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HEARING OFFICER FOX: The time of 9:00 o'clock having come, I appreciate everyone's flexibility with some of the details that are required to conduct a remote hearing such as this one.

I want to, first of all, introduce myself and wish everyone a good morning and welcome them to this Illinois Pollution Control Board hearing.

My name is Tim Fox, and I'm the Hearing Officer for this rule making, which is entitled "Amendments to 35 Illinois Administrative Code 219, Organic Material Emission Standards for the Metro East Area and 35 Illinois Administrative Code 211, Definitions and General Provisions".

The Board docket number for this rule making is R2118. Before we get to the substance of these proposed rules, I want quickly to go through some Board basic things.

First, introductions; second, technical service; third, the procedure to date in this docket; and then some housekeeping details, including the order in which we plan to proceed today.

First of all, introductions. Present today from the Board are -- first of all, Board

Member Cynthia Santos, who is the lead Board Member assigned to this proceeding; and I see that the Board Chair, Barbara Flynn Currie, has also joined the call.

In addition, present from the Board Staff are Board Attorneys Vanessa Horton and Daniel Pauley, who is assisting me as the host graciously for this hearing today. And also present from the Board's technical staff is Anand Rao and Essence Brown.

Secondly, I want to address technical information. As you all know, of course due to Covid 19, in addition to this physical location in Collinsville, we have allowed Webex participation through both phone and computer.

For those participating by Webex, either on the phone or using the call me feature for sound, if you would like to speak during the hearing, please take your phone off of speaker phone and talk directly into the phone, as that will produce a much clearer sound for the court reporter and all of the other participants.

If you wish to speak, you will also need to unmute yourself. Each person entering the Webex
feed will be muted upon entry.
If you are participating through a computer, you can unmute yourself by clicking the microphone Icon. And if you are participating through a phone, you will need to push star 6 on your keypad to unmute yourself and be recognized.

For the benefit of our court reporter, and of course all of the other participants, please bear in mind that there may be a slight delay with Webex video; and please make every effort to speak clearly and void speaking at the same time as another person, which will help to produce a very clear transcript.

Finally, we are recording the Webex feed of today's hearing, in order to assist the court reporter. Once the Board receives the transcript of the hearing, we will post it to our clerk's office online for approval and then destroy the recording of the Webex feed.

Third, $I$ will quickly review the Board's procedure today. On October 5th of 2020, IEPA filed this rule-making proposal, with a motion requesting that the Board expedite this review.

In an order on October 15th, 2020, the

Board accepted the proposal and granted the motion to expedite. Without commenting on the substantive merits of the proposal, the Board submitted it to first notice publication in the Illinois Register, where it appeared on October 30th of 2020.

The Board published notice of the two hearings to be held on this docket. On October 20th, it appeared in the Springfield Journal Register, the Chicago Sun Times, the LaSalle News Tribune, the Rockford Journal Star, the Peoria Journal Star and the Belleville News Democrat.

On October 21st, the notice appeared in the Galena Gazette, the Champaign News-Gazette, the Centralia and Mount Vernon Morning Sentinel, and the Dispatch in Rock Island Argus.

Finally, on October 22nd, it appeared in the Metropolis Planet. Today we are, of course, holding the first hearing in this rule making. In an order dated October 16th of 2020, the Hearing Officer directed participants intending to testify at this hearing to prefile that testimony by November 19th.

On November 18th, the Board received prefiled testimony on behalf of IEPA by Mr. Rory

Davis, who is present with us on this Webex call. No other participants prefiled testimony.

To expedite the hearing, the Hearing Officer also urged participants to prefile any written questions, based on testimony by December 3rd; and on that date, the Board Hearing Officer Order included the Board questions on IEPA's proposal.

If you want to note that yesterday, December 9th, IEPA filed a motion to amend its proposal, to the extent of the wording in Section 219.208(f)(1) and (f) (4).

The Board has posted each of these documents and filings to the Clerk's Office online under this Docket No. R2118, filed promptly as they were received.

Finally, and I thank you for your patience for our housekeeping for this hearing. It is governed by the Board's Procedural Rules; and under Section 102.426 of those rules, all information that is relevant, and it is not repetitious or privileged, will be admitted by Hearing Officer into the record.

> Please bear in mind that any questions
posed today by the Board, or its staff, are intended solely to help develop a complete and clear record for the Board's ultimate decision; and those questions do not reflect any determination, or any judgment on the proposal, the testimony, or any questions that are based upon it.

Although the Hearing Officer's order that intended to begin today with IEPA prefiled testimony and its witness, we may have a small number of persons who wish to offer a public comment on the proposal; and we can make an opportunity available for them to offer brief comments, so that they may remain in the hearing or leave, as they wish.

After that, we can begin with the prefiled testimony of IEPA's witness under Section $102424(f)$ of the Board's Procedural Rules. This prefiled testimony will be entered into the record as if read. IEPA's witness may begin with a brief introduction or summary, if he wishes to do so.

I would intend, then, to turn to the questions for the agency's witnesses. Again, the Board has filed some of those, and you can turn to the agency for any responses.

After those, we can see whether there is
anyone who did not prefile testimony, but wishes to testify here today. And we can also see whether anyone, before we conclude, wishes to offer a public comment.

There will also be an opportunity for any participants to testify or comment on the Board's request with the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to perform an economic impact study of the proposal required by the Environmental Protection Act.

Does anyone have any questions about our order of proceeding?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Not seeing any indication, or hearing any indication that anyone does, why don't we turn, as I suggested, to see whether anyone participating in this call wishes to offer a brief public comment on the agency's proposal.

Please, at this point, unmute yourself, if you would, to indicate that you do wish to offer a public comment.

> (No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: If you believe you are
speaking to us, and we're not responding, please double check to make sure you have unmuted yourself.

If you do want to order a comment, we'll just wait a second or two to make sure anyone wishes to do so is able. I'm not seeing or hearing any indication that anyone would like to start this hearing with a public comment.

I think Mr. Matoesian and
Ms. Vetterhoffer, on behalf of the agency, that we're prepared to turn to the agency witness, Mr. Davis.

Is the agency prepared, Ms. Vetterhoffer or Mr. Metoesian, to have the court reporter swear Mr. Davis in?

MR. METOESIAN: Yes. This is Charles Metoesian. I'm an attorney with the Division of Legal Counsel. I'm appearing for the Agency today.

I have with me Mr. Rory Davis, who is the Manager of the Regulatory Development Unit in the Air Quality Planning Section of the Illinois EPA Bureau of Air.

Also, as you indicated, Dana Vetterhoffer is on the call. She is also an attorney. She's the Deputy General Counsel of the Division of Legal
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Counsel, and you can now swear in Mr. Davis, if you would like.
(Mr. Rory Davis was duly sworn.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you very much, Madam Court Reporter. Mr. Davis, thank you for your appearance today and for your written testimony on the 18th of November.

Mr. Davis, thank you for your appearance, which the Board appreciates. We do, as I mentioned, have your prefiled written testimony. We proceed to questions right away, or if the Agency -- if Mr. Davis would like to offer a brief introduction or summary, that would be fine.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Rory Davis. I am the Manager of the Regulatory Development Unit in the Bureau of Air at Illinois EPA. I became the manager of that unit in March, but have been an Environmental Protection Engineer in the Air Quality Planning Section since 2005.

I was responsible for assembling the technical support document or TSD, and will be providing all the testimony for the agency, and will try to answer any questions any participants have. HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Thank you

[^0]very much, Mr. Davis. The one set of questions in our record today were submitted on December 3rd.

In speaking with the agency procedure -before we begin, we can proceed through those in numerical order?

MR. DAVIS: Yes. I did have one question, whether the Board would like me to read those questions in full before giving my answer. I do have a full set of questions with answers.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Why don't I do this, Mr. Davis, since those have been available for about a week, why don't $I$ just take up the first one with a brief summary of the substance of the question; and we could hear the Agency's response for each of those questions, if the opportunity is warranted for those questions.

I agree that was coming through more clearly. I'm going to repeat, just in case there is any issues with the sound quality. What I will do, Mr. Davis, is summarize each thing one by one, hear the Agency's responses to the questions.

Mr. Davis, why don't you begin with question number 1?

MR. DAVIS: In question No. 1, the Board asked
about the proposed definition of chemical milling masking, and whether parenthetical, if needed, that included different kinds of chemical milling masking.

The Agency believes that the definition is consistent with the one with Aerospace CTG. We think the parenthetical provides some clarification; but if the Board finds it to be redundant, then the definition would also be sufficient without the parenthetical.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, thank you. Does anyone who is participating in the call have any follow-up?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, I'm not seeing the opportunity.

MR. DAVIS: The second question was also a JCAR question, whether in the proposed definition for commercial exterior aerodynamic structure primer, there should be a change, generally to a comma, and the placement of "and", whether it should be "and landing gear and doors" to "landing gear," comma, "and doors."

The Agency looked into this. We believe
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the definition could refer to the landing gear and the landing gear doors, and was intentionally written, as proposed; and from the CTG, that's the Agency that recommends that the proposed original CTG language not be altered.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, thank you. Does any participant have a problem with that issue? (No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Neither seeing, nor hearing anything, Mr. Davis, No. 3.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Also, in public comment 1 from JCAR, a question in the proposed definition for a commercial interior adhesive, should there be a cross reference to the FAA's fire worthiness requirements.

The Agency does not believe the cross reference is necessary. The Aerospace CPG did not provide a citation to the specific fire worthiness requirements being contemplated.

Not clear why the citation is not provided, but it may be to ensure that the most up-to-date FAA requirements are applicable.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, again, thank you. Is there any follow-up questions? Please
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unmute yourself, if you would like to raise them (No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Neither seeing nor hearing anything, continue.

MR. DAVIS: The next several questions are of the same sort. So, in public comment 1, JCAR noted that the VOM limit in Section 219.204R2N for interior adhesives is . 750 kilograms per liter, when the federal limit and the CPG is .760. And then the Board asked for comment on why it would be more restrictive than the federal standard.

The limit for the answer -- the limit for this category should, indeed, be 0.760 kilograms per liter as the Board suggests.

It appears that in drafting -- in the drafting process, a rounding error was accidentally introduced, due to the number of significant digits that would appear in the rule.

So, for the next few questions, the limit contained in the CTG should be used; and, in all cases, the parenthetical pounds-for-gallon limits are correct, as proposed, because they were not affected by that error.

So, in each case, the suggested ones from
the Board or JCAR is correct; but in all cases, also the English units for pounds per gallon are also correct, as proposed.

I'll go ahead and go through those.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Actually, Mr. Davis, I think you have made clear that for questions No. 4 through 9, that these simpler questions about the substances, that the standard from Federal Rules based on the CTG is the correct for each one of those.

Am I understanding you correctly?
MR. DAVIS: Yes. So, the limits in the CTG are what was intended by the Agency, and we were not intending them to be slightly more stringent.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Secondly, I think I understood you correctly. Please set me straight, if necessary.

Originally, the proposed equivalence, the parenthetical was in pounds per gallon is correct, as proposed, and are not to be adjusted to correspond to the CPG. Am I correct in that?

MR. DAVIS: That is correct.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: And that would apply to each of the questions No. 4 through 9 apply to
different substances; am I correct about that?
MR. DAVIS: That's correct. There is a one-sentence quick answer, if you like. I could just rattle off the answers for the record.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Why don't we do that, and that would give anyone who had a follow-up question a chance to address those specifically.

Can you be clear about which question, that addresses those? Mr. Davis, please go ahead.

MR. DAVIS: Question 5, the answer is "This limit should be 0.645 kilograms per liter," and the 5.4 pounds per gallon equivalent is correct.

Question 6, "This limit should be zero .880 kilograms per liter," and the 7.3 pounds-per-gallon equivalent is correct.

Question 7, "This limit should be
0.880 kilograms per liter," and the
7.3 pounds-per-gallon equivalent is correct.

Question 8, "This limit should be
0.880 kilograms per liter," and the
7.3 pounds-per-gallon equivalent is correct.

And question 9, "This limit should be
0.675 kilograms per liter," and the
5.6 pounds-per-gallon equivalent is correct.

[^1]HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, thank you for that specific clarification.

Is there any participant who wishes to follow up on any of those questions that Mr. Davis just listed?

MR. RAO: This is Anand Rao here. I have a quick clarification question for Rory. I think it's -- let me see.

Question 7 and also question 8, it says that the VOM content limit in Section 219204R2SS were scaled inhibitor is . 870 KD per liter, when the federal limit is 0.880 KD per liter.

Can you comment on whether the federal limit can change, or is it set at .880 KD per liter?

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, unmute.
MR. DAVIS: Sure. The federal limit is not actually a federal limit. It's more what is in the Control Techniques Guidelines, just to characterize that as a suggested limit from the CTG.

I think there's another question about this later on. As far as can it change, we don't often see the controls that the guidelines revisited.

Generally, the CTG categories are set as a
category, and then the State is responsible for, you know, whatever reason, wherever you are in non-containment areas classification to make rules, if they are necessary; and then the requirement is just to have RACT rules and the CPGs provide model rules that would qualify it's RACT.

It is possible that they could revisit the CTG and move some of these limits around, but I think it's unlikely.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Okay, thank you.
MR. RAO: Sorry for jumping the gun.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Sure. On those questions No. 4 through 9 that Mr. Davis just addressed, does any participant have a follow-up question?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, I'm not seeing or hearing anyone. No. 10?

MR. DAVIS: Okay. In question 10, it's also from public comment 1 from JCAR. They questioned whether the reference proposed in had 219.205(k)(2) should include a citation to the Federal Register regarding the USEPA's Emission Trading Policy Statement.

When the Agency looked at this, we found
that there are a number of references to USEPA's trading policy statement throughout Part 219.

In some instances, the suggested citation from JCAR is given; and in others, it is not. So, the Agency believes either is appropriate and will defer to the Board's preference.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: And, Mr. Davis, if I may clarify here slightly, is it the Agency's position that these should be added to each of these references in Part 19 in the Board's discretion?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, I think so. For example, there's 219.205. This is K 2 that is an amendment.

There's also an $H$ and $a n I$ and a J2. There's very similar language. In some cases, the Board has included the reference and some hasn't. I thinks it's about half and half.

So, yes, if the Board would like to include the reference, then that would be fine. If they did not, it would not be unusual also.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you for that clarification, Mr. Davis.

Does anyone wish to offer a follow-up question on No. 10?
(No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Neither seeing or hearing any, No. 11 is an issue that $I$ believe HP has addressed in it's motion to amend its proposal as filed yesterday. Specifically, changing a reference to subsection $F 6$ to a reference to Section 4.

Does anyone wish to have a follow-up on that or a motion to amend?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Neither hearing or seeing any, Mr. Davis, No. 12, please?

MR. DAVIS: Okay. In public comment 1, JCAR also questions why in 219.219B, certain work practice standards -- certain activities for cleaning aerospace components may take place are exempted from the proposed rules.

The sole basis for the exclusion of these activities was consistency with the requirements of the Aerospace CTG. USEPA developed a guideline, including the cited exclusions, based on its expertise in the field and input provided by stakeholders.

The Agency recommends that the exclusions be retained in the rules.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up questions?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, question 12?
MS. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Hearing Officer. This is Melissa Brown. First and foremost, can you hear me all right?

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Yes.
MS. BROWN: Okay, thank you. My question is that I just want to confirm that those facilities that came under proposed Section 219.208(f)(1), that takes a limit of under 25 tons per year of volatile organic material, those facilities that take the less than 25 tons-per-year limit, before the compliance date of the rule, are exempted from the entire Subpart $F$, which includes the cleaning requirements in Section 219.219, correct?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, I believe that is the case. And while I say I believe that is the case, perhaps it would be better to address that in a post-hearing comment also, so we can take a second look at that and make sure. Yes, I believe that is the case.

MS. BROWN: Okay, thank you. And then since I mentioned the point of the compliance date, $I$ just want to confirm, I believe this was in an Agency's filing, but it's your understanding that the
compliance date for the rule will be changed from January 1st and will no longer be January 3rd, 2021, correct?

MR. DAVIS: That's right. The Agency does acknowledge that compliance date would not be appropriate and has said so.

So, we said we would examine it closer to, you know, any adoption, or perhaps when the second hearing is resolved and post-hearing comments. So, we will have more information then. But, yes, that is correct.

MS. BROWN: Thank you very much. That's all I have.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any additional follow-up questions on No. 12 for Mr. Davis?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Neither seeing nor hearing any, Mr. Davis, No. 13 appears to be in order.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Question 13 is regarding the question I brought up earlier. Is IEPA aware of any updates or reviews of the Aerospace EPG; and if we're not aware, does it expect any updates or reviews in the future?
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The Agency is not aware of any reviews or updates to the CPG and does not expect any updates to the CTG in the future.

As I stated, it's not very common for them to revisit certain parts of a CTG. I would note that there is a NESHAP for aerospace manufacturing and rework facilities at 40 CFR 1653, Subpart GG, and that is periodically reviewed and updated.

I believe that is every five years by rule by the USEPA, but that is for control of hazardous air pollutions and not for VOM.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, thank you. Is there any follow-up anyone wishes to ask?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Neither seeing nor hearing, Mr. Davis, No. 14, please?

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Question 14 is asking about the technical support document at page 7 in Section 5.11 of the document.

It states in the CTG and in the TSD that the specially coating have relatively low use and that lower VOM formulas of them are generally available. Sorry, not generally available.

The Illinois EPA is aware of whether the

[^2]use of specially coating by potentially affected sources is consistent with the CTG document, and I believe that is asking about potentially affected sources in Illinois; and the Agency can say that, yes, the discussions with the potentially affected sources during outreach appears to support that characterization in the TSD.

I'll just repeat it. The discussions with potentially-affected sources, during outreach for this rule making, do support the characterization in the $T S D$ and in the CTG, specialty coatings used account for a small minority of the emissions of active sources.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Is there anyone who wishes to raise any follow-up questions?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Neither seeing nor hearing any, Mr. Davis, No. 15.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Question 15 is also about the technical support document, page 8, Section 5.1.2.2 refers to comments regarding a 2015 review of the aerospace NESHAP, and IEPA provides a copy of those comments, for the record, and does this review include any review of the aerospace EPG?

If so, can Illinois EPA provide a copy for the record?

The Agency will provide a copy of those comments, the post-hearing comments if not sooner, and the review did not include a review of the Aerospace EPG.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Any follow-up?

MR. RAO: This Anand Rao. I have a follow-up question.

Mr. Davis, can you clarify, for the record, if any of the potential sources are covered by the NESHAP rules?

MR. DAVIS: I'm not certain. NESHAP is
National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{P}$.

I'm not aware that any of the sources in Illinois are subject to the NESHAP. I could double check that, but $I$ believe that they are not. Again, I would have to double check that, and I can follow up to the Board in these comments.

MR. RAO: Thank you. That's all I have.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Does any other
participant have a follow-up question?

No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Not seeing or hearing any, Mr. Davis, we're ready to proceed.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Question 16 is also from the technical support document from Section 5.2 The document states the "Add-on controls may not be cost effective for smaller sources, and would Illinois EPA comment on how it would classify sources, if smaller or larger, and it considers potentially affected sources to be large or small for this cost effectiveness."

The Agency does not have a specific threshold for what it would consider a small or large source, with respect to this statement from the TSD.

The CTG and the proposed coating limits in it are generally considered to be cost effective control measures to meet the RACT requirements. The Agency and the TSD only meant that a significant capital outlay for installing and operating controls would be less likely for smaller sources to employ, especially when compliant coatings are ready commercially available.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thanks, Mr. Davis. Any follow-up?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Not seeing or hearing any, No. 17, please.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Question 17 is also about the technical support document page 9, Section 6.0, Illinois EPA states, "The coatings applied to exterior of airplanes are exempt from the miscellaneous metal parts and product limits."

And the question is: Would we please cite the specific source of this exemption? Those exemptions are both found in 211, the definitions for those.

In the definitions for miscellaneous metal parts and product coatings at Section 211.3850, and in the definition for miscellaneous metal parts and products coating line at 211.3870 .

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Any follow up?
(No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: We are ready, Mr. Davis, for No. 18.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. This question is about page 9 of the technical support document in Section 7.0.

The Illinois EPA refers to reviewing other state's regulations in drafting its proposal.
"Would Illinois EPA comment on which state's regulation it reviewed, and how the regulations compare with this proposal?"

I believe we looked at a number of states to see how the regulations were structured and how consistent they were with the CTG requirements.

This is a common check that the Agency generally performs to make sure we have not missed, you know, maybe an update of some kind. The states that we reviewed were very consistent with the CTG.

Specifically, I think we looked at Ohio, Indiana and New Jersey, probably some others. I don't remember all. But, you know, at certain points you don't keep looking.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any follow-up from the Agency? (No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Davis, not seeing or hearing, No. 19, the Board's final statement.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Question 19 is regarding the technical support document in Section 7.2, and that's on page 12.
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The document states that it proposes the CTG's RACT level control for coating application processes as using one or more of nine listed techniques, two of which are HVLP spraying and electrostatic spray.

It also allows any other coating spray application methods that achieve transfer efficiency equivalent to HVLP or electrostatic spray applications, and then asks for comments on why these two techniques are the standard for an alternative.

And, also, to comment on why the proposed rules would not allow the use of alternative non-spray coating application methods.

So, the answer would be that the HVLP and the electrostatic spray application methods are the ones required in the rule language at $219.219(e)(7)$.

Other methods are acceptable, if their transfer efficiencies are equivalent to those two methods, and if they are approved by the Agency.

These methods are the standard for an alternative, because they are the methods that were considered RACT and required by the CPG.

I and the Agency are not aware of coating
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application methods that would be considered non-frail to those mentioned in the $C P G$ and TSD. Those are flow coatings, dip coating, roll coating, brush coating and cotton tips swab applications.

Those methods would generally be considered to add transfer efficiencies better than the spray coating methods, and this is just because spraying coatings with VOM, you atomize the particles, and there are more emissions.

And, so, dip coating, or roll, or brush coating is going to have -- generally going to have better transfer efficiencies than spraying the coating on. So, a non-spray alternative to those may be acceptable, if it had a transfer efficiency equivalent to HVLP or electrostatic spraying.

It's just unclear what those alternatives might be.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Is there a follow-up question to Mr. Davis' response? (No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Not seeing or hearing any, and that brings us to the end of the Board's questions.

Is there any other participants that

[^3]wishes to ask any questions of the Agency's proposed testimony?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: I'm not seeing or hearing any, do we have today in this Webex feed anyone who did not prefile testimony, but who wishes to offer testimony today?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Again, I'm not seeing or hearing any indication that anyone did not prefile wishes to testify today.

Do we have anyone who wishes to offer a public comment on the Agency's proposal or on its testimony here today that has not yet done so?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: I can take a moment to make sure people are unmuting themselves who appear to not be responding.

There's no indication that anyone on this call is wishing to offer a public comment. What I would like to do somewhat abruptly is take a moment, as I mentioned, to address the issue of an economic impact statement.

Section 27B of the Environmental

Protection Act provides that the Board must request that the Department of Commerce and Economic, Opportunity known as DCEO, conduct an economic impact study of proposed rules before the Board adopts the rules.

The Board must make either the study or the Department's explanation for not conducting one available to the public at least 20 days before a public hearing.

In a letter dated October 15th, 2020, the Board's Chair, Barbara Flynn Currie, requested the DCEO conduct an economic impact study of this specific proposal and requested a response no later than November 30th of 2020.

Today, the Board has not received a response to that request. While I intend also to address this at the second hearing, is there anyone present today who would like to testify or comment regarding either the Board's request for a study and/or DCEO's response?
(No response.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Not seeing or hearing any indication to that effect, Madam Court Reporter, I think we've reached the point where we can go off
very briefly to address procedural issues.
If we may go off the record just for a moment.
(Discussion off the record.)
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Madam Court Reporter, you may rejoin us and resume the transcript, please.

I do want the record to reflect that the Board briefly went off the record with the participants to discuss procedural issues relating to deadlines, and we are now back on the record.

I do want to stress that copies of the transcript of today's hearing are expected to be available no later than December 17th of 2020, one week from today, of course.

When the Board receives that transcript, it will post it to the Clerk's Office online or COOL (Phonetic) from which it could be viewed, printed and downloaded immediately.

The second hearing in this proceeding is scheduled on Thursday, January 7th, 2021, at 9:00 a.m., by video conference between the Board's Chicago and Springfield offices, with additional participation through Webex.

I do want to note for the participants
that January 7th is a day on which the Board has scheduled a regular Public Board Meeting at 11:00 a.m. on that date. That, if necessary, we will recess the hearing so that the Board could conduct that meeting and resume very soon after the meeting had concluded.

The deadline to prefile testimony for the second hearing is December 30th, 2020. The Board video conference hearing is on January 7th.

The Board rules require that any document to be offered as a hearing exhibit must be received by the Board's clerk at least 24 hours before the Board is scheduled at the start of the hearing at 9:00 a.m. on January 7th.

If it is not filed by that deadline, the exhibit may, nonetheless, be filed as a public comment after the hearing adjourns.

At the conclusion of the second hearing, the Board adjourns, we will set a deadline for any post-hearing comments. We want to ensure to the participants that that opportunity remains open. It seems premature to set a deadline at this point.

Are there any other matters that we need to address at this time, before we adjourn the first

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

hearing?
Mr. Metoesian, on behalf the Agency, are you prepared to adjourn this hearing on the IEPA proposal.

MR. METOESIAN: Yes, I am, sir.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. I do want, Madam Court Reporter, if you would help me correct an oversight.

I do see that we were joined on this joined by Board Member Jennifer Van Wie name, spelled capital $V-a-n$, space, $W$-i-e. I would like the record to reflect she joined us and the oversight is entirely mine.

Anything further before we do officially adjourn? (No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: I am not seeing or hearing anything at all. This hearing is adjourned, and I appreciate the participation of all. Mr. Davis, particularly your questions are helpful for the Board. Thank you, and we will see you again on January 7th in the new year.
(WHICH WERE ALL THE PROCEEDINGS HAD.)
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