.

MS. MANNING: I'm sorry?
MR. DUNAWAY: We'll identify --
MS. MANNING: Would they be off of the Ameren ponds that you have listed from number 1 through 11 that says "see closure date" on your column H?

In other words, Mr. Dunaway, haven't all of those been closed pursuant to an IEPA-approved closure plan?

MR. HAMMONS: Hearing Officer, this is Jeff Hammons from the Environmental Law \& Policy Center. I just want to note that at the last hearing, we were not supposed to get into site-specific
discussion, and it seems like we're veering back into that territory.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Is this an
objection?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes.
MS. MANNING: Madam Hearing Officer, to respond, it appears from the Agency's exhibit, that all the entities that have closed as of this date pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan are the Ameren facilities.

The Agency's proposal, particularly their part 700 proposal, would have -- will impact that in that the closure plans that have already been approved are now subject to being completely reopened and redone.

So my question is, are Ameren's facilities that are listed "see closure date number one," have they been closed pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm going to overrule the objection because the document that we're speaking about lists specific facilities. And so if the Agency would like to follow up during its post-hearing comments to identify the facilities,

Ms. Manning is questioning about, that would be fine.
MS. MANNING: I would like them also to identify that the closure occurred prior to June 30, 2019, the effective date of the Illinois CCR Act.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is Vanessa
Horton. That would be up to the agency.
MS. MANNING: I'm going to move on. The Agency does intend, does it not, that those closures that have occurred prior to July 30, 2019, be subject to the full gamut of part 700, including, for example, doing closure alternatives pursuant to 845.710, even though these facilities have already closed pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan. Is that the Agency's intention?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine Zeivel. I'm sorry, Ms. Manning. There were so many questions kind of that ran on top of one another that we were still trying to answer the first one, too, and then we couldn't follow your last one.

So if we could go back and respond to the request to identify the specific ponds and make some points of clarification on those original questions and then return to your most recent question, we will probably ask you to re-ask that. We were not able to follow.

MS. MANNING: The only question I have right now then, Ms. Zeivel, does the Agency intend that, as an example, 845.710 that requires a facility to -- an ash pond to present the closure alternatives analysis, apply to an ash pond that has already closed pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. No CCR surface impoundments that meet the definition of closed in the rule would not need to do that.

In addition, there is an exemption under Section 22.59(e) of the Act where CCR surface impoundments that have a closure plan approved by the -- or submitted by May 1, 2019, and a complete closure within 24 months would not have to have a construction permit pursuant to part 845. Those would not have to get a construction permit.

The closure alternatives analysis is part of that construction permit. So, therefore, those that fall within that exemption under 22.59 would not need an alternatives analysis for that permit.

MS. MANNING: Thank you. I would simply ask that in response to my question as to the universe of entities that have closed prior to the effective date
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of the CCR law, that is June 30, 2019, and -- but after October 19, 2015, I would like the Agency to confirm that the only entities, the only ash ponds within that period of time that would be affected would be those Ameren facilities that are listed as inactive but not inactive closed?

MR. DUNAWAY: Based on the definition of closed but not inactive closed, those specific Ameren ponds do not meet the definition of closed.

MS. MANNING: And that is, Mr. Dunaway, because, although they closed pursuant to an agency-approved closure plan and met that portion of the definition, they did not close by October 19, 2015, correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: That's correct.
MS. MANNING: So if Ameren were to propose a change to the Board to remove the date before October 19, 2015, and insert June 30, 2019, the only ponds that would be affected were those that we just discussed with Ameren, correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: I would have to look at all the data from other ponds. I can't affirmatively answer that question right now.

MS. MANNING: Well, none of the other plans
on here, on your list, closed prior to July 30, 2021, you have in column $H$. So there are not any listed beyond the ones that we discussed and that are listed on here.

So there wouldn't be any other closed ponds that are not included in your list, would there be?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Andrew Armstrong from the Attorney General's Office. Objection asked and answered. And we're not here to determine the facts of any particular ponds. We're talking about a list of impoundments.

The witness has already answered the question. We'll have to take a look at all the facts.

MS. MANNING: I think I've had my questions answered anyway, Mr. Armstrong. So thank you. I'll stop now.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Moving on, and it'll be back to Mr. Armstrong, do you have any questions on 700?

MR. ARMSTRONG: The Attorney General's Office does not.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Then it would be the Technical Unit for the Pollution Control Board, Ms. Brown or Mr. Rao, do you have questions on 700?
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MS. E. BROWN: We have no questions for this subsection.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: And that was

Ms. Brown, just for the court reporter?
MS. E. BROWN: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Are there any
follow-up questions on 700 from the room here?

Okay. I don't see any.
Are there any follow-up questions on 700 on Webex?

Okay. Moving on to 710, and we'll start again with Little Village, Environmental Law \& Policy Center, Prairie Rivers, Sierra Club, any questions on 710.

MS. BUGEL: I do not have any further questions at this time. I did ask my questions on 710 at the last hearing. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Right. We did start 710 at the last hearing. I'm not a hundred percent sure if we finished 710 .

So I guess let me just run through everyone and see if there's any questions on 710 , and we'll categorize them as follow-up questions.

Midwest Generation, any on 710?
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questions on 710?
MR. RAO: This is Anand Rao. I have no questions for 710.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Moving on. 720, closure plan.

Ms. Bugel, any questions on 720?
MS. BUGEL: We have no questions on 720.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Midwest Generation, 720?
MS. GALE: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Williams, City of Springfield, any questions on 720?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. I just have one quick question on 720. This one is a follow-up to a pre-filed question that we submitted, Question 19. Let me know when you're ready.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: And just as a reminder for questioners. If you have a letter at the end of the section, just say it out military style for our court reporter.

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. What did you say?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm sorry. Just a
general reminder for everyone asking questions. If you're stating a section that ends in a letter, just

[^5]say "C" as in cat.
MS. WILLIAMS: This is Question 19(a), as in apple.

MS. ZEIVEL: Agency is ready.
MS. WILLIAMS: In the response to this question, the Agency has said that use of a closed site would require an amendment to the operating permit. And I just wanted to explore generally a concept that $I$ had seen in other states to evaluate whether this is something the Agency is going to be open to.

So, in other states, facilities have closed impoundments with a cap in a manner that they reference as "solar ready." And I just want to confirm that if a closure plan is submitted with an initial operating permit that would allow for the cap to be "solar ready," whether that would be something that could be done without requiring a leader amendment to the operating permit as long as it was included in the initial.

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. I think that would be okay. If the submitted post-closure care plan includes solar as a potential use and that's taken into account in the final post-closure care
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MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Great. Thank you. That answers my question.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Dynegy, any
questions on 720?
MR. GRANHOLM: Ryan Granholm for Dynegy. We have no questions on this section.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Environmental Regulatory Group, Ms. Brown, any questions on 720?

MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. No questions on this section.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ameren, any questions on 720?

MS. MANNING: Mr. Dunaway, would the exemption you spoke of in $22.59(e)$ with regard to exempting Ameren's closed ash ponds from compliance with Section 845.710 also exempt the Ameren's closed pond from 845.720?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes. The closure plan is part of the construction permit.
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Therefore, the exemption in 22.59 would also apply to the closure plan.

MS. MANNING: Thank you. That's all.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Attorney
General's Office, any questions on 720?
MR. ARMSTRONG: We have no questions on this subpart. Andrew Armstrong from the Attorney General's Office.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Rao, Ms. Brown, any questions on 720?

MR. RAO: We don't have any --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Can you repeat, MR. Rao? I'm sorry. I didn't catch that.

MR. RAO: We don't have any questions until the next subpart.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: All right. We'll move on to 730 .

And I'll just note that an additional board member has joined. Board Member Santos is joining us on Webex.

So we'll move on to 730, Initiation of Closure.

So, Ms. Bugel, any questions on 730?
MS. BUGEL: We do not have any questions.
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Midwest
Generation?
MS. GALE: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. City of
Springfield, 730?
MS. WILLIAMS: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Dynegy?
MR. GRANHOLM: No questions on this section.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Brown, any
questions on 730?
MS. BROWN: No questions on this section. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Manning, 730?

MS. MANNING: Mr. Dunaway, same question I discussed previously with regard to Section $22.59(e)$, exempting Ameren's closed ash ponds from compliance with 845.720 and 845.710 and 720 , would the same apply to 845.730?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. I don't know that as exempt as much as the ponds in question have already initiated closure. So it's probably not applicable.

MS. COURTNEY: Hearing Officer, Courtney. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes?

MS. COURTNEY: Jenny Cassel has an objection

[^7]and she's trying to speak but is muted.
THE COURT REPORTER: Who's speaking?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Who's speaking?
MS. COURTNEY: Sorry. This is Kiana Courtney from ELPC, from Environmental Law \& Policy Center.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. We'll try and unmute Ms. Cassel.

For us, she is unmuted. On our Webex screen, it's showing that she does not have any audio. So she might have to have the Webex call her phone or change her audio input.

We'll give her a second. I understand it's an objection. But, Ms. Cassel, you can log out and log back in. Sometimes that helps.

Okay. She's saying that she will log back in in the comments.

Perhaps, Ms. Courtney, you would like to state her objection?

MS. COURTNEY: Yes. This is Kiana Courtney from the Environmental Law \& Policy Center. She stated in the chat same objection as Mr. Armstrong raised with regard to asking applicability of rules to particular plants.

MS. MANNING: And I would respond that it's
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the role and obligation of the Board to determine how its rules are going to play out in the regulated community, the facilities which the agency has identified in its exhibit, as to those that are -- the rules apply to.

And as we've established, Ameren is about the only facility, the only company, that has ponds that have closed prior to the effective date of the CCR log, but that have not closed prior to October 19, 2015.

So they are a special class of ponds, and it makes absolute sense for the Board to understand how this rule will apply to ponds that effectively have already closed with the approval of the IEPA.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is --
MR. ARMSTRONG: Andrew Armstrong.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Go ahead,
Mr. Armstrong.
MR. ARMSTRONG: Andrew Armstrong from the Attorney General's Office. I just want to say for the record, I don't think you've established any such thing.

That said, I think that the witness is just talking about the applicability and the effects of the

[^8]exemption in $22.59(e)$. That's one thing, which is what $I$ understand is what my question is getting at.

But if we're saying that -- we're talking about applying the rules to specific impoundments. That's clearly not the Board's rule in this hearing. The Board's rule in this hearing is to adopt regulations, not to apply them.

I believe Mr. More stated that last time we were here.

MS. MANNING: And the question, Mr. Armstrong, is: The Board's adoption of rules, there needs to be understanding of how and in what context they apply. And my question went to that issue. What context would apply to the initiation of closure -- we're talking about a section called "Initiation of Closure" -- as to facilities that, based on the Agency's own exhibit, have already closed.

So the question is --
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Go ahead,
Ms. Manning.
MS. MANNING: The question is: Does the construction exemption that Mr. Dunaway discussed in $22.59(e)$ apply also such that 845.730, Initiation of
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Closure, does not apply to an ash pond that, as of today's date, has closed with the approval of the Agency?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is Vanessa
Horton. Based on my previous rulings in the previous days of this hearing, I will sustain the objection of Ms. Courtney and Ms. Cassel and Mr. Armstrong.

And I ask that, Ms. Manning, please only ask your question generally, as $I$ think you just did, and not reference back to specific sites and whether the rule will apply to specific sites but more generally.

If you could continue.
MS. MANNING: So thank you. I believe then you suggested that the general nature of the way I asked the question was appropriate for the Agency to answer it; is that what $I$ understand?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. MANNING: Thank you. Then I'll wait for the Agency to answer.

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Any CCR surface impoundment that has initiated closure per 845.730, would really not be applicable because they've already initiated closure. So it's something of a moot point.

MS. MANNING: Thank you. That's it.
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Attorney
General's Office, any questions on 730?
MR. ARMSTRONG: We do not have any questions on the initial part.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Mr. Rao, any
questions on 730 from the Board?
MR. RAO: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: You said not until the next subpart and I forgot. Sorry about that.

Okay. Moving on to any follow-up questions on 730 in the room?

None.
Any follow-up questions on 730 on Webex?
Okay. None.
Moving on to 740 , Closure By Removal,
beginning with Ms. Bugel, any questions on 740?
MS. BUGEL: Yes. Mr. Mychal Ozaeta will be asking questions for the Environmental Group.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Ozaeta, are you on the line?

MR. OZAETA: Can you all hear me okay?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MR. OZAETA: Thank you. Mychal Ozaeta from
Earthjustice on behalf of Prairie Rivers Network.
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I would like to start by directing the Agency to the response to Ameren's Question 4 on Page 139 of Exhibit 2. Please just let me know when the Agency has turned to the appropriate page.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We got it.
MR. OZAETA: In its response, the Agency
states that its proposed language at 845.740 (b), as in bravo, is based on a proposed amendment to 40 CFR Part 257, and if that amendment is not adopted, the Agency, "believes it will have to request that the Board delete Section 845.740 (b) and related subsections in order to meet the requirements of Section 22.59(b)(1) of the Act."

40 CFR 257.102(c), as in Charlie, in particular, includes mandates or closure by removal. If the amendment referenced by the Agency is not finalized by the time this Rulemaking concludes, and the Agency does request that the Board deletes Section $845.740(\mathrm{~b})$, as in bravo, would the Agency offer replacement language for that section?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Discussions between staff and management are still ongoing regarding this language. If we do not come to a final conclusion, it will absolutely have to be deleted.
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don't feel confident in responding.
MR. OZAETA: As a follow-up question, does the Agency believe that if this language in 845.740(b), as in bravo, were to be deleted, that this would be something that would be worthy of public participation or public input?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine Zeivel. At this point, it is a proposal in front of the Board, and whether something warrants public comment or not is outside of the Agency's determination and should be directed to the Board.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
I'd like to next direct the Agency to its response to the environmental group's Question 18 on page 63 of Exhibit 2.

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine Zeivel.
MR. OZAETA: Can the Agency respond regarding how the Agency will determine compliance with a transportation plan and other removal requirements in proposed Section 845.740(c), as in Charlie?

The Agency stated that it: "Will defer enforcement questions to the appropriate state and federal agencies for the specific issues that arise."

The Agency is charged with carrying out the

[^10]mandates of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, correct?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. Yes.
MR. OZAETA: And air quality is one of those mandates; is that correct?

MS. MARTIN: Yes.
MR. OZAETA: Responsible removal is,
likewise, mandated in the Coal Ash Pollution
Prevention Act Amendments to the Illinois
Environmental Protection Act; is that correct?
MS. MARTIN: Can you repeat the question?
MR. OZAETA: Yes. The question is: Is the responsible removal in the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act Amendments to the Illinois Environmental Protection Act also mandated?

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine Zeivel. The statute will speak for itself, and I don't believe that (inaudible) hearing to confirm or deny (inaudible) --

THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear her.
MS. ZEIVEL: And I don't think the Board wants us spending our time doing that.

So if you have a direct question regarding the proposed rules, we would be willing to take those.

But spending the time to confirm statutory language $I$ don't believe is in our best interest.

MR. OZAETA: I don't think I'm trying to confirm statutory language. I guess I'm just trying to confirm whether, under the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act Amendments to the Illinois

Environmental Protection Act, which is relevant, I believe, to this Rulemaking, whether responsible removal is a requirement or mandated?

MS. ZEIVEL: Well, then the Board will -everyone will have to give us a moment and wait while we all turn to the statute and read it.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is Vanessa Horton in the hearing room.

It's right at 11 right now. So why don't we take a ten-minute break, and we'll be back at five after, at 11:05.
(Whereupon, the record was read as requested.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is the hearing room at the Thompson Center. Is the Agency ready to continue?

MR. DUNAWAY: Not quite. We're waiting on our attorneys to come back yet.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. No problem. MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. We are ready.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sounds good.
Mr. Ozaeta, I believe we were waiting for the Agency's response to his question.

Before beginning, I'd just like to mention
that Member Palivos from the Board is also participating as a call-in user.

MR. MORE: Could the court reporter read back the question?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Well, how about Mr. Ozaeta -- Mr. Ozaeta, if you're online, could you please restate your question?

MR. OZAETA: Yes. The question was: Is responsible removal mandated in the Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act Amendments to the Illinois

Environmental Protection Act?
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. When closure is by removal, Section $22.59(g)$, as in goat, 10 requires that these rules define when complete removal of CCR is achieved, and specify the standards of responsible removal of CCR .

MR. OZAETA: Thank you for going and taking a look at that.

My next question is: Does the Agency have the authority to propose rules to minimize air pollution from the transport of coal ash?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. We do not have the authority; that these are already covered under Federal and State Department of Transportation rules and OSHA safety regulations.

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you ask her to repeat the very beginning of what she said.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Martin, could
you just repeat that for our court reporter?
MS. MARTIN: Sorry about that. Yes.
We do not have the jurisdiction or the agency does not have the jurisdiction. However, this is already covered under the U.S. and State Department of Transportation regulations and OSHA safety regulations.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
Does the Agency have the authority to enforce fugitive dust restrictions that protects adjacent communities, among others, from CCR dust?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. Yes.
MR. OZAETA: And are there fugitive dust regulations in place that the Agency does administer?
$\square$
MS. MARTIN: Yes.
MR. OZAETA: And do some of those regulations concern trucks or transport?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. We can't speak to Bureau of Air. However, yes, there are some respective to mines on the actual site. Once you enter a public state, a federal roadway, U.S.

Department of Transportation and the State Department of Transportation has the jurisdiction there.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
In proposed Section 845.740(c), as in Charlie, 2, the agency lists certain on-site dust controls that must be developed and implemented.

Is there a reason the Agency did not specify any additional minimum dust control measures?

MS. MARTIN: Can you repeat that?
MR. OZAETA: Yes. In proposed
Section 845.740(c), as in Charlie, 2, the Agency lists certain on-site dust controls that must be developed and implemented.

Is there a reason the agency did not specify any additional minimum dust control measures?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. The Agency
believes that the proposed rules there now are
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adequate.
MR. OZAETA: Does the Agency have the authority to establish or specify minimum mitigation procedures or measures for reducing dust in the air as necessary to protect nearby communities and the public?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. Can you restate the question?

MR. OZAETA: Yes. Does the Agency have the authority to establish or specify minimum mitigation procedures or measures for reducing dust in the air, as necessary, to protect communities nearby, polluting facilities, and the public?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. The minimum mitigation measures for dust in the air or particulates in the air are already established in 845.500, Air Pressure.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
I'd like to next direct the Agency to their response to Question 20 on Page 63 of Exhibit 2.

MS. MARTIN: We're there.
MR. OZAETA: In the response, the Agency states that, "The owners, operators, and site staff are more equipped to determine the specific levels of
monitoring per OSHA regulations."
And I believe this insinuates more equipped
than the Agency to determine those specific levels.
The Agency is charged with administering numerous provisions in the Illinois Environmental Protection Act relating to air pollution control and air monitoring; is that correct?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. Yes, but the Agency is not in charge of worker safety, and that is what that response is referring to.

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you have her repeat that, please?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Martin, could you just repeat that for the court reporter?

MS. MARTIN: Yes. Lauren Martin.
Yes. However, the Agency is not responsible for safety, and that's what that response was referring to.

MR. OZAETA: Does the Agency panel know whether the Agency has ever received complaints about dust pollution from residents of communities near polluting facilities?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. I'm familiar with some reports from communities that have

[^11]been made.
MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
Does the Agency have the authority to require air monitoring as it deems necessary to protect nearby communities and the public from fugitive dust?

THE COURT REPORTER: Can he repeat that?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Ozaeta, for our court reporter, could you repeat your last question?

MR. OZAETA: Yes, of course.
Does the Agency have the authority to require air monitoring as it deems necessary to protect nearby communities and the public from fugitive dust?

And when I say "nearby communities," I'm referring to the residents of communities near polluting facilities as I referenced in the previous question.

MS. ZEIVEL: This is Christine Zeivel. The Agency doesn't have any witnesses in the room that can speak generally to the broad nature of the question. But we would be willing to provide a response in our post-hearing comments.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
So if owners, operators, and site staff are more equipped than the Agency to determine the
specific levels of air monitoring, what happens if owners, operators, or site staff fail to implement adequate dust control during the closure-by removal process?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. The response is specific to worker safety, and under OSHA, it is site specific, competent personnel as defined by OSHA that would be making those decisions on-site. So that would be people contracted to the owner/operator.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
I would like to direct the Agency now to its response to the Board's Question 13 on Page 154 of Exhibit 2.

MS. MARTIN: We're there.
MR. OZAETA: In its response, the Agency states that, "The duration over which a CCR storage pile exists will be limited by the time required to complete CCR removal from the CCR surface impoundment."

Proposed section -- and $I$ know this is a different subsection, but it's relevant to this answer.

Proposed Section 845.760(c), as in Charlie, 3 is the subsection addressing extensions of closure
deadlines for impoundments closing by removal; is that correct?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer, yes.
MR. OZAETA: Does Part 845 include a maximum time period for closure by removal to be completed, including extensions?

MS. ZIMMER: Could you repeat your question just so I understand it thoroughly, please?

MR. OZAETA: Yeah.
Does Part 845, anywhere in Part 845, is there a maximum time period for closure by removal to be completed, including extensions?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. No, there is not.
MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
In its response to the Board's Question 13, the Agency also references the requirement that a storage pile have a liner and concludes that,
"Therefore, the area of a CCR storage pile is fixed."
Can CCR storage pile liners cover multiple acres?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Potentially, yes.
MR. OZAETA: Is there any technical limit to the size of a CCR storage pile liner?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. The rule
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doesn't contain a maximum size. However, there are practical limitations given the geometry of the site and the time it would take to construct such a facility within the time allowed for closure.

MR. OZAETA: And this is a bit of a related question. Does Part 845 set out any limit to the acreage that a CCR pile can cover?

MR. DUNAWAY: No. It's limited to the size of the liner.

MR. OZAETA: And liners -- I didn't mean to interrupt you.

And liners do not limit the height of a pile, correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: There's a physical limitation. You can't stack pile beyond the angle proposed or it will fail and move off the liner.

Other than that, there's not a stated limit.
MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
I'd like to move on to Ms. Zimmer's response to Environmental Group's Question 22 on Page 64 of Exhibit 2.

MS. ZIMMER: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that, please, which question?

MR. OZAETA: Question 22 on Page 64 of
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Exhibit 2.
MS. ZIMMER: Okay. Thank you.
MR. OZAETA: In Ms. Zimmer's response,
Ms. Zimmer stated that the Agency did not define the term "temporary" or "temporarily" as it pertains to CCR being stored in piles because the removal process "will take multiple years," and "the record keeping requirements of Section 845.740 will assure a balance between CCR removed from the surface and CCR transported off-site, such that no net accumulation will occur."

How precisely will the recordkeeping requirements of Section 845.740 assure a balance between CCR removed from the CCR surface impoundment and CCR transported off-site so that no net accumulation will occur?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. There's monthly reports, so while it's going to vary somewhat monthly, month by month, there shouldn't be a greater -- a significantly greater amount from month to month of accumulation versus removal. And the monthly reports should show that, and we'll be looking at those monthly reports.

MR. OZAETA: When you say there shouldn't be,

[^12]is that specifically required in the rulings in Part 845?

MS. ZIMMER: It does not specify it in the rules. But, in practical terms, it's going to be limited by the space and the size of the pile. And removal will be ongoing, and we will be monitoring those monthly reports. If it starts to accumulate in significant amounts, the Agency will be looking at those reports and saying, okay, we need to -- if it's accumulating, the Agency will no longer view those as temporary if they're accumulating large amounts in those storage piles.

MR. OZAETA: Do recordkeeping requirements -the recordkeeping requirements of proposed Section 845.740 set limits for the duration that CCR may be stored in a pile?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. There is -- I would -- there is no time limit on a storage pile other than it can be there during closure, but it's not the same material the whole time closure is ongoing. It's the same ongoing process of removal, accumulation and removal of the same type of material. So it's a cycle. You're bringing material into the pile; you're bringing material out of the pile. It's
kind of a process of moving through the pile. So you're not going to have the same material sitting in the pile and accumulating. You're having material during closure; you're having a location where it's temporarily stored after it's being moved off-site. So you're going to be cycling materials through the storage pile. It's not just going to be coming in and sitting there, which is why we can't limit it to a certain time frame, because it has to be there to be used during closure.

MR. OZAETA: Do the recordkeeping requirements of proposed Section 845.740 require that the CCR be transported off-site at any particular time intervals?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. I think the rules as written show that it cannot accumulate, and that covers the process of transport. It cannot accumulate, so it has to be moved.

MR. OZAETA: Is the Agency familiar with the requirement in Section 3.135A, as in Alpha, -5(e), as in echo, of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act that CCR is, "not to be accumulating speculatively"?

MS. ZIMMER: Can you repeat your question and reference, please?

MR. OZAETA: Yes. Is the agency familiar with the requirement in Section 3.135A, as in alpha, -5 (e), as in echo, of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act that requires that $C C R$, "is not to be accumulated speculatively"?

MR. MORE: I'm going to object to the question. Mischaracterizes -- this is Josh More. I'm going to object to the question. The use of CCR is not in the Illinois Environmental Protection Act. It's a different term.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Ozaeta, were you able to hear that objection?

MR. OZAETA: I'm not sure what he said.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm sorry. He'll restate the objection.

MR. MORE: I'm objecting to the use -- to the characterization that the term "CCR" is referenced in the Illinois Environmental Protection Act and, in particular, Section 3.135.

MR. OZAETA: So this section refers specifically to coal combustion by-product, which is coal ash waste that is to be used beneficially. And so I guess I'll rephrase.

Is the Agency familiar with a requirement of
that section that this coal combustion by-product is not to be accumulated speculatively?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes. The Agency
is familiar that coal combustion by-products as defined in 3.135 of the Act, subsection (e), as in elephant, are not to be accumulated speculatively.

MR. OZAETA: Is the Agency familiar with how this specific provision of the Act defines
"accumulated speculatively"?
MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
MR. OZAETA: Has the Agency been able to enforce this provision of the Act?

MR. MORE: Josh More again. I'm going to object to this line of questioning. We're now getting into how the Agency has enforced different sections of the Act that are inapplicable. We're talking about removal and storage for removal.

And now the examiner is asking questions about the storage for beneficial use of a CCB and how that provision is implemented.

I think it's beyond the scope of the rule.
MR. OZAETA: I can rephrase the question or ask a more specific question that's directly related to this provision of the 845.
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Thank you.
Moving on to Midwest Generation, 740?
MS. GALE: I do. I'm going to sit up there, so give me a second.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'll just note that we'll probably break for lunch at noon. It's about 15 minutes away.

MS. GALE: I'm going to turn to Exhibit 3, Page 32, Question 82. And the Agency can let me know when they're there?

There? I can't see you guys.
MS. ZEIVEL: Yes, we're there.
MS. GALE: In the Agency's answer, the Agency states that if the $C C R$ is reused -- excuse me -- CCR surface impoundment --

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you start over and please slow down.

MS. GALE: I'm sorry. I'm mumbling.
The Agency states that if the CCR surface impoundment is reused for a different purpose, the Agency considers that the reuse for a different purpose, a removal, and subject to the corrective action if there are exceedances of the groundwater protection standards at the time of removal.
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So my question is, if there are not exceedances of the groundwater protection standards at the time of removal, then would the CCR surface pond not be subject to corrective action pursuant to 845.620, 845.670, and 845.680?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. If there's no exceedance in groundwater protection standard, that CCR surface impoundment would not be subject to corrective action. However, it would have to demonstrate compliance with the groundwater protection standards for three years.

MS. GALE: So you mean it would have to go through post-closure?

MR. DUNAWAY: There would have to be monitoring for three years. It's not defined as post-closure in these rules.

MS. GALE: Okay. Okay.
Same question. I want you guys to open to 740 as well, just so we're on the same page.

You also state here in the first sentence that "closure by removal that would also require removal of the contaminated liner."

And my question is is, Part $740(a)$, as in alpha, does not require removal of the liner.
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Correct?
MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. We consider decontaminating would be removing of the liner -would be removing the contaminated liner.

MS. GALE: So the Agency believes a liner is always contaminated and it cannot be contaminated any other way?

MS. ZIMMER: Can you restate your question? I'm not quite understanding. It seemed like a partial question.

MS. GALE: Sure. My question is: The Agency believes there's no other method to decontaminate the liner other than removal?

And I'm sorry. I should add, I'm speaking of a polymer liner, like an $H D P E$ liner.

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. We believe removal is the only way to be sure decontamination has occurred.

MS. GALE: What is your basis for that belief?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Any liner, any type of liner always has leakage, pinholes, tears, so there's always leakage, which means if there's contamination, there will always be contamination
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through the liner.
MS. GALE: Okay. Earlier I just asked about if there was no exceedances in the groundwater protection standards, that would still have -- and you said there would not be any corrective action. If there's no --

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. I was under the impression -- okay. Are we talking about a contaminated site or doing corrective action?

MS. GALE: Well, I guess that goes to the question about this answer, is that: Is removal of a liner always required?

And the way I understood your answer was, regardless of the situation, removal of a liner was always required for a removal?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes. In all circumstances, removal will include removing the liner.

MS. GALE: Regardless of the groundwater protection standards status?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Correct.
MS. GALE: What is the Agency's basis for that?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. A couple of the

[^14]things at least in play for leaving a liner in place during removal, any time you remove ash, generally, you're using machinery and you're on the liner. There will be damage. Could be significant damage.

The other possibility is there could be impacts to groundwater beneath the liner, whatever levels they may be. So there could be -- those are two reasons that we believe the liner needs to be removed.

MS. GALE: Okay. And to be clear, I'm talking about polymer liners here, which are plastic HDPE, to make sure we're just on the same baseline.

So the Agency doesn't think a polymer liner cannot be decontaminated by a washing, a plastic liner?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Once again, any type of liner could be damaged, probably would be damaged by removing the ash and fully cleaning it during ash removal.

MS. GALE: So that's an assumption you're making?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Based on information and belief.

MS. GALE: And also, the basis of my question
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is that there's not going to be any $C C R$ in that unit after removal. So if there's not going to be any CCR in that unit after removal, what is the Agency's basis for requiring removal of the liner if it can clean the pond?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Our interpretation, the Agency interpretation of Part 257, is that all areas be removed that had been contaminated and that includes the liner.

MS. GALE: Okay. Well, let's turn to 257, 257.102(c). And under there it's, "Closure by Removal of CCR: An owner or operator may elect to close a CCR unit by removing and decontaminating all areas affected by releases from the CCR unit. CCR removal and decontamination of the CCR unit are complete when constituent concentrations throughout the CCR unit and any areas affected by releases from the CCR unit have been removed and groundwater monitoring concentrations do not exceed the groundwater protection standards."

Right?
MS. ZIMMER: Excuse me. We're not even there yet. Could you tell us what page and then we'll go?

MS. GALE: Sorry. Sure. Sorry. Sorry. I'm reading from exhibit -- reading from the most recent
one, which is not Exhibit 5, but Exhibit -- not 5 -Exhibit 8.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: You're at 257?
MS. GALE: 257.102(c). So Exhibit 8,
Page 483.
MS. ZIMMER: We're ready. Thank you.
MS. GALE: And I won't repeat the whole thing again. But if you read through 102(c), which is about Closure By Removal, this section does not say you must remove the liner. Correct?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. It does not specify a liner. However, it does say decontamination must occur throughout the unit.

MS. GALE: Agreed. But it does not say liner removal is required, right?

I think you answered that question.
So my question is, if the Agency requires removal of a liner, even if the groundwater protection standards -- if the groundwater is below the groundwater protection standards -- the Agency can say that a cost of the removal or replacement of that liner for repurposing a CCR (inaudible) for a use solely unrelated to CCR?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. No.

[^15]MS. GALE: Did the Agency consider the volume
of material that would go into landfills even though
the groundwater protection standards are established,
instead of reusing the material?
MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. No.
MS. GALE: Okay. Considering the energy and
manufacturing impacts associated with manufacturing of
responsible to reuse this resource if it's able to be
cleaned?
mPE liners, isn't it more environmentally
the Agency to speculate because we don't know what the
next use would be.
\[

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

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 09/03/2020
August 25, 2020

MS. GALE: Yes. That's a good idea.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: So we'll pause here for lunch for an hour. We'll resume at 1. Thanks very much.

```
(Whereupon, at 12:03 p.m., a
    luncheon recess was taken to
    1:00 p.m.)
```
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| Page 78 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AFTERNOON SESSION |  |  |  |  |
| HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is Vanessa |  |  |  |  |
| Horton in the hearing room in the Thompson Center. |  |  |  |  |
| The Agency in Springfield, are you guys all |  |  |  |  |
| set? |  |  |  |  |
| MS. ZIMMER: No attorneys. |  |  |  |  |
| HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. |  |  |  |  |
| MS. ZIMMER: The Agency is ready. |  |  |  |  |
| HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Gale, are you |  |  |  |  |
| ready to proceed? |  |  |  |  |
| MS. GALE: Yes. |  |  |  |  |
| I just want to turn to Exhibit 2, Page 139. |  |  |  |  |
| These are the Agency's first questions -- or answers |  |  |  |  |
| to the first questions. |  |  |  |  |
| I am looking specifically at the answer to |  |  |  |  |
| Question 4. |  |  |  |  |
| Shall I wait until Christine is there, |  |  |  |  |
| Ms. Zeivel? |  |  |  |  |
| MS. ZIMMER: No. Go ahead. |  |  |  |  |
| MS. GALE: Are you ready? |  |  |  |  |
| MS. ZIMMER: Yes, we're ready. |  |  |  |  |
| MS. GALE: Thanks. |  |  |  |  |
| The Agency says that Section 845.740 (b) |  |  |  |  |
| applies to any CCR surface impoundment that closed by |  |  |  |  |
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removal after October 19, 2015.
So my question is: If the CCR was removed from the impoundment before October 15, 2015, then Section 845.740 does not apply?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, it appears that $845.740(b)$ applies to a CCR closure by removal after October 15, 2019.

MS. GALE: Okay. So my question was: Does that mean if CCR is removed from the unit before October 19, 2015, that section does not apply to that unit?

MR. DUNAWAY: Whether closure was completed or not as defined in part 845.

MS. GALE: I'm sorry. I missed the front end of that. What did you say?

MR. DUNAWAY: It depends on whether closure has been completed based on requirements of Part 845.

MS. ZIMMER: Yes. We're good.
MS. GALE: Nothing further. Thanks. I'm good.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. So moving on, it would be City of Springfield. Did you have any questions on Section 740?

MS. WILLIAMS: I just had a couple quick
questions on the applicability of Section 740, and specifically I'm looking at $740(c)$, as in cat, $1(a)$, as in apple, regarding manifest.

I asked a similar question $I$ think last time, but I just want to make sure that I'm clear. This language regarding manifest is only going to apply to closure of surface impoundments, correct? It wouldn't apply to operation of ability with dry ash handling, for example?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Can you repeat that last bit?

MS. WILLIAMS: As an example, it wouldn't apply to a facility operating with dry ash handling? It would apply only to the closure of an impoundment?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. The manifests are only for CCR surface impoundments and the materials therein.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.
And just to kind of build on that question, this section also only applies to removal of CCR material, not non-CCR material; is that correct? As I read it anyway...

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. This rule is only for CCR, CCR materials. However, it does not
exempt any other materials from State and Federal regulations.

MS. WILLIAMS: One last question about that then. As I understood Mr. Dunaway's testimony last time with the -- really, we were on Section 710, the Agency's definition, for lack of a better word, the Agency's interpretation or definition of this section Closure by Removal, includes only closure by complete removal and decontamination. Correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: 710 deals with the closure alternatives. 740 is closure by removal. So I'm not --

MS. WILLIAMS: So as I understood your testimony last time, Lynn, closure by removal is only complete closure; if you are going to do partial removal for some type of hybrid, that would have to fall under, by necessity, closure in place, because you weren't completing complete removal. Is that your understanding?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, that's the case. If you don't do complete removal, then you have closing in place.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. I appreciate that. That answers my questions.
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on, Dynegy, do you have any questions on 740?

MR. MORE: We do.
Josh More. I have a couple questions and Mr. Granholm has a couple questions after that.

I'd like to direct the Agency to Lauren Martin's pre-filed testimony, Page 2 of her pre-filed testimony under the heading, "Air Criteria."

MS. ZIMMER: Go ahead.
MR. MORE: Mr. Ozaeta asked a number of questions regarding the appropriate air monitoring at a site during various activities. And I wanted to read into the record a statement and then just confirm that the Agency's position has not changed.

The last paragraph on Page 2 begins:
"Although the preamble."
The second sentence of that paragraph reads:
"Worker safety protections, when properly implemented, will also protect the surrounding communities by controlling the hazards within the work site."
"Worker safety protections on-site by extension prevents the hazardous materials from traveling off-site in quantities that could impact the health and well-being of the surrounding community."
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Does that statement remain true today?
MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. Yes.
MR. MORE: And is it the Agency's position that 845, as currently proposed, requires owners and operators to adopt measures that will effectively minimize CCR from becoming airborne at the facility?

MS. MARTIN: Lauren Martin. Yes.
MR. MORE: I'm going to turn it over to
Mr. Granholm.
MR. GRANHOLM: Ryan Granholm on behalf of the Dynegy entities.

Following up on some questions from Mr. Ozaeta, where an owner/operator elects to close a unit by removal, does the Agency expect that the planned use of temporary storage files during that removal will be discussed in the closure plan submitted to the Agency?

MS. MARTIN: Can you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

MR. GRANHOLM: Where an owner/operator elects to close by removal, does the Agency expect that the use of storage piles, temporary storage piles, will be discussed in either the closure plan or the construction permit application materials that are
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submitted to the Agency?
MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes.
MR. GRANHOLM: And construction permit application materials must also include an anticipated schedule for closure of a unit; is that correct?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes.
MR. GRANHOLM: Will the Agency approve a construction permit where it believes the use of a temporary storage pile will create a threat to human health or the environment?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. No.
MR. GRANHOLM: Will the Agency approve a construction permit that calls for CCR to accumulate in a storage pile indefinitely?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. No.
MR. GRANHOLM: Nothing further.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Ms. Brown from IERG, any questions on 740?

MS. BROWN: Melissa Brown. No questions on this section.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Ameren, any questions on 740?

MS. MANNING: Yes. I just have a few questions. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
MS. MANNING: First of all, Mr. Dunaway -I'm trying to understand, I think it was Mr. Dunaway's answer to Ms. Gale's question related to 845.740(b).

I believe she asked whether if clean closure occurred prior to October 19, 2015 --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: If everybody can mute themselves. Okay. You should be able to proceed. Okay. You can proceed.

MS. MANNING: Could you hear me now?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. MANNING: Okay. Thank you.
I'm again trying to understand the answers that Mr . Dunaway gave to Ms. Gale related to Part -Section 845.740(b). I believe she asked whether closure by removal occurred prior to October 19, 2015, would that section apply.

And Mr. Dunaway, I believe, responded that if closure was otherwise complete and the three-year monitoring requirement was met, the implication of that then would be that monitoring would have to have taken place beginning in 2012.

Was that what Mr. Dunaway intended as a response to Ms. Gale's question?

MR. DUNAWAY: I wasn't discussing monitoring in the answer to that question.

MS. MANNING: The implication of closure not being complete, how does that play into the three-year monitoring requirement?

When does the three-year monitoring requirement kick in?

MR. DUNAWAY: The three-year monitoring requirement would kick in for any CCR surface impoundment that had not completed closure by October 19, 2015. I believe it's the 19th. Maybe the 15 th .

MS. MANNING: Isn't the implication of that, then, three years of monitoring would be required prior to closure in order to meet the definition -the section as written?

MR. DUNAWAY: For those CCR surface impoundments that closed prior to October -- or after October 19, 2015, yes, they would have to have three years of monitor specific to the surface impoundment.

MS. MANNING: That is right. Thank you.
I just have a couple of other questions then. Would an ash pond that has already completed closure by removal, pursuant to an agency-approved closure
plan, have to obtain an construction permit from the Agency for removal?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. As a point of clarification, are you asking about a construction permit for the installation of monitoring wells, or are you asking about a construction permit for the closure itself?

MS. MANNING: I'm asking about a construction permit for the closure itself, similar to the questions $I$ asked in the other sections related to whether a closure permit was required.

And you responded that it would not be required because of Section 22.59(e).

MR. DUNAWAY: Based on the way we believe it would work out is that the construction permit for a closure would not be required if it met the 22.59 (e) exemption. However, all CCR surface impoundments are going to have to have an operating permit, and if additional wells were needed, they would have to be included within that operating permit.

MS. MANNING: That's all $I$ have right now.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: The AG's office, Mr. Sylvester, Mr. Armstrong, any questions on 740?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Andrew Armstrong. We have no

[^16]questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. And I'm skipping our technical units. They won't have questions until the next subpart.

So any follow-up questions on 740 , in the room? No?

Any follow-up questions on 740 on Webex?
MR. OZAETA: Yes. This is Mychal Ozaeta. I have some.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Please proceed.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you. Mychal Ozaeta with Earthjustice on behalf of Prairie Rivers Network.

Regarding the use of CCR storage piles, I believe Ms. Zimmer spoke earlier about the cycling of coal ash. She mentioned that the material will be going to the pile when material is coming out.

Is there an explicit requirement in Part 845, that coal ash must be taken out of a CCR storage pile before more can be placed in the pile?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. The answer -- the simple answer is no. The expanded answer is it's a cycle. So it's going to be continuously coming in, going out, coming in, going out. So it's limited by
the size. But, once again, it's coming in and going out. So I'm not sure -- that's my answer. I'm sorry.

MR. OZAETA: Is there a provision of Part 845 that mandates that coal ash cannot be accumulated in a pile?

MS. ZIMMER: Can you restate your question, please? I'm sorry.

MR. OZAETA: Yeah. I was referring back to Ms. Zimmer's response or your response to Question 22 on Page 64 of Exhibit 2, the mention of no net accumulation will occur.

And so my question is, is there a provision of Part 845 that mandates that this net accumulation cannot occur?

MS. ZIMMER: This is Amy Zimmer. I'm going to point to the definition of "temporary accumulation" in the proposed rule for -- and it means, "An accumulation on the land that is neither permanent nor indefinite. To demonstrate that the accumulation of the land is temporary, all CCR must be removed from the piles at the site. The entity engaged in the activity must have a record in place, such as a contract, purchase order, facility operation and maintenance, or fugitive dust control plan,
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documenting that all of the $C C R$ in the pile will be completely removed according to a specific timeline.

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you have her repeat? HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Sorry, Ms. Zimmer? MS. ZIMMER: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is Vanessa
Horton. Our court reporter -- you went a little bit too fast, so it's a little --

MS. ZIMMER: Okay. I can repeat that.
Okay. I'm just going to point you to the definition of "temporary accumulation" in Section 845.120.

It's on my Page 12, but $I$ don't know if it's everybody's Page 12.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you. And is that the complete answer to the question?

MS. ZIMMER: Yes.
MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
Referring back to Section 3.135A, as in
alpha, $-5(e)$, as in echo, of the Illinois
Environmental Protection Act, does the Agency know if there has been any problems enforcing or any issues enforcing the pile of accumulation limits for CCD?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We have an objection
here in the hearing room.
MR. MORE: Josh More. I'm going to object again. The implementation of other programs, and, in particular, the enforcement of another program, is beyond the scope of this Rulemaking.

And if there is an enforcement, it may be pending; we're running the risk of getting into privileged information.

MR. OZAETA: I'm just referring to piles of coal ash. So whether they're called CCRs or CCB, I believe understanding how important those piles had worked and forms these proposed rules. That's all I'm trying to get at with that question.

MS. DIERS: This is Stephanie Diers with the Illinois EPA. I'm going to object to that question. You're asking about CCB. There is a difference between CCB and CCR.

We also do not have an enforcement attorney or other people on enforcement staff that can answer those type of questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: So this is Vanessa Horton. I'm going to sustain the objection, and we'll limit ourselves to 845.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you. Okay.

[^17]In reference to a response to one of Mr. Granholm's questions, I believe, do the proposed rules require closure plans or construction permit application materials to discuss the use of CCR storage piles?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. Any construction permit application for any modification or closure or taking out of service replacement of $a$ CCR surface impoundment is going to have to include a plan for handling ash that's going to continually be generated or be removed from the pile. So I don't see any way you can file an application and not address temporary storage piles or the use of them in that process.

So my answer would be yes, it's going to be required for them to provide that information in an application.

MR. OZAETA: And is that explicitly stated in a provision of Part 845?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. 845.740, looks like, (C) (4) (B), states that "CCR storage piles shall" and it lists five things, and basically dust control, tarped, that sort of thing.

They're going to have to provide that sort of
detail in an application. Like I mentioned, if they're going to describe or intend to use temporary storage piles either during the hook by removal or otherwise moving the ash around as part of the closure plan, that type of information is going to have to be part of that application, how they're going to comply with this part of 740, you know, they're going to have to tell us how they're going to do that.

So I think that it is required, explicitly or otherwise.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
Do the proposed rules require the denial of a construction permit application that would include the accumulation of coal ash in storage piles?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. It's only going to be for temporary accumulations. We're not going to approve a long-term or permanent storage pile.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
I'd like to direct the Agency to Midwest Generation's Question 82 on Page 32 of Exhibit 3.

MR. LECRONE: We got it.
MR. OZAETA: In Ms. Zimmer's response, Ms. Zimmer states that closure by removal "would also
require removal of the contaminated liner and any CCR that was released" --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Ozaeta, you cut out a little bit there. Could you repeat your question?

MR. OZAETA: Yes. Of course.
In Ms. Zimmer's response, Ms. Zimmer states that closure by removal "would also require removal of the contaminated liner and any CCR that was released from the CCR surface impoundment."

Will that include any removal of soil underlying the impoundment if affected by a release?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. We would require any ash that was released from the surface impoundment if somehow it got through the liner. Yes, it would need to -- that would need to be cleaned up.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you.
In 845.740(a), as in alpha, states that an owner/operator may elect to close a CCR surface impoundment by removing.

I just want to see if the Agency could clarify what they mean by "elect" in that context.

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. I just want to -- I would like to point out they have -- the
owner/operator has choices of removal, retrofitting, closure in place. However, they still have to go through the closure alternative analysis and all of the approval processes throughout Section 845.

MR. OZAETA: Thank you. I have no further follow-up questions, unless Ms. Bugel does.

MS. BUGEL: Yes. This is Faith Bugel representing Sierra Club and asking questions on behalf of the Environmental Groups.

I do have one follow-up question on Ms. Zimmer's last answer.

And, Ms. Zimmer, I believe you said the owner/operator has the choice of removal of retrofit or close in place but still have to go through the approval process.

Does that mean the owners'/operators' choice is constrained by the approval process?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. The owner/operator can choose a preferred path, but they have to meet the requirements of the rule.

MS. BUGEL: Thank you. I have no further questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Any further follow-up questions on 740 in the room? No?

On Webex? Any follow-up questions on 740?
Okay. We'll move on to 750, Closure with a Final Cover System. And I'd just like to reiterate something that $I$ mentioned this morning when we began and mentioned at the previous three days of hearing. I'd like all questioners to please limit themselves to true follow-up questions only. The Agency has -- the questioners have asked over a thousand questions; the Agency has answered them. So if there is a true follow-up question, please go ahead with that. But otherwise, let's move forward through 845.

So 750, Closure With a Final Cover System. I'll begin with Ms. Bugel.

MS. BUGEL: Yes, I have questions, and bear with me while I get to the microphone. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem. MS. BUGEL: Faith Bugel, again, representing Sierra Club. And my first question is, in response to Dynegy's Question 83, and this can be found on Page 55 to 56. And I will give the Agency a moment to get to that spot.

Ms. Zimmer: Okay.
MS. BUGEL: And this response discusses final cover systems at Havana, Hudsonville, and Venice and
also the closed-in-place Havana South Ash Pond System. Is that right?

MR. DUNAWAY: That's correct.

MS. BUGEL: And my first question is about the Havana South Ash Pond, and that has no intersecting groundwater; is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: When you say "no intersecting groundwater," what do you mean?

MS. BUGEL: I would mean that the groundwater is not even intermittently in contact with the ash in the ash pond.

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. I don't recall the details of that particular circumstance.

MS. BUGEL: Is anyone at the Agency on the witness panel able to answer that question?

MR. DUNAWAY: Not right now.
MS. BUGEL: We are not certain if the Agency is trying to answer or if they're done.

Ms. Zimmer: No, we're not trying to answer. We're just waiting for you to go on. Thank you.

MS. BUGEL: Okay. Okay.
Is this something that the Agency could follow up with in writing after the hearing?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, we could follow up on

[^18]that.
MS. BUGEL: And turning to the closed-in-place Hudsonville Ash Pond, does the Agency know whether they have failed to meet Part 620, groundwater quality standards for constituents at the monitoring wells?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes. They have.
MS. BUGEL: Regarding the closed-in-place Venice Ash Pond, have they also failed to meet the Part 620, groundwater quality standards at the monitoring wells there?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, they have.
MS. BUGEL: Okay. And also regarding the Venice closed-in-place ash ponds, do you know if the groundwater is intermittently in contact with the ash in those ash ponds?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. I believe, to the best of my recall, groundwater does intermittently contact ash at Venice.

MS. BUGEL: And do you know if there are other ash ponds in Illinois that are not closed in place where the groundwater also is in contact with ash in the ash ponds?

MS. GALE: I would only object to the extent
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we are getting into specific ponds. Again, this is a Rulemaking, a general Rulemaking, for generalities. And to the extent that we moved into discussing specific individual ponds throughout the state and their connection or nonconnection with the groundwater, I would object to that line of questioning.

MS. BUGEL: May I respond?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. BUGEL: Today we've -- it's been unclear in this hearing whether we can discuss specifics for the point of trying to understand how the rule will apply to various general situations.

In addition, we did have a longer discussion today about specific Ameren ash ponds. And this line of questioning is important because it goes to how the Agency is going to treat coal ash in contact with groundwater.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: These are Dynegy questions. They have listed these specific sites. I believe Ms. Bugel is continuing with follow-up questions about the Agency's response to these specific sites. So to these three $I$ will allow it.

And responding generally to Ameren's question

[^19]from before, we allowed the questioning on that specific list of 73 sites, but $I$ would ask that you perhaps make your question more general if at all possible.

MR. MORE: We did not get into the specifics of each site. Instead, we just asked whether there had been approvals and whether or not certain actions were required.

We didn't get into the facts underlying each site and the basis for any of the approvals. We're just asking, has there been a closure, has there been required corrective action. Not into the underlying facts supporting or not calling into question whether or not these approvals were right or wrong.

MS. MANNING: Madam Hearing Officer, may I, please, lodge an objection as well?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Go ahead. I didn't quite hear that.

MS. MANNING: We were muted, Madam Hearing Officer, and, therefore, I could not also lodge an objection to this line of questioning.

We were foreclosed from presenting any sort of specific as to the Ameren ash ponds. And I would agree with the representative from Dynegy that this
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line of questioning ought not to be presented without a whole sludge of facts of all of the site-specific aspects of the rules.

We'll be presenting testimony as to the
Ameren ponds, and certainly Ms. Bugel can ask
questions as to the information that we present. But to present this in the context of Board questioning and Agency questioning, when we were foreclosed from asking the Agency specific questions relating to the Agency's exhibit, I think it's just something that ought not to be asked right now.

MS. BUGEL: I've got one question, and I'm not sure how I phrased it, but I'm happy to rephrase my question in a general manner.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: That sounds good. Please proceed.

MS. BUGEL: Does the Agency know if there are open ash ponds in Illinois where the ash is in contact with the groundwater at all times?

MS. GALE: Madam Hearing Officer, I don't object to this question as long as it stays general and to the Agency's knowledge. But I would object to any identification of any surface impoundment.

MS. BUGEL: I think you can hold your
objection until the question is asked in that way.
MS. GALE: Okay.
MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The Agency
doesn't have specific information on all impoundments. So it would be hard to say if there are any.

MS. BUGEL: Does the Agency know if there are ash ponds in Illinois where the coal ash is intermittently in contact with groundwater?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, there are.
MS. BUGEL: I have no further questions on Part 750 .

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Thank you,
Ms. Bugel.
Midwest Generation?
MS. GALE: No questions on this part. And I have no questions for the rest of this section, although I reserve the right for follow-up should the need be.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Thank you.
City of Springfield, any questions on 750?
MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, real quick. I have one really quick question on this section.

I'm looking at $850(c)$, as in cat, (1), which references standards for the low permeability layer.

Are you with me?
MS. ZIMMER: Do you mean 750 (c)(1)?
MS. WILLIAMS: Are we on 750? Yes,
750 (C) (1).
MS. ZIMMER: Okay. We're there. You had just said 850, I thought, so I was trying to clarify where we are at.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
So are we all in the same place now?
MS. ZIMMER: Yes, we are.
MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. I'm just going to read the first sentence regarding the low permeability layers.
"The low permeability layer must have a permeability less than or equal to the permeability of any bottom liner system or natural subsoils present, or a hydraulic conductivity no greater than 1 times 10 to the negative 7 centimeters per second, whichever is less."

Does the Agency agree that the 1 times 10 to the negative 7 centimeters per second is an example of a way that the Agency's regulations are more stringent than the Federal?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes.
$\square$

MS. WILLIAMS: And so in designing this low permeability layer, I would assume the facility will design the low permeability layer to meet this minimum requirement.

Can I assume then that in developing the modeling in support of the permanent application, we will also be modeling the hydraulic connectivity no greater than 1 times 10 to the negative 7 centimeters per second from that illustration?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Your last sentence, your last comment there, Ms. Williams, we didn't catch.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. I will start from the beginning and rephrase because I'm not sure I can repeat it exactly as $I$ just said it.

So once you have designed a final cover that complies with the rule, you'll also be doing modeling to show the performance of that final cover, correct?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes.
MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. And when you do that modeling, I assume we'll also be using the same standard of 1 times 10 to the negative 7 centimeters per second; is that correct? If that's what's been designed?
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MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. It could be one way, yes.

MR. GRANHOLM: So, as a general matter, is it correct that the more settling and subsidence are expected, the thicker a final cover system would need to be?

MR. BUSCHER: This is Bill Buscher. It really depends on site-specific circumstances. If you're putting on a thicker cover, you are increasing the loading on the facility. It depends, basically, upon characteristics of the site.

MR. GRANHOLM: Let's turn to Exhibit 2, Page 133. This is CWLP Question 18. I'll refer you specifically to response $18(b)$, as in bravo.

The Agency notes in that response, it says settling associated with municipal landfills would generally be greater than that associated with CCR surface impoundments, correct?

MR. BUSCHER: Could you repeat the question again?

MR. GRANHOLM: That response notes that settling at municipal landfills is expected to be greater than that at CCR surface impoundments, correct?

MR. BUSCHER: Correct.
MR. GRANHOLM: And one of the reasons noted is that material in a landfill is much more compactible.

Is it also true that, unlike CCR, much of the material in landfills also decomposes over time?

MR. BUSCHER: That is correct.
MR. GRANHOLM: So given the differences in compaction and decomposition, has the Agency performed any analysis to determine whether the same thickness of a final cover system is required for CCR surface impoundments as is required for municipal landfills?

MR. BUSCHER: No, we have not done any analysis of that.

MR. GRANHOLM: If you would, please, turn to Exhibit 3, Page 54 to 55.

Following up on the Agency's responses starting at Question 76 , did the Agency rely on any scientific or technical materials when drafting the final cover standards in Part 845?

MR. BUSCHER: We based it on 811.
MR. GRANHOLM: So just to confirm, is the answer to that, no, you did not rely on any scientific or technical materials?
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MR. BUSCHER: That is correct.
MR. GRANHOLM: Nothing further.
Actually, sorry about that. I have to change just to cover one more topic, and that is $750(d)$. And I'll ask you to turn to Exhibit 4, please, Page 7. Question 85 actually appears on Page 6.

Question 85 refers to 5 percent slope, which is provided in $750(d)$, as in David, $4(a)$, as in alpha.

Does the landfill program limit the slope of final cover systems to 5 percent?

MS. BUGEL: I'm going to object to the question on the grounds that it is referencing another regulatory scheme, and earlier the Hearing Officer determined that other regulatory schemes aren't relevant.

MR. GRANHOLM: The Agency, in its last answer and also in the pre-filed answers we were discussing on my last set of questions, referred to the landfill program as the basis of at least parts of its final cover system standards.

So if the Agency is relying on those, I think it's appropriate for us to inquire about those today.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Perhaps you could ask if the Agency is relying on this landfill cover
program.
I'll sustain Ms. Bugel's objection for the same reasons I sustained the objection earlier.

MR. MORE: May I weigh in? The objection was based on the question regarding enforcement. Not how a prior program is interpreted or applied. It was whether the Agency has enforced a certain provision. That was the line of questioning related to Section 3.135 of the Act, which also the Agency objected to because it got into the enforcement of that.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This Question 85 is dealing with the $845.750(d)$, as in dog, 4 alpha.

The Agency, in its response, is saying that it is related to $840.124(\mathrm{~d})(3)$.

MR. MORE: That's fine.
MR. GRANHOLM: Looking at $845.750(d)(4)$
Alpha, the 5 percent slope referred to in that provision, that applies only when consolidating ash between multiple units; is that correct?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. If I'm understanding your question correctly, yes, it's just for final grading and such for the cover system.

MR. GRANHOLM: Just to clarify, final grading
and such of a cover system when adding additional material and before closing an impoundment in place.

MS. ZIMMER: Yes. Amy Zimmer. Yes.
MR. MORE: And only when adding -- Josh More. And only when adding additional CCR is that material for final grading and cover. This provision is only dealing with adding CCR for the final grading and cover, correct?

Put another way, Ms. Zimmer, if I'm not using CCR in the closure, am I allowed to use a greater 5 percent grade on a slope?

MR. DUNAWAY: So this is Lynn Dunaway. 845 says: For purposes of grading and contouring for the final cover system, and it's referring to the use of CCR. So, yes, this is -- for CCR, you should not have a slope greater than 5 percent.

MR. MORE: Just to be clear, when you say "for CCR," that's when I'm adding CCR as a grading material?

MR. DUNAWAY: That's correct.
MR. MORE: And so if I'm not using CCR as a grading material, I could have a slope, for example, at 10 percent, correct?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. If there are

[^20]allowances, yes, there are greater slope percentages that would be allowed for, like, soil or something that would be used.

However, I'm not saying it's a blind date, you could use whatever you want. It would be looked at as part of the design and as part of the permit.

MR. GRANHOLM: Does the Agency have any information suggesting that using final cover slopes steeper than 5 percent, greater than 5 percent, creates a threat to human health or the environment? MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. We don't have that information.

MR. GRANHOLM: Nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Brown from IERG, any questions on 750?
MS. BROWN: No questions on this section. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Ms. Manning at Ameren, any questions on 750?

MS. MANNING: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Manning, you're
muted right now. We are trying to unmute you.
MS. MANNING: I think I'm muted on your side. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. You're all

# Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 09/03/2020 <br> August 25, 2020 

set. We can hear you.
MS. MANNING: All right. Thank you.
Where an ash pond has already been closed pursuant to agency-approved closing plan and includes the final cover system that has been approved and is in place, what part, if any, of Section 845.750 does the Agency intend applies to that closed ash pond with a final cover system already in place?

MR. DUNAWAY: Are you referring to the 5 percent slope issue?

MS. MANNING: I'm referring to 845.750, generally, where a final cover system has already been in place that has been approved by the Agency, what sections of this continue to apply?

MR. HAMMONS: Hearing Officer, this is Jeffrey Hammons from the Environmental Law \& Policy Center. I'm going to object to this question because it's not really following up on any of the Agency's pre-filed answers. It's veering into unchartered territory that the questioner had the opportunity to ask, the pre-trial questions did not, and in the interest of time and in the interest of true follow-up, this line of questioning should be shut down.

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 09/03/2020
August 25, 2020


[^21]Question 27 on Page 66 of Exhibit 2.
MR. LECRONE: We got it.
MR. OZAETA: In Ms. Zimmer's response,
Ms. Zimmer stated that the Agency feels that unlimited extensions for impoundments closing by removal are justified, as long as the need for the extension is demonstrated because the process "may need quite a bit of time to remove the CCR."

Is it the Agency's opinion that closing an impoundment in place could also require quite a bit of time?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes, I do believe closure in place could take quite a bit of time. The Agency, in general, believes closure by removal from any of these facilities would take more time.

That's a general statement. That's obviously very -- we have some sites that are very large. If they chose to close by removal, it could take very, very large amounts of time, so...

MR. OZAETA: Since the closure in place and the closure by removal process, it's been established they could both take quite a bit of time.

What was the basis for establishing a maximum amount of extensions for impoundments closing in place
but not impoundments closing by removal?
MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. The Federal rule has maximum time frames or a number of extensions and the amount of times for closure by removal where a closure must be completed. So we cannot go beyond those timelines.

I meant closure in place. Excuse me. I was corrected. I meant closure in place.

MR. OZAETA: And so just to clarify, are you saying that the reason that there are a max amount of extensions for impoundments closing in place is because the Federal rule requires that?

MS. ZIMMER: Amy Zimmer. Yes.
MR. OZAETA: No further questions for 760, but I may have some follow-up.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Skipping over Midwest Generation.

City of Springfield, any questions on 760?
MS. WILLIAMS: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Dynegy, 760?
MR. MORE: No questions.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No questions.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Brown, any
questions on 760?
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
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MS. BROWN: No questions on this section. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ameren, Ms. Manning, $770 ?$

MS. MANNING: No questions on this section. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Moving on. 780, Post-Closure Care Requirements.

Ms. Bugel, any questions on 780?
MS. BUGEL: Yes, we have questions. And if you'll give me a moment, I'll move to the microphone.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem.
MS. BUGEL: Faith Bugel representing Sierra Club questioning on behalf of Environmental Groups. And I am turning to Page 20 of the -- I'm sorry -Question 20, Page 154 of the Agency's responses to Board questions.

Bear with me. I think I've got a mistake here.

I'm sorry. We're on Page 156, not 154, Question 20, the response to Board questions. And let me know when you're there.

MR. LECRONE: Yeah, we got it.
MS. BUGEL: And this answer refers to inactive closed impoundments that -- whether you could use a previously approved post-closure care plan.

[^23]And my question is, does the Agency intend to require the owner or operator of an inactive closed impoundment that has not completed post-closure care to modify their post-closure plan to meet the requirements of this part if the previously approved plan does not meet those requirements?

MR. LECRONE: Yes, as required by 845.170.
MS. BUGEL: And I am now turning to Page 30, and I think $I$ have a wrong page number again. No. Page 30, Question 9(d), that is a correct page number.

And this response indicates that the Agency is not aware of leaching at concentrations above the applicable groundwater protection standards -- do you see that -- as measured at the points of compliance?

MR. LECRONE: Ms. Bugel, can you repeat where we're at? Which question you're talking about again?

MS. BUGEL: Okay. I'm on Page 30 of the same exhibit, and I'm on Question $9(d)$.

MR. LECRONE: $9(d)$, as in dog?
MS. BUGEL: Correct, (d), as in dog.
MR. LECRONE: We got it.
MS. BUGEL: And do you see the response to that question where it mentions point of compliance?

MR. LECRONE: Yes.

[^24]MS. BUGEL: Can you explain where -- in the Agency's view, where are the points of compliance?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. For inactive closed CCR surface impoundments, the points of compliance are the monitoring wells which were approved as part of that CCR surface impoundments closure plan.

MS. BUGEL: Did the Agency require those monitoring wells to be in any specific location?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. They would have to have been installed pursuant to Part 620.

MS. BUGEL: Did Part 620 require them to be in any specific location?

MR. DUNAWAY: Part 620 requires that groundwater standards be met no greater than 25 feet from the edge of a surface impoundment and at any point where groundwater monitoring is conducted.

MS. BUGEL: And is that different from where Part 845 proposes monitoring to take place?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes.
MS. BUGEL: And Part 845 requires monitoring at the waste boundary; is that correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. Yes, it does.
MS. BUGEL: Is it possible that -- referring
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back to the inactive closed impoundments in this question, is it possible that there could be exceedances of the groundwater protection standards at those wells sometime in the future?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. It's possible.
MS. BUGEL: And would a scenario be a plume of contamination that's still moving towards those wells?

MR. DUNAWAY: That would be one scenario, yes.

MS. BUGEL: I have no further questions on this part.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Skipping Midwest Generation.

City of Springfield, any questions on 770?
MS. WILLIAMS: I don't have any questions on this one.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Dynegy?
MR. GRANHOLM: We have no further questions for the rest of the rule. We reserve the right to follow-ups.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Rest of the rule or rest of the subpart?

MR. GRANHOLM: Rest of the rule. We're done.
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Brown, any further questions?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we do have a few quick follow-up questions on this.

This is Melissa Brown on behalf of IERG. And we're looking at the Agency's pre-filed responses to IERG's pre-filed questions.

So hearing Exhibit 2, Page 137. Please let me know when the Agency gets to that page.

MR. LECRONE: Yeah, we got it.
MS. BROWN: Thanks.
So IERG's pre-filed Question 3 asks regarding closed inactive surface impoundments, and the Agency made the point of clarification there's a difference between closed inactive, inactive closed, which they addressed in response to a prior question by Ms. Manning, so we appreciate that.

But our follow-up in regard to IERG's
pre-filed Question 3(a), as in alpha, so the Agency provided a response to this question as to closed inactive surface impoundments and we would like the Agency, if they could provide a response to this question but as to inactive closed surface impoundments.
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So if an inactive closed surface impoundment had a post-closure plan approved by the Agency prior to the effective date of these rules, would it be appropriate to add clarifying revisions to

Section $845.780(d)$, as in Delta, 2, as IERG had laid out in its pre-filed questions?

MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. I believe you may have asked your question differently than you intended to, because you asked about inactive closed CCR surface impoundments.

MS. BROWN: Yes. So our pre-filed question, as written, asked about closed inactive. And the Agency answered that in pre-filed responses. But at this point we want to ask the same question but as to inactive closed CCR surface impoundments.

MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Inactive closed CCR surface impoundments are subject, according to 845.170, and as long as they meet the requirements of 845.170, they would not need to alter their post-closure care plan other than required by . 170 .

MS. BROWN: Right. But if they do need to alter their already approved post-closure care plan, then they still need to submit that written post-closure care plan along with their initial
operating permit application pursuant to $845.780(d)$, as in Delta, 2, correct?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. A closed -- an inactive closed CCR surface impoundment would have -should submit their post-closure care plan with their initial operating permit. If it needs to be modified, that's when they would make that modification.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.
And then just similar question but to IERG's pre-filed Question $3(\mathrm{~b})$ on the same page, so we asked that question in pre-filed questions as to closed inactive. But we would like to ask the same question now as to inactive closed or inactive closed surface impoundment that has a post-closure care plan approved by the Agency prior to the effective date of these rules would be revision to $845.780(e)$, as in echo, that IERG proposed in a pre-filed question be appropriate?

MR. DUNAWAY: Lynn Dunaway. The Agency's opinion is that 845.170 lays out the sections which are applicable to inactive closed, CCR surface impoundments, and no clarification is necessary.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. That's all I had.
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Manning and Ameren, any questions on 780?

MS. MANNING: I have no questions at this point. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Any follow-up
questions on 780 in the room?
None.
Any follow-up questions on 780 on Web Ex?
Let's move forward with 845.800.
Ms. Bugel any questions on 800?
MS. BUGEL: I believe Ms. Courtney has questions on 800.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Ms. Courtney, on Webex, any questions on Section 800?

MS. COURTNEY: Yes, I do. I have a couple of questions about 815.800. So Kiana Courtney for the Environmental Law \& Policy Center Question 4, Environmental Group.

If the Agency could turn to Exhibit 2, Page 24, this is in regards to Question $23(\mathrm{~b})$, as in beta.

If you could let me know when you're there.
MR. LECRONE: Yeah, we got it.
MS. COURTNEY: The Agency's response to that

[^25]question was that Section $845.280(a)$ requires Agency approval before a permit can be transferred and will, hence, become a part of the permit record.

Clarifying question. And by "permit record" in the operating records or as a part of a permit application? I'm looking for clarity on the phrase "permit record."

MR. LECRONE: Yes, that's correct. If there's a change of ownership, the facility is going to have to file a modification request for change of ownership, and then that documentation will be provided to the Agency and it will be part of the permit record.

MS. COURTNEY: So it's not the operating record?

MR. LECRONE: The permit would go in the operating record as well, but the change of ownership documentation for the Agency would be part of the permit record.

MS. COURTNEY: And in relation to that question on that page in $23(c)$ as well, so $800(d)(1)$ states that the owner/operator of a CCR surface impoundment must place copies -- it says $800(d)$, as in dog -- must place copies of all permit application and
permit issues under this part in the timeline of submitting information.

Does the operating application and the construction application -- I'm sorry.

When does the operating application and construction application go into the operating record?

MS. MARTIN: This is Lauren Martin. We already answered this on the first day.

MS. COURTNEY: So on the first day, we had talked about different plans and trying to get a clarifying on those. I'm talking about the permit applications or the operating permit application, when that goes into the operating record. So this is a slightly different question.

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. We believe it would be on the same schedule.

MS. COURTNEY: Could you clarify what that schedule is and where it mentions that in the rule?

MS. DIERS: All right. This is Stephanie Diers from the Agency. We answered -- we believe we answered this on the first day. It's going to take us some time to go back through the documents and find what you're looking for. So we would like to answer this in writing in post-hearing comments.

MS. COURTNEY: I'm sorry. You said you would respond in post-hearing comments to that question? MS. DIERS: Yes, because, due to time, we'd like to move on.

MS. COURTNEY: Okay. Thank you. Those are all my questions for Section 800.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on, Midwest Generation?

MS. GALE: I have no questions for the whole subpart. Although I reserve right to follow-up.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: City of Springfield, any questions on 800?

MS. WILLIAMS: Nothing on 800.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Skipping
Dynegy.
Ms. Brown, any questions on 800?
MS. BROWN: This is Melissa Brown. IERG has no questions for the remainder of the rule but would like to reserve follow-up questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Manning, Ameren, any questions on 800?

MS. MANNING: I'm sorry. On 800?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. MANNING: No, we have no questions on
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part 800 .
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: AG's office, any questions on 800?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Andrew Armstrong, the AG's office has no questions on the remaining two subparts but reserves the right to ask follow-up questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. And, Mr. Rao, any questions on 800?

MR. RAO: No questions on 800 .
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. You said no questions for 800? Sorry, you cut out.

MR. RAO: Yes, no questions on 800.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Thank you.
All right. Moving on.
Marie was just pointing out it's almost 3:00.
It's 2:54 right now. Let's take a 10-minute break.
And we'll come back at 3:05, and we'll start up with 810.
(Whereupon, a break was taken, after which the following proceedings were had:)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: This is Vanessa
Horton. We are back in the hearing room. It's 3:05.
Is the Agency ready?
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Is Springfield?
MR. LECRONE: Yes, we're ready.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. So we're moving on to 810.

Ms. Bugel, any questions on 810?
MS. BUGEL: I believe Ms. Courtney has
questions on 810.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Ms. Courtney?
MS. COURTNEY: Yes.
Can you hear me?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Yes.
MS. COURTNEY: So the couple follow-up questions for 845.810 in relation to Exhibit 2 on Page 133, Question 17. Please let me know when you're there.

MR. LECRONE: Okay. We're ready.
MS. COURTNEY: So that question and answer refers to having a website for Federal rule compliance and Illinois rule compliance.

My first question is, does the Agency think it's unreasonable to ask a company to have two web pages, where one web page identifies documents required by 40 CFR Part 275 and the other identifies documents required by Part 845 proposed rule?
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MR. MORE: I'm going to object. These questions were asked the first day of hearing. Ms. Gale particularly had a whole series of questions regarding the answer to this question on the duplicate websites.

In an effort to move the process along, I believe all the questions relating to this were asked the first day in connection with Section 170.

MS. COURTNEY: May I respond?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Of course.
MS. COURTNEY: So in effort to also move things along, we held off on asking those follow-up questions because they were directly related to the website rather than the definition section. And the website is referenced in part 845.810.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I will overrule your objection, Mr. More.

And you can continue, Ms. Courtney.
MS. COURTNEY: Should I repeat the question?
MR. LECRONE: Please repeat the question.
Thanks.
MS. COURTNEY: So does the Agency think it's unreasonable to ask the company to have two web pages, where one web page identifies documents required by
the Federal Rule 40 CFR Part 257 and the other identifies documents so far as by the Illinois rule, the proposed Part 845 rules?

MR. LECRONE: The Agency does not think that's unreasonable.

MS. COURTNEY: Thank you.
And second question, does the Agency think the public would benefit from having clearly demarcated websites so they easily can discern what documents are pursuant to 40 CFR Part 257 Federal rule and what documents are pursuant to Part Code 845?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. As we put in our answer for 17, you know, we suggested it be labeled "Illinois CCR Rule Compliance Dated Information." That way it's clear what we're talking about.

MS. COURTNEY: Okay. Thank you.
And those are my questions for 810, and we reserve the right to follow-up.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. City of Springfield, any questions on 810?

MS. WILLIAMS: I guess I'll just follow up briefly. This was originally my question. Based on this --
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Williams, you are breaking up a little bit. If you could repeat.

MS. WILLIAMS: All right. So in the earlier hearing when the Agency was asked about this question -- can you hear me okay?

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: If everybody could mute themselves.

MS. WILLIAMS: Excuse me?
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm sorry, everyone but yourself could mute themselves. But you can continue, Ms. Williams.

MS. WILLIAMS: I can't hear the Hearing Officer. I'm not sure what she's saying.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: All right. You can go ahead. We were having some interference but, please, go ahead.

MS. WILLIAMS: When the Agency was asked about this at the first hearing, I had a perception in the hearing room, at least, that there was a consensus, which may not actually be the case. That this proposal by the Agency to change the way the websites are labeled and this interpretation of having two websites would be confusing and less beneficial to the public.

If it were determined by the parties to be the case, that this is not as helpful to the public due to separate websites, does the Agency see a substantive or operational problem from their end with allowing a single place for the public to go that identifies the different documents needed for the different roles?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. At this point, the way things stand, the Agency prefers two websites.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, $I$ understand that, and I'm giving you an opportunity to explain a reason that it would interfere with your operations, and so I'm assuming that you don't have one. Is this your preference?

MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. We just think it would be easier to keep separate the requirements of the two separate rules, at least for now, as the way things stand.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on to
Ms. Manning for Ameren. Any questions on 810?
MS. MANNING: I have no questions on 810. Thank you. And I don't expect to have any questions
on financial assurance either.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Thank you.
All right. Any follow-up questions in the room to 810? No?

Any follow-up questions on Webex to 810?
MS. E. BROWN: This is Essence from the Technical Unit.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I'm sorry.
MS. E. BROWN: I do have a question on 810.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: I skipped over you. Please go ahead, Ms. Brown.

MS. E. BROWN: So in addition to the documentation, providing the final permit being available, from the owner's website --

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Brown?
MS. E. BROWN: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: You need to slow down, please.

MS. E. BROWN: In addition to the documentation regarding the final permit being available on the owner's website, is the Agency willing to put all the documents for all CCR surface impoundments in one place to make it easier for the public to access these documents?
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Do you want me to restate my question.
MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone. Can you
clarify, are you asking if the Agency would be willing to put it on the -- all on the Agency's website as well?

MS. E. BROWN: Yes.
MR. LECRONE: This is Darin Lecrone.

Currently, we don't have the ability, the technical resources to be able to post all of that.

MS. E. BROWN: Okay. I have no further questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Thank you.
Moving on to subpart $I$, financial assurance, 845.900, general provisions.

Ms. Bugel, any questions on 900?
MS. BUGEL: Mr. Hammon should have questions for us on this subpart.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Mr. Hammons, questions on 900?

MR. HAMMONS: Hearing Officer, I don't have any questions -- this is Jeff Hammons from the ELPC. I don't have any questions on 900 .

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Moving onto City of Springfield, 900? I'm
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sorry, Midwest Generation.
MS. GALE: No questions on this.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: City of Springfield,
Part 845.900?
MS. WILLIAMS: I don't expect to have any questions on this subpart.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
I am skipping Dynegy. I am skipping IERG. I am skipping Ameren. The AG's office.

And I'm returning to the Board's Technical Unit, Ms. Brown or Mr. Rao, any questions on 900?

MR. RAO: No questions on subpart I.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No questions on subpart I?

MR. RAO: Subpart A, the financial assurance. I misspoke.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Got it. All right. So moving on to 910, upgrading financial assurance.

Ms. Bugel?
MS. BUGEL: I'll turn it over to Mr. Hammon, if he has questions.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Mr. Hammons, any questions on 910?

MR. HAMMONS: Yes, this is Jeff Hammons with

ELPC. I will be doing all the questions for this subpart. I have one follow-up question under 910. This is in response to an Agency answer to one of our questions in particular. It's Exhibit 2 at Page 122. And this is for Question 4(b), as in bravo.

If the Agency could just let me know when you're there.

MR. LECRONE: We're good.
MR. HAMMONS: So this question has to do with upgrading financial assurances. In particular, the Agency responded the regulating community has generally upgraded financial assurances as required. So my follow-up question is, in the event a corrective action plan or closure plan is amended that causes cost estimates to increase, but an owner or operator lacks the ability to obtain financial assurances sufficient to meet that cost estimate, do the rules provide for who will cover the difference between the existing financial assurances and those updated cost estimates?

MR. MATHIS: This is Bob Mathis. And no, the rules do not address that.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. That's my only
question.
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HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay.
Any follow-up questions on the room to 910?
None?
Any follow-up questions on Webex to 910?
Okay. Moving onto 920, Release of Financial
Institution and Owner or Operator?
Mr. Hammons, any questions on 920.
MR. HAMMONS: No questions on 920.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on to 930, cost -- I'm sorry, Midwest Generation?

MS. GALE: I have a question on 930. I'm sorry.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: No problem. 930, Cost Estimates.

Mr. Hammons, any questions on 930?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes, I have one question that's another follow-up to Agency pre-filed answer.

This is on Page 123 of Exhibit 2, the Agency's response to Question 5(b), as in bravo. Just let me know when you're there.

MR. LECRONE: We're ready.
MR. HAMMONS: All right. So this question has to do with the timing of initial costs. We asked how the Agency would verify cost estimates. And it
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indicated that initial cost estimates would be submitted to the permit section for approval.

So my question is just about timing. For existing impoundments that are required to submit cost estimates and financial assurance within 60 days of this Rule's final promulgation, how will the impoundment provide those cost estimates when it's not required to provide a preliminary closure plan until September 30th of 2021, which is more than 60 days after these rules are supposed to be finalized?

MR. MATHIS: This is Bob Mathis. We're going to have to take a look at that in the language and get back to you in the post-hearing comments.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. That's the only question $I$ had on that section.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Ms. Gale, Midwest
Generation?
MS. GALE: Yes.
I just want to turn to Exhibit 3, Page 34 --
33, 34. And I can't see you in my screen, so you're going to have to let me know when you're ready.

MR. LECRONE: Ready.
MS. ZIMMER: We're ready.
MS. GALE: Thank you.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

Really, the follow-up is the Agency's answer -- the question was, was what was the basis for the 25 percent. The Agency answered that it believes 25 percent is not unreasonable.

So I guess my follow-up question is, where did the Agency come up with 25 percent? Or how did the Agency come up with 25 percent?

MR. MATHIS: This is Bob Mathis. We answered that Question 95 in the pre-filed questions. We did express that there are exceedances with a lot of these CCR facilities. And we know some type of corrective action is probably going to be necessary.

So we do believe that 25 percent of the total cost is not unreasonable.

MS. GALE: Okay. That's what you said. I guess, what made you think 25 percent as opposed to 15 percent or even as opposed to 35 percent? What I'm asking for is how did you come up with 25 percent? I'm really just curious.

MR. MATHIS: This is Bob Mathis again. Through Agency discussions, when we discussed this, we had differing opinions and we determined -- we agreed on 25 percent sounded like that was not unreasonable.

MS. GALE: Okay. Thank you.
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Page 141

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Are there any follow-up questions on 930 in the room?

No?
Any follow-up questions on 930 on Webex?
Okay. Moving on.
940, Revision of Cost Estimates.
Mr. Hammons, any questions on 940?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes. This is Jeff Hammons with
ELPC. I have one question. And this is related to the last question just in regards to -- it's a question about timing. So this is a follow-up to Agency's response to Question 6 on Page 123 of Exhibit 2.

For clarification, for the record, the question is on Page 123, but their answer is on Page 124 of Exhibit 2.

Is the Agency there?
MS. ZIMMER: The Agency is there.
MR. HAMMONS: Thank you.
The screen is really tiny so $I$ can't really tell.

So this Question Number 6 asks about cost revisions to modifications to corrective action closure plans and post-closure plans, and the Agency
response indicated that there's a 30 -day time period from Section $940(\mathrm{~b})$, as in bravo.

My follow-up question is just for the initial construction permit application and approval for closure plans, what is the time period applicable for when cost estimates must be updated for that?

So rather than asking about the modifications to closure plans, asking about the timeline for the initial approval of the initial closure plan.

MR. MATHIS: This is Bob Mathis. The facilities will have 60 days from the effective date of this cost estimate, initial cost estimate, and financial assurance submitted into the Agency.

MR. HAMMONS: Okay. My question is, when they apply for the final closure plans for a construction permit, and then the Agency approves that application, is the 60-day time requirement, are they required to, you know, obtain the new process of financial assurance within 60 days or some other time period?

MR. MATHIS: That would be 60 days. This is Bob Mathis. This would be 60 days.

MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. No more questions on this section.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Thank you. Midwest Generation, any questions on 940? MS. GALE: No. I'm done for the remainder. HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. So we'll move on to 950, Mechanisms for Financial Assurance.

Mr. Hammons, any questions on 950?
MR. HAMMONS: No questions on 950.
HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on to 960, Trust Fund.

Mr. Hammons, any questions on 960?
MR. HAMMONS: Yes. I have one follow-up
question to the Agency's pre-filed answer in response to our Question 8(b), as in bravo, which is on Page 125 of Exhibit 2.

MS. ZIMMER: We're ready.
MR. HAMMONS: Thank you. So the question was, what is the procedure for making determinations of whether to withhold in response to request for reimbursement of a trust fund. And the Agency's answer was that staff compares current cost estimates in the latest approved permit to the latest valuation of the trust fund.

So my question is, if an owner or operator has an approved closure permit and has undertaken some

[^27]activities pursuant to that permit but they haven't requested a modification of that permit that reflects those changes, potential changes in cost estimates, can they still get reimbursed?

MR. MATHIS: This is Bob Mathis. Not until they've had that included in the cost estimate because we want our technical staff to look at that to be sure what is being done at the site is actually reducing the cost.

MR. HAMMONS: Okay. Thank you. That was my only question.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Moving on to 970, Surety Bond Guaranteeing Payment.

Mr. Hammons, any questions on 970?
MR. HAMMONS: No. And I have no more questions on the remainder of this subpart.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: Okay. Then --
MR. HAMMONS: I reserve the right for follow-up.

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: By my count, that is no other participants have any questions for the remainder of the subpart.

Are there any follow-ups for 900?
Okay. Ms. Court Reporter, I'd like to go off
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the record.
(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)

HEARING OFFICER HORTON: We're back on the record, and we just went off the record briefly to discuss some procedural issues. We'll be reconvening for the second hearing on October 29th. And we've added a fourth day, which will be on October 6th. And we'll be having public comments on Wednesday, September 30th, during the lunch hour, from 12:00 to 1:30 tentatively. And then Thursday evening will be on Webex, public comment starting at about 5:30. And I will follow-up with the Hearing Officer order describing these dates.

So as long as there's nothing further, we'll conclude this first hearing, and thank you very much.
(Whereupon the meeting concluded at 3:49 p.m.)
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