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HEARING OFFICER FOX: Good morning everyone, and welcome to this Illinois Pollution Control board hearing. My name is Tim Fox, and Mark Kaminski and I are the assigned hearing officers for this rulemaking proceeding entitled, Amendments to 35 Illinois Administrative Code, Subtitle C, as in Charlie, Water Pollution. The board docket number for this rulemaking is R18-23.

I am the only representative of the Board present here in the Springfield office. I do want the record to reflect that present there in the Chicago office are Board Members Cynthia Santos and Jennifer Van Wie who are jointly assigned to this rulemaking.

Member Van Wie and Santos, are there any other representatives of the Board present in Chicago this morning?

MS. SANTOS: Not at this moment right now.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Okay. Thanks very much.
This hearing -- jumping on to the procedural background, this hearing is governed by the Board's procedural rules so that all information that is relevant and is not repetitious or privileged will be admitted into the record.

The Board published notice of this hearing on November 10, 2021, in both the Chicago Sun Times and the Springfield Journal Register.

Please keep in mind that any questions posed today by the Board or its staff are intended solely to help develop a clear and complete record for the Board's decision and do not reflect any decision on the proposal, the testimony or questions.

For the sake of our court reporter in Chicago, please speak clearly and avoid speaking at the same time as another person so that we can produce a clear transcript.

On January 10 of 2018, the IEPA filed a rulemaking proposal under the governor's Executive Order 16-13. That order directed state agencies to review regulations and determine those that are either outdated, repetitive, confusing, unnecessary or harmful to the state's economy, and the order directed agencies to amend or repeal those regulations as necessary.

IEPA proposed numerous changes to Subtitle C, and at that time the Board had begun its own review of this rule. On March 22 of 2018,
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the Board opened this docket specifically to address the water pollution regulations.

On November 4 of 2021, the Board proposed -- adopted a proposal for public comment which requested comment both generally and on 41 specific matters. We are today of course holding the first hearing of this rulemaking.

On November 4 of 2021, the hearing officers directed participants intending to testify at this hearing to pre-file their testimony by December 30 of 2021.

On December 30, the Board did receive IEPA's responses to the Board's requests for comments; but IEPA did not identify a witness, and no other participant pre-filed testimony or comment by that deadline.

I do want to note for this video hearing and any other, a document to be offered as a hearing exhibit must have been received by the Board's clerk at least 24 hours before the scheduled start of the hearing. The Board also did not receive any exhibits before that deadine. I do want to express that the rules specifically allow any document that is not allowed as a hearing
exhibit can be filed later as a public comment. Also, I want to stress that we have a second hearing scheduled in four weeks on Thursday, February 3.

At this point I'd like to ask,
Miss Terranova and Miss Brown, may I impose upon you to identify the participants for the record before we get under way.

MS. TERRANOVA: I'm Sarah Terranova, $T-e-r-r-a-n-o-v-a$, attorney with Illinois EPA. And also here from the Division of Legal Counsel -I'll let you introduce yourself.

MR. KONDELIS: Nick Kondelis, K-o-n-d-e-l-i-s, attorney for Illinois EPA.

MS. TERRANOVA: And then technical staff we have Darin LeCrone, Scott Twait and Yetunde, and I don't know your last name, but I'm gonna let each of you go through and introduce yourself and spell your last name.

MR. LECRONE: Darin LeCrone D-a-r-i-n, L-e-C-r-o-n-e, I'm the manager of the Permit Section.

MR. TWAIT: Scott Twait, T-w-a-i-t, and I'm the manager of the Water Quality Standards Section.
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MS. AGVESOLA: Yetunde Agvesola, Y-e-t-u-n-d-e, A-g-v-e-s-o-l-a.

MS. TERRANOVA: What's your title?
MS. AGVESOLA: I'm an environmental protection specialist with the Water Pollution Department.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Miss Terranova, thank you very much.

Miss Brown?
MS. BROWN: I'm Melissa Brown, M-e-l-i-s-s-a, B-r-o-w-n, I'm outside counsel for the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group, also IERG, I-E-R-G.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you, Miss Brown.
I want to step next to the order of our proposed order for our hearing. We can begin by identifying any person who wishes to offer a public comment. There is a sign-in sheet both here in Springfield and in Chicago on which persons can indicate that they would like to offer a comment. I can see that the sheet in Springfield is blank.

Member Van Wie, Member Santos, are you aware that there's anyone there who wishes to comment?

MS. SANTOS: No.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Not at this point, very
good.
At that point we then turn to pre-filed testimony. As I mentioned, we did not receive any. However, the agency has made available a witness or witnesses to respond to questions. And I do have at least a single question for the Board, and I believe Miss Brown has questions on behalf of IERG. We can turn to those.

Next we can determine whether there is anyone who did not pre-file testimony but does wish to testify here today. That would be allowed under the Board's rules. We can then determine once again whether there's anyone who wishes to offer public comment. Any questions about the order of our proceeding? It's a fairly simple one.

I believe Miss Terranova, we're prepared at this point to have the court reporter swear in Mr. LeCrone. Would it perhaps be wise to swear in each of the three agency witnesses so they're prepared to respond?

MS. TERRANOVA: It depends on the Board's question, but $I$ would say at least Darin and then at least either Scott or Yetunde. So, please, one of the two based on your reference. Actually, all
of them.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. It's the agency's sense that it is efficient to swear in the three witnesses so that they're available to respond to questions.

If the court reporter would swear in those three.
(WHEREUPON, the witness was
duly sworn.)

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Miss Brown, I believe we reached the point where we can turn to you and the questions you apparently have.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.
MS. BROWN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. LeCrone. My name is Melissa Brown, Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group, I just have a few questions for you today.

As it was stated I believe in the Board -one of the Board's most recent orders that the proposed revisions here are, excuse me, nonsubstantive cleanup revisions. Was it the agency's intent for these proposed revisions to be nonsubstantive cleanup revisions?
A. Yes. The intent was for them to be
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nonsubstantive language and cleanup only.
Q. Okay. And are these proposed revisions subject to US EPA review and approval?
A. I'm not a hundred percent certain. Some will be, I believe. The ones -- the portions that deal with US EPA delegated programs I'm sure we'll have to send to them, but all of them probably will not require US EPA approval.
Q. Do you have a sense about, you know, how -- roughly an estimate of how much of the proposed revisions would be subject to review or approval?
A. Assuming the Part 302 is water quality standards and any portion of 309 that would deal with the NPS program, maybe the portions that deal with pretreatment language. Even though we're not a delegated pretreatment authority, they may still want to the review and approval those sections as well. Part 303 will also need US EPA approval.
Q. Have the proposed revisions been submitted to US EPA at this point for any formal pre-review process?
A. I don't know about formal pre-review, but we have a copy of the US EPA on the proposed
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changes as an informal review to see if they've got any concerns. And we have not heard back from them.
Q. Thank you. That was my next question. So then just to clarify, you have not heard that back yet from US EPA, and you have not heard any concerns as of yet as to the proposed revisions from US EPA?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. So then right now there's -the proposed revisions have been sent to US EPA, and then is it -- to confirm your understanding that once these proposed revisions are adopted by the Board, that they will, at least portions of them that you've listed, will be submitted to US EPA for a formal review and approval process?
A. I believe that's correct, yes.
Q. And are you aware of generally the time frames for that formal review and approval process generally?
A. I think that once we submit them to them formally, $I$ think they have -- is it 60 days to approve and 90 days to disapprove?
Q. Okay.

MS. TERRANOVA: I have to look that up for sure.

MS. BROWN: That's fine. Thank you. BY MS. BROWN:
Q. And then so with -- I guess taking both together both informal review that's occurring right now by US EPA as well as the formal review that will occur after the Board adopts these proposed revisions, is it your or the agency's understanding that US EPA can comment and express any thoughts or concerns they have with the provisions and the regulations as a whole, not just the minor nonsubstantive comments that the agency is proposing?
A. I don't know the answer to that, but I -yeah, $I$ just don't know.
Q. Okay. And just to rephrase, also to make it more general is, $I$ guess getting to the question of is it possible that US EPA's review, both the informal process and the formal process, can be broader than just the proposed revisions, the minor, nonsubstantive proposed revisions that are the subject of this rulemaking?
A. I would hope that they wouldn't comment on
things that aren't related to this rulemaking, and I suppose they could if they chose to. But it's why we try to send this stuff to them ahead of time, give them a heads up of what the intent is in order to streamline that review and hopefully keep it limited to the issues that are at hand with this ruling.
Q. Last question just to confirm again and wrap it up, you have not heard any concerns at this point from US EPA?
A. No. I have not.

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

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you, Miss Brown.
As I mentioned to Miss Terranova, the Board does have one question that it wishes to raise, and I can phrase it this way for the agency.

Of the Board's questions in its November 4 order, Number 34, as a result of your hearing officer's error, inadvertently asks about a Subsection B that does not exist. We appreciate the agency's efforts to answer that question. Our only request is that since it was not as clear as it might have been, we would just request that the

[^0]agency look at the response that it submitted to us on December 30 and see whether they wish to revise their answer or propose a different cross-reference in that answer.

Any questions about that, Miss Terranova? MS. TERRANOVA: No.

HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. And that was something the agency can prepare either for the second hearing on February 3 or for post-hearing comments that would become due at a deadline we'll set at that second hearing, that would be perfectly fine.

MS. TERRANOVA: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Did either Member Van Wie or member Santos have any questions for the agency's witnesses?

MS. SANTOS: No.
MS. VAN WIE: No.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Was there anyone else there in Chicago that might wish to ask a question or at this point can we move on?

MS. SANTOS: Move on.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: Excellent.
I'm assuming, Miss Brown, you wrapped up
your questions? She indicates that she has.
I do want to confirm also just as a matter of business, is there anyone who did not pre-file testimony that does wish to testify here at this hearing today?

I see no indication here in Springfield that anyone falls into that category.

MS. SANTOS: None here in Chicago.
HEARING OFFICER FOX: I thought I saw you shaking your head, Member Santos, and we can move on at this point.

To clarify once again, anyone who -- is there anyone who wishes to offer a public comment?

I'm not seeing or hearing anyone here in Springfield.

Member Van Wie, I see you shaking your head that there is not anyone there either.

I think we reached a point at which we can move on to the issue of economic impact study. Section 27B of the Environmental Protection Act provides that the Board must request that the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, or DCEO, conduct an economic impact study of the proposed rules before the Board adopts them. The

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

In a letter dated October 26 of 2021, the Board's chair, Barbara Flynn Currie, requested that DCEO conduct an economic impact study of this proposal, and the Board requested specifically a response no later December 10 of 2021.

On November 17 of 2021, the Board received a response from the acting director of DCEO which respectfully declined the request to perform a study.

Is there anyone who would like to testify or comment either on the Board's request or DCEO's response?

I'm not seeing anyone who wishes to do so here. I see Member Santos indicating that there's not anyone in Chicago.

Let me turn to a couple of procedural issues before which $I$ think we can adjourn quite quickly. There is a second hearing in this docket scheduled for Thursday, February 3 of 2022, at 10:00 a.m. by video conference just as this hearing
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is between the Board in Chicago and Springfield offices. The deadline to pre-file testimony in the original order is February, I'm sorry, January 27 of 2022, seven days before the scheduled hearing. For that video hearing, any document, I want to stress, that any participant wishes to introduce as an exhibit must be received by the Board's clerk at least 24 hours before the scheduled start of the hearing, and that of course may be submitted electronically through the clerk's office online.

Our court reporter indicates the transcript of today's hearing are expected to be available no later than Friday, January 14 of 2022. When the Board receives that, they will be posted right away to the clerk's office online where it can be viewed and printed.

Are there any matters that need to be addressed at this time before we adjourn this hearing?

I'm not seeing any indication here in Springfield. It sounds like there is no indication either in Chicago.

I thank everyone for their participation
which is appreciated. We can adjourn, and thanks again to all of you.
(WHEREUPON, the hearing was
adjourned at 10:20 a.m.)
which is appreciated. We can adjourn, and thanks
again to all of you.
(WHEREUPON, the hearing was
adjourned at $10: 20$ a.m.)
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| thoughts 13:11 three $9 \cdot 19$ 10:4.7 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { way } 7: 814: 17 \\ \text { we'll } 11: 615: 10 \end{array}$ | 19276 2.11 |  |
|  | we'll 11:6 15:10 | 2 |  |
| Thursday 7:3 | we're 9:16 11:16 weeks 7.3 | $2017: 3$ |  |
| 17:23 | weeks 7:3 <br> welcome 4:2 | 2018 5:14,24 |  |
| Tim 4:3 | West 1:13 | 2021 5:2 6:3,8,11 |  |
| time 5:12,23 | Wie 2:5 4:13,15 | 17:5,9,10 2022 1.1417 .23 |  |
| $12: 18$ 14:4$18: 19$ | $8: 20 \text { 15:14,18 }$ | 2022 1:14 17:23 |  |
|  | $16: 16$ | 18:4,14 |  |
| Times 5:2 | wise 9:18 | 217 2:13,21 |  |
| TIMOTHY 1:12 | wise 9:18 <br> wish 9:10 15:2,20 | 22 5:24 |  |
| 2:3 | wish 9:10 15:2,20 16:4 | 24 6:20 18:8 |  |
| title 8:3 | 16:4 <br> wishes $8 \cdot 15,21$ | $2617: 5$ |  |
| today 5:5 6:6 9:11 | $9: 1314: 16$ | 27 18:3 |  |
| 10:17 16:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 1314: 16 \\ & \text { 16:13 17:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 27B 16:20 |  |
| today's 18:13 transcript 5:13 | $18: 6$ | 3 |  |
| transcript 5.13 | witness 6:14 9:4 | 37:4 15:9 17:23 |  |
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