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MS. BUGEL: Yes. I am Faith Bugel here on behalf of the Sierra Club, and with me is Mr. Abel Russ with Environmental Integrity Project representing Prairie Rivers Network.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. Ms. Nijman and Ms. Gale?

MS. GALE: Yes. Kristen Gale here with Jennifer Nijman and Drew Nishioka on behalf of Midwest Generation, LLC.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.

Do we have any housekeeping matters before we proceed?

[^0]

[^1]that is how we handled it, and I don't know how it will work to upload the volume of exhibits we have, so --

MS. GALE: I mean, if I might
suggest, maybe we jointly contact the Clerk, since he handles that and see what he thinks?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah, if
you could.
MS. GALE: Yeah.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Because
he's the guy who does all the work on that, Don Brown.

MS. GALE: Yeah.
MS. BUGEL: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I don't see where it would be a problem, but, you know, who knows.

MS. BUGEL: Okay, yeah.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I don't
know. Thank you for bringing that to my attention. I know there is a lot of stuff.

Anything else?
MS. GALE: Two things.
One, Mr. Hearing Officer, our
original order of witnesses was Mr. Gnat, and then Ms. Sharene Shealey and then our experts.

Ms. Sharene Shealey woke up this morning very ill, and she is hopeful she will be able to make it, but we need to -- we may have to start with Mr. Gnat, finish him, and then we may have to move on with the -- our groundwater experts, simply because $I$ can tell you, from what she tells me, we don't want her here right now.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: That's unfortunate.

MS. GALE: Yeah.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
That -- that will be fine.
MS. GALE: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: That will
be fine. And I think you have one more thing, Ms. Gale?

MS. GALE: I do. Thank you, sir.
At the end of the last week, I
went through pictures that are in Exhibit 1513 with Mr. Gnat. I -- the Complainants requested, and I agreed, to modify the pictures, because the bates numbers were within the colored part and

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

move the Bates numbers to the bottom.
I unfortunately also misread my
own notes when $I$ read in the Bates numbers from my notes, and so I just want to correct for the record that on -- in the transcript of that day, which is May 19th, on page 209, line 3, I identified the photo as -- incorrectly identified the photo as 108351. The correct Bates number for that photo is 108350. The next photo on the same page, transcript page 209, line 21, I incorrectly identified the photo as 108350. The correct Bates is 108352 .

On page 2 -- excuse me. On
transcript page 210, line 12, I incorrectly stated the Bates number as 108352. The correct Bates number is 108375. And finally, on transcript page 210, line 20, incorrect Bates number was 108375. The correct number is 108386 .

We have provided the pages to Complainants' counsel, Mr. Hearing Officer, and Ms. Hutchins -- it's not Hutchins. Your name is not Hutchins. Horton. Thank you.

And so we are asking that just simply take out the photos that were in Gnat
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Binder No. 2, and replace them with the photos that have the Bates numbers legible on the bottom.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Ms. Bugel?
MS. BUGEL: No objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Great.
The record will so reflect. Thank you so much.
Anything else?
MS. GALE: Nothing from us.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
right. I think Mr. Gnat is up here. He is in the middle of Ms. Gale's direct. If you could raise your right hand, Mr. Gnat?

THE WITNESS: Good morning.
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank
you, Mr. Gnat.
Ms. Gale, you are up.

WHEREUPON:

$$
R I C H A R D \quad G N A T
$$

called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:

D I R E C T EXAMINATION (Cont).
by Ms. Gale
Q. Thank you.

Good morning, Mr. Gnat.
A. Good morning.
Q. I just went through discussing the photos we -- that we discussed of the northeast area at Joliet 29.

Do you recall that discussion?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And that -- you took those photos on
one of your inspections of the northeast area, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And when did you start those inspections, about?
A. Somewhere in 2009, or so.
Q. And when you first started the inspections in 2009, did you see ash in those inspections?
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A. Yeah. There were some areas that had some bare ground and some rural development that I identified, and within that I saw soil, and I saw some evidence of the ash or cinders within that in the -- with the soil itself.
Q. And then other than what you identified in your report of ash mixed in with the soil itself, have you ever seen ash anywhere else?
A. No, I have not, outside of the areas that we identified over our inspections and then repaired, correct.
Q. And we covered this just a couple weeks ago, but -- well, obviously you have been to Joliet 29 Station, right?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And can you just describe the surrounding area of Joliet 29 Station, please?
A. Sure. The -- to the -- to the south is the Des Plaines River and the intake channel for the plant. To the east is the Brandon Lock and Dam. To the north is Channahon Road followed by various small commercial, light industrial type activity, and then to the west is a former industrial area, which has now been redeveloped.

[^2]Q. And it's redeveloped. Do you know sort of about the redevelopment, where it's at?
A. I believe that's still industrial use. I don't know if it's a trucking terminal or not, but it's certainly still industrial use.
Q. And you mentioned the Brandon Road Lock and Dam. What is that?
A. The lock and dam is -- the dam itself is not a hydroelectric dam or anything. I believe it's a structure that was put in place along with other lock and dams for flood control, and it also allows for barges and boats to move through -- through the Des Plaines River area there.
Q. And so when you do your inspections or you're at Joliet 29 Station, do you see boats and barges on the river?
A. Yes, on a regular basis.
Q. Okay. I want to go back and talk about your testimony in May about the northwest area at Joliet 29, and I believe you stated you did the sampling there to determine whether it was coal combustion byproduct; is that right?
A. Correct.
\[
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[^3]

[^4]permit -- excuse me.
The operating application had
documents from other consultants, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And so your estimate of hundreds of hours doesn't include their work?
A. That's correct, yes.

MS. BUGEL: I'm going to object to the leading nature of the questions.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Sustained.
BY MS. GALE:
Q. And you mentioned the construction permit application. How big was that -- the Joliet 29 construction permit application?
A. The same. Hundreds of pages, and I believe the three-inch type binder, if not larger. Yeah, three-inch binder.
Q. And just so we make the record clear, approximately how many hours did it take KPRG to collect the Joliet 29 construction permit application?
A. You know, into the upper hundreds of hours.
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Q. All right. I'm going to move on to Powerton, and if you could open to your Gnat Book 3, please.

Ready, Mr. Gnat?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Turning to the first tab, this is the maps from Exhibit 1307. Can you describe what those map -- that map is, please?
A. Sure. The first map is a
groundwater contour for the silt and clay layer unit for November 21st, and the second one is for the gravely silt -- I'm sorry -- the gravely sand unit for November 2021.
Q. Okay. You said the first map is for the silty clay unit. What is -- what is that?
A. Well, when we go through the boring logs, there is a discontinuous unit that underlies the Ash Surge Basin, the Service Water Basin, Metals Cleaning Basin, that general area.

There is a silty clay layer that underline -- underlies it that is not present a little bit further to the east. It was not present further to the north.
So it's not under, for example,
the Former Ash Basin. So that unit sits above those -- those basins, and basically water, even though it's hydraulically connected to the sand and gravel underneath it, it doesn't allow water to percolate down quite as fast, and so the water levels are a little bit higher in that unit.
Q. And I think you misspoke. You said that unit sits above the basins. The unit sits --
A. Below the basins, correct.
Q. Thank you.

And so for the silty clay unit, which direction is the groundwater?
A. Groundwater is flowing to the west.
Q. And so for the sand unit, which direction is groundwater?
A. Groundwater flows in a northerly direction.
Q. And to clarify, what -- was one unit on top of the other?
A. Correct. And they are hydraulically connected. So there's no -- if you drill through the silty clay layer, it's -- you encounter the water table and the silty clay layer, and when you get down to the base of it and into the sand and

[^5]gravel, it's still saturated. There is no break or unsaturated material between them.
Q. And how do you know, or how would -how -- well, $I$ will say it this way.

How did -- was it discovered that the silt clay unit existed and the sand unit existed?
A. Based on boring log interpretations.
Q. And can you describe what's
happening? You say they are hydrologically connected. What does that mean?
A. That, like I said, the -- once you encounter the saturated zone within the silty clay layer, when you get through the base of the silty clay layer into the underlying sands, it's still saturated.

So there's no indication that this is a perched water zone or anything. It's just in an area -- since it's a silty clay area, it's just not letting the water percolate down through quite as fast as if you go to the west where you don't have that layer, rain falls down, and it's more of a sandy unit, and it percolates down much, much quicker.
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Q. And KPRG has submitted -- well, how long has KPRG submitted the groundwater reports to the Illinois EPA for the Powerton station?
A. I believe we started doing those in 2012. Yeah, 2012/2013 timeframe.
Q. And are these maps in those reports?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. And has Illinois EPA ever disputed the -- your interpretation here of the two units?
A. No, they have not.
Q. And you said from 2012. So -- and so since 2012, you've reviewed the groundwater levels?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay. And, to your knowledge, do you recall that the Ash Surge Basin was re-lined?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Do you recall when?
A. I believe somewhere in the 2012
timeframe.
Q. 2013?
A. 2013, correct.
Q. And in your review of the
groundwater elevations from 2012 to present, have
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## you seen the groundwater levels drop?

A. Well, the groundwater levels
fluctuate up and down, depending on the season, obviously, and precipitation and so on, but what we did not see is as the ash basin was pumped out and basically dewatered for the construction purposes, we didn't see an effect on water levels around the basin.

So one would -- one would
interpret that -- if the basin was leaking and they dewatered it for an extended period of time for re-lining, you would see water levels drop, because you have dewatered the basin. We did not see that. And then conversely, when -- once the liner was placed back in and water placed back into the -- you know, the Ash Surge Basin comes back online for slurry and ash. You know, again, if that basin was compromised for some reason, it's a brand new liner, but you would expect then if, in fact, that was associated with the basin leaking, you could see water levels come up again.

And we didn't. We just saw
standard, normal fluctuations in groundwater over that entire construction time.

[^6]Q. So if you see standard fluctuations in groundwater, what does that mean to you?
A. That the water levels that we are seeing, those slightly higher water levels within the clay, they are, in fact, the result of that this is a slightly less permeable material. So it's holding up the groundwater. It's not -- not peculating down quite as fast, but certainly not as a result of adding head from water in the basin.
Q. And we discussed this in May related to Joliet 29, but to revisit it for Powerton, in 2010, how was the -- what constituents was the groundwater sampled for?
A. In 2010, that was for the dissolved metals and inorganics that were identified by Illinois EPA under their request to do the voluntary hydrogeologic investigation and groundwater sampling.
Q. And then -- and at Powerton, did you also assist in the requirements for the Powerton compliance commitment agreement?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. What did you do?

[^7]```
A. I assisted in pulling together the information to establish the groundwater management zone that was agreed upon between Midwest Generation and Illinois EPA, as well as, I believe, an ELUC for the property, environmental land use control, ELUC, E-L-U-C.
```

Q. And, to your knowledge, the
groundwater -- is the groundwater management zone
still in effect?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. Same question for the ELUC, the E-L-U-C. Is the ELUC still in effect?
A. Yes, that's -- that actually sits right on the deed.
Q. And then in -- again, similar to Joliet 29, in 2015 at Powerton related to sampling of the groundwater, what happened?
A. In 2015, the federal CCR rules came into -- into play, and under that program, the requirement was for total inorganics. So you no longer filter it in the field. It's just a total metals analysis, and the list of parameters, slightly different.
Q. I want to turn to the service water
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```
basin at Powerton.
```

Recently, did KPRG conduct an investigation of the contents of that pond?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was that investigation?
A. They did -- we did a bathymetric survey for that, as well as some sampling of the sediment within the basin and analyzed it for physical parameters to evaluate whether or not it might, in fact, have some component of ash to it or not.
Q. And what were -- what was the conclusion of the investigation?
A. Based on a bathymetric survey and on the sampling, the nature of the materials of the sediments accumulating -- first off, there wasn't very much accumulating, and the nature of it was not ash-like, so to speak, and my understanding is that the Illinois EPA agreed with that conclusion.
Q. Now, I want to turn to the East Yard Runoff Basin. Are you familiar with that basin?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. That is a located to the south and
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slightly west of the Ash Surge Basin and the Ash Bypass Basin, and my understanding is that is primarily surface runoff, a stormwater runoff retention pond.
Q. And under the CCAs, did you assist in the complying with the CCAs related to the East Yard Runoff Basin?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. What did you do?
A. I believe under the CCA we had to sample it for eight or nine rounds of sampling and analyze it for parameters specified, and we did that and submitted that to the Agency.
Q. And by sampling, what did you sample?
A. The water. The water -- I don't remember if it was the intake or the outfall from the East Yard Basin.
Q. Can you turn to the next exhibit in your book marked for identification as 1514?
A. Yes.
(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit No. 1514 was marked for identification.)

[^8]BY MS. GALE:
Q. And it start at Bates

No. MWG13-15_48711. What is this document?
A. This is the Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Report for Powerton Generating Station dated April 24th, 2015.
Q. And did KPRG assist in preparing this document?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Can you turn to Table 3, which is located at 13-15_48742?
A. Okay.
Q. And what is Table 3?
A. Table 3 is a summary of the analytical data for the sampling of the East Yard Runoff Basin, and nine rounds of sampling from February 2013 through February 2015 on a quarterly basis.
Q. And what did the -- excuse me. What do the samples show?
A. The samples to us indicated that the water in the East Yard Runoff Basin is, in fact, stormwater runoff. It is not water that one would encounter in an ash pond.
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[^9]mentioned, for total inorganic, total metals as specified in the rule, and so those are not field filtered, whereas when we collect the CCA samples from the same wells at the same time, for those analyses we field filter them prior to placing them into the acid preserved jars.
Q. And under the federal program, you collect that groundwater information. Do you also prepare reports based upon that?
A. Yes, we do.
Q. And under the Illinois CCR program at Powerton, generally speaking, what does KPRG do?
A. The same thing. The state rule is a little different from the federal rule, in that they don't recognize detection monitoring versus assessment monitoring. The Illinois EPA just requires the full -- what would be considered the Appendix III, Appendix IV parameters of the federal rule. They just consider that one -- one list of analyses, and those are required on a quarterly basis, plus turbidity, which is not required under the federal rule.
Q. And what kind of reports do you
prepare under the Illinois CCR rule?
A. We prepare -- under the state CCR rule, within 60 days of your last day of sampling, you have to provide a summary of the data, and so we refer to those as our 60-day reports, and so we provide those, as well as then an annual groundwater monitoring and corrective action report as required under the rule.
Q. And for the Powerton Station, did KPRG prepare any permit applications?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. So what permit -- so what permit applications did you prepare for Powerton Station?
A. We prepared the operating permit for the Ash Bypass Basin and Ash Surge Basin, the initial application for the initial operating permit for the Former Ash Basin, as well as now under the state rule, the Metals Cleaning Basin is also involved, and we prepared the operating permit for that and construction permit for that as well.
Q. So for the operating permit
application for the Ash Surge Basin, Bypass Basin, and Former Ash Basin, did you act as a
\[
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clearinghouse similar to your description of Joliet 29?
A. That is correct, yes.

MS. BUGEL: Objection, leading
questions.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Sustained. Could you rephrase? Thank you. BY MS. GALE:
Q. Sure. For the operating permit applications for the Ash Surge Basin, Bypass Basin, and Former Ash Basin, how did -- what was KPRG's role?
A. KPRG's role was kind of like a hub or a clearinghouse where we would -- for the sections that other consultants were involved with, for example, structural integrity and so on, all of that would be -- being submitted through us, and we would be bringing the whole application together, and then there were sections of that application that KPRG generated as well.

So we were somewhat as the clearinghouse for it, and bringing the whole permit together for submittal.
Q. And for the operating permit
application for the Ash Surge Basin, Bypass Basin, and Former Ash Basin, how big was the application?
A. Again, those are -- each of those applications are three-inch binders with hundreds of pages, literally.
Q. And for KPRG alone, how -approximately how many hours did KPRG spend preparing the operating permit application for the Ash Surge Basin, Bypass Basin, and Former Ash Basin?
A. You know, certainly between the applications there is some same or similar material that goes in on historic background and so on, but then each one has its own specific items. So each permit application is literally into the hundreds or upper hundreds of hours for KPRG work alone.
Q. And then you mentioned the Metal Cleaning Basin operating permit application. Why did you treat that
differently?
A. The Metals Cleaning Basin was not part of the federal rule, and so once it was identified that that was going to be brought in
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under the state rule requirements, we had to install a couple of additional monitoring wells to bring that up to -- to bring the monitoring system up to the state rule requirements.

And with the installation of
those wells, we basically had to start our background groundwater sampling from scratch, because for the other wells, we have already had some sampling under the federal rule. So, you know, when the state rule kicked in, we already had -- for a lot of the wells for the other basins, we had eight rounds of background, and so on. For the Metals Cleaning Basin, we had to start from scratch on that.
Q. And what was -- and was that in addition to your role -- well, let me put it this way.

What was your role in preparing the operating permit application for the Metal Cleaning Basin?
A. Well, it was just -- well, from the get-go was to install the additional monitoring wells and do the eight rounds of background sampling, calculation of all the statistics
associated with that, and then the same role as we played for the other ones where we were somewhat the hub and clearinghouse for all the other information that's being prepared by other specialty consultants to feed into that one permit application and then pulling the whole application together.
Q. And then to prepare the Metal Cleaning Basin operating permit application, approximately how many hours just for KPRG to prepare the application, including installing the new wells and the eight rounds of sampling?
A. Right. Once -- once you start adding that in, certainly into the upper hundreds of hours, if not even tipping a thousand.
Q. Did KPRG assist in preparing a construction permit application at the Powerton Station?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Which one?
A. The construction permit application for the Ash Bypass Basin and Ash Surge Basin, and the construction application for the Former Ash Basin, as well as then the separate one for the

[^10]Metals Cleaning Basin, each one of those three sets is an individual submittal.
Q. And what was KPRG's role in preparing those permit applications?
A. The same, as kind of a hub and central clearinghouse on it.
Q. And for the construction permit applications for the Powerton basins, approximately how big -- pages. How many pages was each application?
A. Hundreds of pages.
Q. And again, approximately how many hours did KPRG spend preparing those applications?
A. Hundreds of hours.
Q. Mr. Gnat, have you visited the

Powerton Station?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And have you observed the Service Water Basin?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay. I want you to turn to the next tab in your book, Exhibit -- Gnat Book G. This is an excerpt of Exhibit 710 that was previously admitted in the first hearing. It's

[^11]these sheets, and it starts at MWG13-15_34260.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Mr. Gnat -- and I actually want you to turn to Sheet No. C021, which is hard to read, and I actually have the larger size here if you need it, but that's on Bates

No . MWG13-15_34265.
A. Yes.
Q. What is depicted in Sheet No. C021?
A. This is -- it looks like the construction drawings by Natural Resources Technologies, which was the consulting firm that did this work and the design work, and this in particular is a set of east/west and north/south cross sections through the -- designed cross sections through the Ash Surge -- I'm sorry -through the Service Water Basin.
Q. And I'm sorry. Just -- did you say it shows the elevations as well?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. And the elevations in these cross sections, what did -- what does that mean?
A. The elevations are relative to mean sea level. So those are surveyed by an Illinois
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licensed surveyor, and it's all surveyed towards a benchmark that's established on the property that's, I believe, relative to -- it's called NGVD; so National Geodetic Vertical Datum, I believe.
Q. So looking at Sheet No. C021, what is the elevation of the base of the interior of the Service Water Basin?
A. It looks like approximately 440, 441 -- 441 elevation relative to mean sea level.
Q. And at this -- looking at the same sheet, approximately what is the elevation of the top of the Service Water Basin?
A. The top ranges anywhere from about 459 to -- about 459 to 460 feet above mean sea level.
Q. And we are going to put on the screen the Board's 2019 opinion, page 39. On page 39, I believe, last paragraph, the Board states, "In addition, Midwest Gen employees recalled ash ponds and historical ash flooded on several occasions with water rising 30 feet above the bottom of the Secondary Ash Settling Basin and Illinois River flowing in and out of the Former
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Ash Basin."
Now, first of all, Mr. Gnat, is -- to your knowledge, what is the Secondary Ash Settling Basin?
A. I believe that's the same as the Service Water Basin.
Q. And so knowing that the base of the Service Water Basin is at 441, how high would the river have to be to be 30 feet above the base of the Service Water Basin?

MS. BUGEL: Hearing Officer, I'm going to object here to this is beyond the scope of our -- our case that we put on.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You are going to have to speak up, Ms. Bugel.

MS. BUGEL: I'm sorry. I'm going to have to object to this being beyond the scope of Complainants' case. We did not get into flooding.

MS. GALE: This is --
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We did
not get into what?
MS. BUGEL: Flooding.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. Gale?
MS. GALE: Well, this is Midwest
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Generation's direct. So I -- I don't understand the objection.

MS. BUGEL: Their case in -- needs to be in response to our case. It can't go beyond the scope of our case.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I will
let it in. You know, the Board can disregard if they so choose, and, you know, I'm not sure where it belongs, but you may proceed, Ms. Gale. Overruled. BY MS. GALE:
Q. I'm sorry, Mr. Gnat. I didn't hear the answer to your last question.

So, knowing that the base of the
Service Water Basin is at 441, how high would the river have to be to be 30 feet above the base of the Service Water Basin?
A. Four hundred seventy-one feet.
Q. Mr. Gnat, are you familiar with river gauges in the Illinois River?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And what are river gauges?
A. There are gauges in various parts of the US river system that are set up by the US

[^12]Geologic Survey, and they are for the purpose of recording what the stage of the river is at a particular time.
Q. I'll read 2022 Stipulation No. 10, "The NOAA National Weather Service river gauge located at the Peoria Lock and Dam is the closest river gauge upstream of the Powerton Station."
(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit
No. 1515 was marked for
identification.)
BY MS. GALE:
Q. Mr. Gnat, I would like you to turn to the next tab in your book --
A. Okay.
Q. -- which has been marked for identification purposes as 15 -- Midwest Gen Exhibit 1515, Bates No. MWG13-15_124544.

Mr. Gnat, what is Exhibit 1515?
A. This is the gauging data from the Illinois River at the Peoria Lock and Dam, which is the nearest upstream gauging station established.
Q. And looking at the bottom of that page, do you see it says historical crests?
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|  | Page 41 |
| :---: | :---: |
| A. Yes. |  |
| Q. What is the highest crest that was |  |
| recorded at the Peoria Lock and Dam? |  |
| A. That was 456.57 feet on April 24 th |  |
| of 2013. |  |
| Q. Okay. And, Mr. Gnat, I would like |  |
| you to turn to the next tab. It reads |  |
| stipulation -- excuse me. 2022, Stipulation |  |
| No. 11, "The NOAA National Weather Service river |  |
| gauge located at the Kingston Mines is the closest |  |
| river gauge downstream of the Powerton Station." |  |
| And the next exhibit, Midwest |  |
| Gen Exhibit marked for identification as 1516, |  |
| labeled as MWG13-15_124541. |  |
| Mr. Gnat, what is Midwest Gen |  |
| Exhibit 1516? |  |
| (Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit |  |
| No. 1516 was marked for |  |
| identification.) |  |
| MS. BUGEL: Hearing Officer, I am |  |
| going to object to this line of questions about |  |
| both 1515 and 1516, as these are printouts from |  |
| NOAA. Mr. Gnat has not been established as having |  |
| first-hand knowledge of these printouts. He |  |

[^13]cannot authenticate them. He has not
authenticated them. He can't establish the -- you know, the foundation for these exhibits.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. Gale?
MS. GALE: We can go through some questions, sure.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: That's
fine. Yes.
BY MS. GALE:
Q. Mr. Gnat, can you flip back to Midwest Gen Exhibit 1515, please?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you stated earlier when I asked you if you knew what river gauges were, you said -- well, remind us when you said you knew what river gauges were.

What are they?
A. River gauges are established by the US Geologic Survey at various points on rivers to record and document the elevation of the river at that location, and they call it river stage.
Q. And how do you know what river gauges are?
A. That's a common practice that's
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established across the country by the USGS. It's used in flood -- you know, understanding flood control and so on. It's just a very common -commonplace information and setups across the entire United States.
Q. And as a hydrogeologist, have you consulted the NOAA river gauges?
A. Sure.
Q. For what?
A. For the purposes of evaluating flood stages, and certainly for -- as part of the construction permit application, we had to do some basic groundwater -- numerical groundwater modeling in support of the construction permit applications, and getting an understanding of river -- river stages in the area adjacent or -you know, adjacent to the plant. This is information that -- that is needed and we -- it was pulled for those purposes, certainly.
Q. And where did you go to find that

## information?

A. You go online.
Q. Which website?
A. You can go to the NOAA website.
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There is -- also you can go right -- access probably the same website. You can do it through the USGS as well.
Q. And looking at Exhibit 1515 -- well, does this look like something you would consult?
A. Yes. This is a typical printout.
Q. Okay. And same thing with

Exhibit 1516. What does this look like?
A. The same -- the same printout, except for the next river gauge downstream, and so this is for Kingston Mines, which is the first river gauge downstream of the plant. So when we were doing our modeling, we certainly would look at the river stage at the nearest gauging station upstream of our facility, and at the river gauge at the nearest station downstream of our facility.
Q. And so when you did the modeling, were these the two stations you -- river gauges you looked at?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Looking at Exhibit 1516, which is the Kingston Mines river gauge, and looking at the bottom, left corner under historic crests, what is the highest the Kingston Mine dam
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has ever been at?
A. The historic crest on this printout here is 26.54 feet on April 24th, 2013.

Now, that is the measurement on
the gauge itself. So in this particular case, a little bit further up, it provides what the gauge datum is, which is 428 feet. So this -- the way you would interpret this is it would be 26.54 feet higher than 428 feet. So that would be 440 -454 feet, plus or minus. Something around that order.
Q. Does 454.5 feet sound about right?
A. Correct.

MS. BUGEL: Objection, leading.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Sustained. You can rephrase.
BY MS. GALE:
Q. Do you want to try that math again, how many feet?
A. If I had a pencil or a --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Oh, here.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. Can I write on this exhibit?
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BY MS. GALE:
Q. By all means.
A. 454.54 feet.
Q. Thank you.

So based upon the record highs
at both the Peoria Lock and Dam and the Kingston Mines, has the Illinois River ever reached 471 feet?
A. No, it has not.

MS. BUGEL: Objection. That was asking about facts that have not been established.

MS. GALE: All right. Mr. Hearing
Officer, he said at the beginning that the -- you know, the base -- the base liner was at -- well, I have it written down.

MS. BUGEL: But my objection to the question is use of the word "ever," which is not established by this exhibit. This exhibit only goes back to 2020.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Do you
want to rephrase, Ms. Gale?
BY MS. GALE:
Q. Sure.

Mr. Gnat, under the Exhibit 1515

[^14]and 1516, what does historic crests mean to you?
A. These are the highest levels reached at that location over the period of recording, and so if -- I get -- if we would go back to Exhibit 1515, the spread of data here is from 1943 to 2000 -- 2019. And for Exhibit 1516, the spread of data is from 1943 to -- also to 2015. Well, actually, the data goes up to 2022. It provides the recent crests.
Q. Okay. So based upon this
document -- and you said, I think, the earliest was 1943, but does historic crests identify -these are the -- well, the -- when you say historic crests, is that all of the crests, or what does that mean to you?
A. Right. So when I look at this -and let's say for Exhibit 1516 where it says historic crests, and it provides the first five of them, the way $I$ would interpret that is these were the five highest elevations that the river reached over the period of recording at that station.
Q. Okay. So based upon the record of historic crests over the period of recording at both the Peoria Lock and Dam and the Kingston
\[
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Mine, did the river reach 471 feet?
MS. BUGEL: Objection, leading.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Overruled. He may answer, if he is able.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. No.

BY MS. GALE:
Q. So focusing on the 30 feet above the bottom of the Secondary Ash Basin, is that accurate?
A. No, that's not accurate.
Q. And do you have personal experience with that, on how high the historic crests have been?
A. Well, between myself and all of the crews that were out there, we never saw water that would suggest that the Service Water Basin was under water, which at 475 -- 471 feet of elevation, it would be under water.

MS. GALE: Thank you. Mr. Hearing
Officer, Midwest Generation moves for the admission of Exhibits 1515 and 1516.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Ms. Bugel?
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[^15]that were dredged in.
Q. And do you see the area between
those channels?
A. Yes. Between those two channels, yes.
Q. And to your knowledge, has KPRG ever taken any samples from that area?
A. I have not, but KPRG has, yes.
Q. And what samples -- what did KPRG sample?
A. Midwest Generation requested us to sample the dredge spoils. Those are dredge spoils in that area from the dredging of the -- dredging or maintenance, but those are dredge spoils that are placed in that area.
Q. Okay. And what are dredging -- I think you said -- can you just explain what dredging spoils are?
A. That's when you go in and you excavate and dredge out for these channels to bring in water from the Illinois River. Those would have to be excavated and dredged out, and it's -- and if they start silting in, you maintain them and dredge them out some more, but basically,
\[
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the spoils from the excavation of those was placed onto that area in the middle, and we were requested to sample that, and the term used for that is "dredge spoils."
Q. Thank you. All right. Let's just make sure.

Mr. Gnat, I would like you to
flip to the one, two, three -- six -- fifth tab in your book, and it's a map, and it's an excerpt of Exhibit 1310.
A. Yes.
Q. What is depicted in this map?
A. This is the groundwater contour map
for November 2021 for the Waukegan station.
Q. Have you visited the Waukegan
station?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. How would you describe the area the Waukegan station is located in?
A. That's an old and heavily industrial area. To the north, the Mans-Johnsville [sic] Superfund site. To the west was an old tannery, and the general boiler site. Immediately south is the wastewater treatment plant, still operational,
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and then south of that are -- there is an old coal gas site. I believe that that might have been a Superfund site. But I know that the old -- the Outboard Marine site just south of here as well was an old Superfund site.
Q. And on this figure -- I think you said it's a map of Waukegan station.

What is depicted in the map of
the Waukegan station?
A. This map shows the entire station. In particular for this map, though, we were -this is a map for the groundwater flow that goes beneath the West Pond and the East Pond, which is kind of in the bottom, central half of the figure.
Q. And what's the groundwater flow?
A. Groundwater flow beneath the ponds
is in an east/southeasterly direction.
Q. Okay. And so similar to our discussions about Joliet 29 and the Powerton Station, in 2010 what was the groundwater sampled for?
A. In 2010, that was part of that initial voluntary sampling that was done for the list of parameters that were provided by the

Illinois EPA, and those were for dissolved organics -- inorganics.
Q. And then in 2015 at Waukegan, what kind of groundwater sampling was starting to be conducted?
A. In 2015, the federal CCR rule was coming into play, and we started the federal CCR sampling under that program. That was for total metals. I believe also at that time to -- in response to some of the requirements under the federal rule, there was -- had to be an adjustment of the east berm of the East Pond, and for that, Midwest Generation obtained a construction permit from Illinois EPA.

And under the -- under the requirements of that permit, that also specified total metals, and at that time, Illinois EPA just asked us rather than under -- doing sampling under CCA, that we can stop the dissolved metals and just fulfill the requirements of the construction permit itself for that, and those were total metals, a slightly different list than the federal rule, but from that point forward, we were not doing any type of field filtering for groundwater
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samples at Waukegan station.
Q. So looking at the figure, do you see the area east of the East Pond?
A. Yes.
Q. And on your visits to the station, have you viewed that area east of the East Pond?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And what are you seeing you -- when you have observed that area?
A. Well, from -- going to the east it's a fairly steep slope going down. There has never been any indication of seeps or anything like that of -- visible along that slope, and then that goes into kind of a marshy area down at the base.
Q. And in May I believe you testified about data from the ELUC wells at the Waukegan station. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. What are the ELUC wells?
A. The environmental land use control
wells were for the site investigation that was being done on the tannery to the west of the -- of the plant. That was being done under, I believe, the Illinois EPA site remediation program, the

[^16]SRP, and they documented groundwater contamination with inorganics moving to the east and onto our property.

And as part of the risk-based closure that's allowed under the site remediation program, they requested that Midwest Generation would allow for an environmental land use control, or ELUC, to be placed on the property associated with their contamination coming onto Midwest Generation property, and Midwest Generation agreed to it, and Wells -- I believe -- 10, 11, 12 and 14 -- 14 and 15, and actually, there was a well 13, but it's no longer in use, but those are all the wells that were installed by the consultant working for the tannery as part of the ELUC.
Q. And what is the purpose of an ELUC?
A. It's -- the purpose is it's placed right on the deed of the property, and it restricts the -- in this particular case, it restricts the use of groundwater within that area. So no groundwater wells, potable water wells, can be installed on that area of the property.
Q. As part of the compliance commitment agreement for the Waukegan station, what did you
assist in establishing at Waukegan?
A. An expanded environmental land use control.
Q. And what do you mean by expanded?
A. So, the initial ELUC that was placed on the property for the tannery investigation so that that investigation could get closure under the SRP program, the -- that ended basically just past the property line on the property, and the rest of the ELUC basically -- an expanded ELUC was -- was put in place that basically covers from that location all the way to the east beneath the ash ponds and south of the ash ponds all the way to Lake Michigan.
Q. So we have discussed your work for Midwest Gen pursuant to the federal and state CCR rules for Joliet 29 and Powerton Station. For the Waukegan station, generally speaking, what is your work -- do you conduct any work under the federal CCR rules?
A. Yes. We do the sampling under the federal CCR rule, as well as under the state CCR rule.
Q. And for the sampling, what type of

[^17]reports do you prepare?
A. Under the federal rule, there are semi-annual and annual reporting requirements, and under the state rule, the same. It's a quarterly required sampling, and we submit what we call the 60-day reports, which are data summaries 60 days after the last day of sampling in the field.
Q. And any other reports for the sampling?
A. And then there is an annual reporting requirement as well.
Q. And then for the Waukegan station, what permit applications did you prepare?
A. The application for -- the initial application for operating permit, as well as the initial application for a construction permit.
Q. And for the Waukegan operating permit application, and is that -- was that -well, what ponds was the operating permit application for?
A. The East Pond and the West Pond.
Q. And for the operating permit application for the east and west ponds, what was KPRG's role?
\[
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[^18]preparing the construction permit application?
A. The same. We developed some of the sections, and other sections were developed by other consulting firms with other expertise, and we basically were a clearinghouse and pulled the whole package together.
Q. And for the Waukegan construct -excuse me.

For the Waukegan construction permit application for both ponds, approximately how big was the application?
A. Again, hundreds of pages.
Q. And approximately how many hours did KPRG spend preparing the application?
A. Hundreds of hours.
Q. If you can turn to the next document in your binder. This has been marked for identification purposes as Exhibit 1517. It starts on Bates No. MWG13-15_81195.

Mr. Gnat, what is Exhibit 1517?
(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit
No. 1517 was marked for
identification.)

[^19]BY THE WITNESS:
A. This is the analytical reporting package from Eurofins, which is the lab that did the analyses for the Waukegan station, and this in particular is for three -- a subset of three samples that were drawn for the LEAF test, L-E-A-F, test, for the three ash samples that were collected from that area west of the West Ash Pond.
Q. So we discussed this in May -- well, the area west of the West Ash Pond, remind us, what did Midwest -- excuse me -- what did KPRG do in that area?
A. We established a fairly large boring. We were asked to do a sampling in that area, detailed sampling, and to basically just guarantee that that one round will take care of everything. So we ended up doing 40 borings over a 10-acre area, or 4 borings per acre, which generally is a little bit -- could be overkill, but we were asked to do it expeditiously. We did a very thorough, detailed sampling of the ash, and based -- and then I believe there were two to three samples per boring analyzed for the ash

[^20]parameters as defined in the CCR rule, and based on those results, we chose a subset of three samples that we had the lab run for this LEAF test.

## Q. And, Mr. Gnat, what is the LEAF

## test?

A. It's a leaching test that -- and I believe it stands for leaching environmental framework testing, and it's a leaching test that has been established. In this particular case, they take the sample, and they collect leachate over a wide range of pH . I believe the pH ranges from as low as 2, which is an extremely acidic condition to as high as 13, which is an extremely alkaline condition, and a whole slew in between of different pH levels, including neutral.

Then they also run it at the natural pH , which is the pH of the material when they received it. And so they basically run a liquid of a high pH or a low pH , depending on the run they are doing. They collect the leachate at the bottom, and then they run that for the full list of parameters that are listed in the CCR rule.

[^21]
## Q. And then why -- what is -- why use

## the LEAF test?

A. The LEAF test has more recently come into popular use and is looked at to get an understanding of how materials might give up or mobilize various constituents under the whole range of pHs, and then knowing, you know, kind of what the general pH range is for the particular site that you are looking at, and so on, you can get an idea of what might truly be mobile in the system associated with that.
Q. And so when you did this investigation of the area of the west -- of the West Pond, why did you choose the grid pan pattern?
A. That's a very robust approach to sampling. So, I mean, you could certainly do lots of different approaches, and normally, if we weren't requested to just do everything and as expeditiously as possible, we'd probably propose doing a phased approach where we would go out and do a set of five borings or so, you know, five or six borings across the site, collect several samples from each boring, and then take a look
statistically, how is the variability in that data.
And if the variability is low, then that set of samples is pretty representative of the ash in that whole mass. If the variability is high, you would have to go back and collect additional samples to get a representative sample. So, I mean, statistically, if you look at something, if it's purely homogenous, you can pull one sample out of 100,000 cubic yards and that sample is representative, because it's pure homogenous.

So, generally an approach is if we are asked if there is no, you know, desire for expeditious purposes or whatever, you know, we would look at doing a phased approach. Let's do a handful of borings across that area, get a good idea horizontally and vertically through that area, take a look statistically, what's the variability, and do we need to collect more samples to be representative, or does the set we have represent that mass fairly well statistically?

MS. GALE: Mr. Hearing Officer,

Midwest Gen moves for the admission of 1517.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Ms. Bugel?
MS. BUGEL: No objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank
you, Ms. Bugel.

```
                    Exhibit }1517\mathrm{ is admitted.
```

(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit
No. 1517 was admitted into evidence.)

BY MS. GALE:
Q. Mr. Gnat, I would like to move on to the Will County Station. Will you flip to the last tab in your binder?
A. Yes.
Q. And a map, which is an excerpt of Exhibit 1314, what does this map show?
A. This is the groundwater contour map for the Will County Station ash ponds for November 2021.
Q. And have you been to the Will County Station?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. How would you describe the area that
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the Will County Station is located?
A. The Will County Station is
somewhat -- kind of an isolated piece of property with the Des Plaines River to the west, the Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal to the east. I believe there is a materials quarry to the south, and then on the other side of the river and further north, those areas are some undeveloped, some residential, some commercial.
Q. And looking at the map, what is the direction of the groundwater flow?
A. Groundwater flow beneath the ponds is to the west.
Q. Thank you. So similar to the prior stations, in 2010, what was the groundwater sampled for?
A. You know, the same under that voluntary agreement. The Illinois EPA had a list of parameters that they wanted analyzed on a quarterly basis. They're inorganics, and they were for dissolved metals.
Q. And then in 2015 at Will County related to the groundwater, what happened?
A. That's when a federal rule was
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applied and Ponds 2 South and 3 South were considered to be -- to fall under the jurisdiction of the federal rule, and so we installed Wells 11 and 12 to bring the monitoring system that would be in compliance then for the federal rule for -that combined two ash ponds together, and then we did groundwater monitoring on -- first we established the background under the federal rule and groundwater monitoring using a total metals analysis.
Q. Okay. And then in 2021, what happened related to groundwater?
A. The state rule came into effect, and Ponds 1 North and 1 South were included under the jurisdiction of the state rule, and so in order for us to, again, meet the monitoring requirements under the state rule, we installed Wells 13, 14, and 15, downgradient of Ponds 1 North and 1 South to make sure that we fulfilled the requirements of the state rule as well for groundwater monitoring.
Q. And for the Will County Station, were you -- did you assist in responding to the requirements under the compliance commitment agreement?
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A. Yes, we did.
Q. What did KPRG assist in preparing?
A. We assisted in preparing the --
there is an environmental land use control that's on the property, and I also believe that there is a groundwater management zone that has been established on that property as well.
Q. And, to your knowledge, is the groundwater management zone still in effect?
A. Yes, that's my understanding.
Q. And similar question. Is the ELUC still in effect?
A. Yes, it's on the deed.
Q. And looking at the west side of the ponds, have you observed that area before?
A. Yes.
Q. What is over there?
A. Well, again, it drops off fairly steeply from the ash ponds, and, in fact, when we were installing Wells 13,14 , and 15 , we actually had to build out some pads a little bit to be able to place these wells, and so there is, you know, somewhat of -- you'd call it an embankment. So that's there, and then there is also a utility
corridor above ground, high power lines, that run just to the west of where we have our wells, within that area, and then you have got the river.
Q. And so when you have looked over there, what have you observed?
A. You know, it's a fairly
well-vegetated slope there. Did not see any seeps or evidence of seeps, whatsoever.
Q. So, Mr. Gnat, we have discussed your work for Midwest Gen pursuant to federal CCR rules related to the other three stations. At Will

County Station, what is KPRG doing pursuant -- for Midwest Gen pursuant to the federal CCR rule?
A. For the federal rule, we are doing the groundwater monitoring under the federal rule and the associated reporting under the rule.
Q. And for the -- are you also doing work for the -- under -- for Midwest Gen under the Illinois CCR rule?
A. Yes, we are.
Q. What is KPRG -- excuse me.

What is KPRG doing under the
Illinois CCR rule?
A. Again, we installed the additional

[^22]monitoring wells required for the reporting for the groundwater monitoring. We do the quarterly groundwater monitoring for the impoundments, and we also did the initial permits for application -initial application for operating permits -- I'm sorry -- for the ponds, as well as the construction permit applications for the ponds.
Q. So, the initial operating permit application that you mentioned, what operating permit application did you prepare -- or excuse me -- have a role in?
A. There is an initial application for an operating permit for Ponds 2 South and 3 South, and then there is a separate one for Ponds 1 North and 1 South.
Q. And for the Ponds 2 South and 3 South operating permit application, what was KPRG's role?
A. The same as on the previous ones, kind of a hub and clearinghouse for information coming in from other consultants. We also wrote some of the sections, and we pulled the entire application package together.
Q. And the operating permit application
for Ponds 2 South and 3 South, approximately how big was it?
A. Again, hundreds of pages, three-inch binder.
Q. And approximately how many hours -or excuse me.

How many hours just for KPRG did it take to prepare that application?
A. Hundreds of hours.
Q. And then you mentioned that there was a separate operating permit application for Ponds 1N and 1s?
A. Correct.
Q. Why was that separate?
A. We had to install the three additional monitoring wells, and with that, again, kind of similar to what the Metals Cleaning Basin was on the Powerton site, you know, since this wasn't under the federal rule, we did not have the benefit of all of the background federal rule sampling that was done.

And so the establishment of the statistical background, the required minimum of eight rounds of sampling and so on, none of that
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was available for the Ponds 1 North and 1 South. So all of that had to be done, and so that was being run as a separate application, a permit application.
Q. And what was KPRG's role in preparing the permit application?
A. The same. You know, we installed all the wells. We did all the initial background sampling, and then acted as the hub and clearinghouse for the -- you know, the information from other specialty consultants coming in and as well as writing some of the sections ourselves and pulling together the entire permit application.
Q. And for the operating permit application for Ponds $1 N$ and 15 , how big was that application?
A. Hundreds of pages.
Q. And to prepare that -- excuse me -yeah.

To collect that application, including installing the wells and collecting the additional data, approximately how many hours of KPRG's time was spent?
A. Well into the hundreds, if not even
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tipping a thousand hours with all the well installations and having to go back and do eight rounds of upfront monitoring and so on.
Q. And you mentioned the construction permit applications for Ponds $1 \mathrm{~N}, 1 \mathrm{~S}, 2 \mathrm{~S}$, and 3S, right?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the status of those
construction permit applications?
A. Those are in the process of being prepared for final submittal. There was a public meeting held last week in regards to those, and so now there is a timeframe after the public meeting. And so those applications are in the process of being completed and finalized.
Q. And what is KPRG's role in preparing the construction permit applications?
A. The same. Acting as a hub and clearinghouse for data and aspects coming in from other consultants, as well as preparing some of the pages ourselves or sections ourselves, and also attending the public meeting.
Q. And understanding that they are not final yet, approximately how big is the

[^23]applications?
A. They will be hundreds of pages, three-inch binder type.
Q. And so far, approximately how many
hours has KPRG spent in preparing the construction permit applications for the four ponds?
A. Easily into the upper hundreds of hours.

MS. GALE: Mr. Hearing Officer, can
I have five minutes?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes. Off
the record for five minutes.
(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We are back on the record.

Ms. Bugel, do you want to take a break before you start your cross or --

MS. BUGEL: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
Ten minutes. Off the record. Thank you.
(Whereupon, a short break was taken.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
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right. We are back on the record, Kari.
You know, I was -- again, I
forgot to announce we have Vanessa Horton, the staff attorney, today from the Board. We also
have environmental scientist Essence Brown in the back. Thanks for being here.

You may proceed, Ms. Bugel.
CROSSSEXAMINATION
by Ms. Bugel
Q. Okay. And, Mr. Gnat, I believe you
still -- do you have your binders in front of you with all your exhibits from both May and today?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay. Can you please turn to

Exhibit 1502?
A. Which binder would that be?
Q. I think that's Book 2.
A. Yes.
Q. And this -- just to refresh
everybody's recollection, this Exhibit 1502
contains an alternate source demonstration?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And that's found at Appendix B?
A. Correct.
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[^24]alternate source demonstration we are looking at appears at 114021, the Bates No. 114021, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you didn't evaluate what the alternate transient source was, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And in your testimony when you referenced the alternate transient source, did you reference the possibility that it was road salt?
A. I would have to go through here and read this, but --
Q. And -- I'm sorry -- just to make my question clear for the record, $I$ was not referring to the alternate source demonstration. I was referring to your testimony back in May.
A. Oh, I believe that there -- in previous testimony and discussions and even the previous -- prior to May hearings and so on, I believe that there was discussion of the use of road salt associated with Channahon Road, and my understanding is that from some of the previous testimony and so on, that that was somewhat agreed upon as well by the Illinois Pollution Control Board.
Q. And did you do any leach testing to determine whether the constituents you were seeing in the alternate source demonstration were caused by road salt?
A. I do not believe that for this alternate source demonstration we did any LEAF testing, which we did for other -- other stations.
Q. And your answer referenced LEAF testing. LEAF testing is one -- is a leach test, correct?
A. Correct. It's a specific type, yes.
Q. Did you do any leach testing in general to determine whether the constituents referenced in this alternate source demonstration were caused by road salt?
A. Now, I -- we did not, and I -- one of the things is by 2021 when this demonstration was done, all of the ash has been removed at this point. So I believe the ash was fully removed out of that impoundment from, I believe, in 2019 or so. So there is no ash in which we could even sample at that point.
Q. There is no ash in the ponds, correct?

```
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A. And that -- this is for Pond 2.

There is no ash in Pond 2. There is still -- the warning layer is still down in there, but all of the ash has been removed.
Q. And are there still Poz-O-Pac layers in the three ponds at Joliet?
A. I believe so.
Q. And do the berms remain at the three ponds at Joliet?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. And did you do any evaluation to confirm whether the source, the transient source, was offsite?
A. We -- considering it was -- we were seeing it in our upgradient well, as well as our downgradient wells, that tends to indicate a source upgradient to the ponds, and the ponds are immediately upgradient -- or immediately adjacent to the road, but that was -- under the federal rule, there is no specific requirement to identify the specific source.
Q. And I would like to turn to

Exhibit 1504.
A. Yes.
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Q. And Exhibit 1504 consists of boring
logs, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Are any of these boring logs marked
"draft"?
A. Yes. All of them are.
Q. And the -- looking at the very first boring on Bates page 79341 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- this boring stops at 17 feet, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know why this stops at 17 feet?
A. I believe that's where refusal was encountered by the Geoprobe, which was the drilling method that was being used. It's generally on top of bedrock.
Q. Does -- is there anything on here that indicates that bedrock was encountered?
A. Not on this specific boring, no.
Q. Is there anything on this specific boring that indicates that refusal was -- refusal was -- I don't know the right word -- encountered
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or established?
A. No.
Q. And flipping through this series of borings, can you tell me, is there any indication on any of them that the boring hit bedrock?
A. No, not on these borings.
Q. And is there any indication on any of these that there was refusal when the borings stopped?
A. No. Not specifically on these borings, no.
Q. And can you please turn to Exhibit 1511?
A. Okay.
Q. And you -- when you were discussing Exhibit 1511 in your testimony in May, you testified to not seeing any seeps along the length of the area inspected.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you please describe the length of the area that you inspected?
A. Sure. We walk from just -- there is a fence line on the southeast corner of the
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property, and we start the inspection several hundred feet to the west of that fence, and then it proceeds down the -- and down the entire length of the intake channel, and then the Des Plaines River all the way up to an area that's just short of the lock and dam.

And there is actually kind of an
entrance off of Brandon Road that there is a little parking lot there, and that people also drive further back into that property, and there is a lot of evidence of people there doing campfires and fishing and whatnot. So that's basically the entire length that we do.
Q. And flipping to Exhibit 1512, would you have walked the same area?
A. Yes.

MS. BUGEL: Okay. And we are going
to -- Leah is here, and she is going to distribute an exhibit from the liability phase of this hearing.

> May Leah approach?
> HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes.

Thank you.
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BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. So we have placed in front of you an exhibit that was marked in the previous hearing, Complainants' Exhibit 248N, as in Nancy.

And do you need a minute to
review that, Mr. Gnat?
A. It depends on the question you will ask.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. Fair enough. And to refresh everybody's recollection, this is a letter that you wrote, correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And your signature appears on Bates page 19444?
A. Yes.
Q. And the -- I call it the Re: line. I don't know what other people call it, but I'm going to refer to the Re: line of the letter, which is, R-E, colon.

The Re: line of this letter refers to the Joliet No. 29 Former Ash Burial Area Runoff Inspection 2009. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Where did you get the
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terminology formal -- "former ash burial area"?
A. Exactly where -- where that was pulled from, I don't know. It might be what was provided to me as referencing what was in that -I believe it was the 1999 Phase II work that was done prior to purchase of the property by Midwest Generation.
Q. In writing this letter, you decided to use that terminology in the Re: line, correct?
A. Right. Again, that was terminology that was given to me. I mean, it's not something that I created or whatnot, but it -- terminology at that time, that's what my understanding was, yes.
Q. And can you please refer to the first sentence of this letter? In the first sentence, it refers to -- beginning at the very end of the first line, "the former ash burial area on the northeast side of the Joliet 29 property." Do you see that?
A. Yes, "outside the fenced boundary of the facility," yes.
Q. So this letter refers to the same area covered by Exhibits 1511 and 1512, correct?
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A. Correct. And, you know, just to clarify, we actually start the walk to the west of that fence line, as well as then continue on past it, obviously, but we actually start several hundred feet west of that, yes.
Q. Leah is going to approach you with an excerpt of Exhibit 901.

And, Leah, just to confirm,
that's page 15 from 901?
MS. BAHRAMIPOUR: Yes.
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. And, Mr. Gnat, you have referred to the fence line. Can you please tell us where the fence line is?
A. Sure. If you take a look at Ash Pond 3, what's identified here as Ash Pond 3, so you go a little bit to the east of that, you will see kind of a darker, almost triangular-shaped area. And right below that triangular-shaped area and before you see the boundary of the channel, you'll see what looks like a little access road, because that is an access road.

And if you take that access road to the east there right to the corner of what
would be that triangular-shaped area, that's basically where the fence -- there's a gate there, and that's the gate we would go out, and then that fence goes from that point to the north to just short of Channahon Road there.
Q. And, Mr. Gnat, I have given you -or Leah has given you a marker.

Can you draw very -- just very
approximately onto this exhibit where the fence line is?
A. Sure. Got it.

MS. BUGEL: And, Mr. Hearing
Officer, we believe it would aid the Board to actually have that marked. So this is a new exhibit. I have not yet presented this proposal to Midwest Generation, but -- what number would we do?

And we have pre-numbered our other exhibits. So we can mark this and copy it at lunchtime and submit it.

So I would move for
Complainants' -- can we go off the record for a second?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure.
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(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)

MS. GALE: I'm a little confused on
the process here. We have not seen what Mr. Gnat has done before we had to answer an opinion on what the motion would be.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
They don't have a copy of this.
MS. BUGEL: They have a copy of it, but they don't have it with -- Mr. Gnat's marked --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Then we will wait until it's marked, and you can make your motion then.

MS . BUGEL: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may proceed.

MS. BUGEL: Very good.
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. Mr. Gnat, one question about this. The fenced boundary -- I'm sorry. Or the -- what you have -- what we have referred to as the fence line, that is different from the property line, correct?
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A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So now referring back to

Exhibit 248N. So, I'm looking at the first page, Bates page 19442, the first sentence of the second paragraph. This says, "During the inspection KPRG identified five areas outside the fenced boundary of the Joliet No. 29 facility."

Do you see that reference?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And the fence line is the same as the fenced boundary, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the fenced boundary is different from the property boundary, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the next sentence goes on -- I'm sorry. Let me finish that sentence.

The rest of this sentence goes on to say there was either, quote, "either sheet wash erosion or drilling has exposed the underlying ash slag and may transport the material to the Des Plaines River."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
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handheld GPS unit, a Garmin-type unit.
Q. And those coordinates are, quote, N41 degrees, space, 30.068 and that is that little -- there is a little apostrophe, and then a slash, W88 degrees, space, 06.419 apostrophe, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that apostrophe -- what does that apostrophe stand for?
A. Minutes.
Q. So these coordinates are --
A. Minutes and seconds. 41 degrees, 30.068 minutes.
Q. So these coordinates are expressed in terms of degrees and minutes, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's possible to express coordinates in the form of degrees, minutes, and seconds, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. And both -- in your experience, are both degrees and minutes also equally accurate as degrees, minutes, and seconds?
A. You know, that depends. In this
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particular case, 30.0 -- 30.068 minutes, you could convert that to minutes and seconds, if you would like.
(Whereupon, Complainants'
Exhibit No. 1518 was marked for
identification.)
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. And we can -- we are passing out a new exhibit, and this is a demonstrative that was provided three days ago, and we have marked this Exhibit 1518.

And on this first page, in the search box with the magnifying glass on the upper, left-hand side -- do you see that search box?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And in the search box, do you see the same coordinates that we just identified in bullet point Area 1 in Exhibit 248N?
A. Yes.
Q. And the -- they are expressed
slightly differently with the N at the end instead of at the beginning. Do you see that?
A. Yes, for -- yes, for -- yes.
Q. And then the \(W\) is at the end instead
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of the beginning?
A. Correct.
Q. And instead of the slash mark, it's just a comma in between?
A. Correct.
Q. And below that do you see -- under the blue graphic with the buildings, do you see the coordinates expressed in degrees, minutes, and seconds?
A. Yeah. I haven't done the number crunch myself, but that would -- if you are converting above to minutes and seconds, you know, assuming the number crunch is right. I don't know. But \(I\) haven't done it myself.
Q. And do you see a red pin on this image?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that the red pin does not accurately represent where Area 1 is located at Joliet No. 29?

MS. GALE: Objection, foundation.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Ms. Bugel?
MS. BUGEL: Well, the foundation is
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that these are the coordinates that Mr. Gnat himself gave, and he has also walked the property and wrote the letter that identified Area No. 1. He's --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I agree.
Overruled. He may answer, if he is able.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. Yes. I believe that's -- if that's the area I'm thinking of, that's probably pretty close, yes.

BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. Okay. And just to confirm at the bottom of this exhibit, the bottom right-hand corner, it gives a scale, and that scale says 1,000 feet. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And can you please turn to the second page of this exhibit?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the upper left-hand in the box with the magnifying glass, do you still see the same coordinates that appear in your letter for Area 1?
A. Yes.
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Q. And in the lower right-hand corner, do you see the scale of 200 feet?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see the red pin again?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you have any reason to
believe that that red pin does not accurately represent where Area 1 is located at Joliet 29?
A. No. It seems approximately right.
Q. And turning back to Exhibit 248N, can you please turn the page to Bates page 19443?
A. Okay.
Q. And do you see a bullet, the first bullet on this page?
A. Yes.
Q. And that bullet refers to Area

No. 2?
A. Yes.
Q. And you give the coordinates for Area No. 2, correct?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And those coordinates are N41 degrees, 29.950 minutes, slash, W88 degrees, 06.621 minutes, correct?
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Area 4, Ms. Bugel?
MS. BUGEL: I'm -- no. We are on
page 4.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
MS. BUGEL: And in the upper
left-hand corner it should still say Area 2.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank
you.
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. And Mr. Gnat, you see it still says Area 2 in the upper left-hand corner?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the box with the magnifying glass, do you see the same coordinates that you gave for Area 2 in Exhibit 248N?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you see the red pin again?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have any reason to believe that that red pin does not accurately represent where Area 2 is located at Joliet 29?
A. That looks roughly correct.
Q. And turning back to Exhibit 248N, can you please look at the second bullet point on
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Bates page 19443?
A. Okay.
Q. And that bullet refers to Area 3,
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that bullet gives the
coordinates for Area 3, correct?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And those coordinates are N41
degrees, 29.916 minutes, slash, W88 degrees, 06.683 minutes, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And can you please turn to page 5 of Exhibit 1518?
A. Okay.
Q. And in the search box with the magnifying glass, do you see the same coordinates that you gave in Exhibit 248N for Area 3?
A. Yes.
Q. And you see the red pin on this
image?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you have any reason to believe that the red pin does not accurately
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represent where Area 3 is located at Joliet 29?
A. No.
Q. And do you see the scale in the
lower, right-hand corner?
A. Yes.
Q. And that scale now shows 200 feet -I'm sorry.

That shows 500 feet?
A. Five hundred feet, correct.
Q. Thank you. And can you please turn to page 6 of Exhibit 1518? And in the search box, do you still see the same coordinates that you gave for Area 3?
A. Yes.

MS. GALE: Objection. That's not what the document says on page 6 underneath Area 3.

BY THE WITNESS:
A. Page 6, Area 3. Yeah, that's -yeah. That's incorrect, yes. BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. All right. Okay.
A. Those are Area 2 and --
Q. It's the coordinates for Area 2.
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Area 4, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see the red pin on page

7?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you have any reason to
believe that the red pin does not accurately represent where Area 4 is located at Joliet

No. 29?
A. No. I have -- that looks roughly
correct.
Q. And if you look in the lower right-hand corner, does the scale show 1,000 feet?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And turning the page to page 8, in the search box with the magnifying glass in the left -- upper left-hand corner, do you still see the same coordinates that you gave for Area 4?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And in the lower right-hand corner, do you see the scale of 200 feet?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have any reason to believe that the red pin does not accurately
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represent where Area 4 is located at Joliet
No. 29?
A. Roughly, it appears to be roughly
correct, yes.
Q. And turning the page. I'm sorry.

Let's start by turning back to Exhibit 248N, Bates page 19443. Do you see the last bullet on this page?
A. Yes.
Q. And that bullet references Area

No. 5, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it provides the coordinates for

Area No. 5, correct?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And those coordinates are N41 degrees, 29.889 minutes, slash, W88 degrees, 06.947 minutes; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And before the slash, is
the operator -- I'm sorry -- is the apostrophe missing?
A. Yes.
Q. But that still represents to you
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29.889 minutes, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And looking at page 9 of

Exhibit 1518 labeled Area 5, do you see the same coordinates in the search box on the upper left-hand side with the magnifying glass?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And those are the same coordinates
that you gave in Exhibit 428N for Area 5?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see a red pin on this image?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you have any reason to believe that the red pin does not accurately represent where Area 5 is located at Joliet No. 29?
A. That's roughly correct.
Q. And looking at that red pin, that is not on the banks of the Des Plaines River, correct?
A. That is along the intake channel, correct.
Q. And -- and looking in the lower
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right-hand corner, the scale shows 1,000 feet, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Based on that scale, do you have any approximation of how far that pin is from the Des Plaines River?
A. As the crow flies or along the bank?
Q. As the crow flies.
A. Two hundred feet, three
hundred feet.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And can you please turn to page 10? And do you see the scale in the lower right-hand corner?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. That scale now shows 200 feet,
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you see the search box in the upper left-hand corner with the magnifying glass?
A. Yes.
Q. And that search box still contains the coordinates for Area No. 5, correct?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Do you have -- and do you see the
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red pin on this?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe
that the red pin does not accurately represent where Area 5 is located at Joliet No. 29?
A. That looks roughly correct.
Q. And can you please turn to
exhibit -- well, let me stop there.
Complainants move for
Exhibit 1518 to be admitted into the record.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. Gale?
MS. GALE: We would object to the admission of this document. It's inaccurate at least for one of the areas, and it also -- he estimated, but he wasn't sure why the difference between the search and the result. So it's just foundation on whether the results are accurate.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I thought this was a demonstrative Exhibit. 1518?

MS. BUGEL: Yes. It's a
demonstrative. Then, do we --
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: No. You
can -- yeah. Is your objection still the same?
MS. GALE: Yes. As an exhibit, yes.
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HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
Well, I'm going to accept it as -- excuse me -- a demonstrative exhibit. It may assist the Board. It has no probative value. Thank you.

MS. BUGEL: Mr. Gnat -- actually,
Hearing Officer, can I make one recommendation, that we just have Mr. Gnat use the marker to correct Area 4?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes. And
then I guess you will make a copy when able, hopefully sooner than later, and then you will move it, and then Ms. Gale will have her time to object?

MS. GALE: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
Yes, yes, you may.
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. Mr. Gnat, can you please go back to

Area 3 on page 6? And are you on Area 3, page 6?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you please take the marker we provided to you and cross out Area 3 and just replace that with 2 ?
A. Okay.
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Q. Thank you. And -- and you can set that aside for the moment.

And can you please turn back to
Exhibit 248N, Bates page 19444?
A. Okay.
Q. And on this page, do you see where
```

it states Area 6?

```
A. Yes.
Q. And this says Area 6 is located within the fenced boundary of the Joliet No. 29 facility, approximately 500 feet west of Area 5. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Area 6, you do not provide coordinates for Area 6, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And turning -- earlier I gave
you page 15 of Exhibit 901. Do you still have that in front of you?
A. The -- this map?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. On that, could you just mark
approximately where Area 6 is located?
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A. I can do it approximately, but I don't have a scale on this map here. So unless it's up at the top, but \(I\) don't see a scale. So I'm going to be guessing based on having been there, but, you know, saying here it's 500 feet. It looked less, but \(I\) don't have a scale on this map, but --
Q. Well, let me interrupt you then.

Would it be easier for you to do that on Exhibit 1518, page 10, that has Area 5 marked, and has the scale of 200 feet in the lower right-hand corner?
A. Yeah. I can -- I can mark it on that.
Q. Okay. So if you could please draw a block dot approximately where Area 5 is, and then indicate -- just write Area 5 -- add a 6 -- and 6 in the upper left-hand corner. Where it says Area 5, we can add a 6 to that.
A. Okay.
Q. And just -- we can set those aside.

We are going to move on to Exhibit 15 -- sorry.
We are going to look back at
1513 before we distribute the next exhibit.
\[
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Exhibit 1513, and this is in binder 2 or book 2, the very last exhibit.
A. Okay.
Q. Mr. Gnat, do you recall referencing dredging of the Des Plaines River when you were testifying as to this exhibit in May?
A. If I recall, when I would see the big chunks of dolomite and so on, that -- you know, that was probably from dredging operations of the channel. That's what my reference was to, yes.
Q. And were you involved in -personally involved in any dredging of the Des Plaines River?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Were you involved in any construction of any part of the lock and dam system on the Des Plaines River?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Do you have any first-hand knowledge regarding the placement of dredged spoils from dredging at the Des Plaines River?
A. No.
Q. And you are not appearing as an
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expert witness in this proceeding, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So you are here as a fact witness,
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are not offering any expert opinions on dredging or dredged spoils, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And we can now distribute

Exhibit 1519.
(Whereupon, Complainants'
Exhibit No. 1519 was marked for
identification.)
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. And, Mr. Gnat, Exhibit 1519 is also
a series of photos, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And these photos -- are these photos familiar to you?
A. They look like pictures I would
take, but \(I\) don't know when they were taken.
There is --
Q. Do these --
A. Do you know what -- you know, which
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\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]
of my inspections this one was out of?
Q. These photos were part of

Exhibit 1513. Do those now look familiar to you, that they are from the same series as Exhibit 1513?
A. I am assuming that's correct. I --
you know, I -- pictures are pictures. They -assuming they are -- this one says Exhibit 1519. This one says Exhibit 1513. So they certainly look like pictures I have taken. I don't know if it's from the same walk or from a previous -- from the previous years. That's the only thing I can't put together.
Q. Okay. Do you see that the Bates numbers are sequential?
A. On the Exhibit 1513 here that's in my book, there are no Bates numbers available or that are legible or that \(I\) can see.

MS. BUGEL: Can we go off the record for a second?
(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. We are back on the record. Sorry, Mr. Gnat.
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BY THE WITNESS:
A. All right. Now -- now, I have a set here with the Bates numbers. So, yes, it appears it's from the same -- same sequence.

BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. So -- so do the -- does the area photographed in these pictures, is it familiar to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And these photos were taken at the northeast area at Joliet, correct?
A. Correct. During that site walk, yes.
Q. And the photos -- you took the photos during a walkover inspection of that northeast area?
A. Yes.
Q. And looking at Bates 108284, there are no cobbles visible in this picture, correct?
A. That is correct. Along this part of the intake, by the intake channel here, I do not remember seeing lots of those cobbles, which you see further on when you are along the Des Plaines River, correct.
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\section*{Q. And can you please page through 108285 and go through 108292 and tell me if you see any cobbles in this next eight pages?}
A. So, on -- I will go along here.

No. 285, that picture is taken a little bit further up from the bank, but I just note all along this part of the bank, I don't remember seeing very much in terms of cobble. The 286, no. That's just inside the fence there. 287, no cobbles there. This is all one side of the fence there.

289, that's a picture facing the other way up into the -- so we are not even looking at the -- at the -- at the river here at this point. Same with 290. And then 291 -- and I believe I'm -- I'm pretty sure I know where this is taken. This is right as you are approaching where the intake splits off from the river itself, but I do believe that there is a little bit of cobble at this point along the channel, and it's almost evident in the picture in here. So that's kind of where -- if I remember right, where you start seeing that cobble that I refer to as probably dredging from the channel.

\footnotetext{
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Q. And --
A. And then 292 -- I believe you said
through 292?
Q. Yes.
A. Again, this picture is looking away from the channel, so I wouldn't expect to see anything there in terms of cobble.
Q. And turning to the next page, which is 108302, there are no cobbles visible in this picture either, correct?
A. I wouldn't necessarily say from this angle that you would be able to see it, but I'm looking a little bit further up. I'm standing up on top. So I'm not necessarily looking straight down. So I wouldn't necessarily say that absolutely that I see -- would see no -- or none of that type of cobble there. It could just be the view of this picture.
Q. In the picture, in the view, there is no cobble visible, correct?
A. I think that would be correct, yes.
Q. And turning to the next page, 108313, if you could flip for the next six pages through 108318, and tell me whether there are any
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cobbles visible in any of these pictures?
A. No. And I wouldn't expect any.

These are all pictures looking more towards the interior, because I'm not just looking at the bank, but also the interior. So all of those pictures through the 318, from 313 to 318, are looking away from -- from the embankment. So I wouldn't expect to see any there.
Q. And can you please turn to 108323?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you can look through the next set of six pictures, from 108323 to 108328. There are no cobbles visible in any of these pictures, correct?
A. Again, that entire sequence of pictures is from the internal part then of my site inspection, so not along the bank. So I wouldn't expect to see the cobbles there, at the surface at least.
Q. And just to confirm, in the pictures, you don't see any cobbles, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And turning to Bates 108329, there are no cobbles visible in this picture, correct?
\[
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A. Correct. Again, quite a distance off the bank.
Q. So you are quite a distance from the river, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. How far -- do you have any estimate of how far you are from the river?
A. Kind of hard to tell on the scale here. You can see the river in the background there, so a couple hundred feet.
Q. And if you could page through the next five pages and tell me whether there are any cobbles visible in any of these pictures?
A. Five pages? That is correct. Again, these are interior pictures. So not along the embankment.
Q. And if you could turn to Bates page 108335.
A. Okay.
Q. There are no cobbles visible in this picture, correct?
A. That's correct. Pretty heavily overgrown here, but getting closer to the bank knowing kind of where this picture is taken, there
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is cobble there. You just don't see it in this picture. It's a little bit further off the bank.
Q. And you do see the river in this picture, though, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you can see the river in the upper right-hand corner?
A. The upper right-hand corner is the sky. The river is kind of right in the middle where you can see through the bushes.
Q. So looking at the upper right-hand corner, it's your testimony that --
A. Oh, no, I take it back. Yep.

That's water there. You are correct. So, yep, the river goes along there. I was focused in on -- I'm looking right through the -- through the brush here.
Q. That white spot in the middle looks to be a bright reflection from the river, correct?
A. Yeah, either that or just a sun reflection on the lens or whatnot, but yes.
Q. Okay.
A. And yeah, upper right, you are correct. That is water.
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Q. Okay. And turning to the next page, this Bates 108337, there are no cobbles visible in this picture, correct?
A. If this is the particular area I'm thinking of, by the angle of this picture, no, you will not see any. Cobbles will be over to the right.
Q. And there is a -- do you see what looks like a metal pole in this picture?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you know where that's located at the Joliet 29 property?
A. If I -- I'm just looking at this picture, and, you know, it's a pole that was when we were doing the repairs. It was probably anchoring down a hay log. So I can -- yeah, wherever we did our repairs, you will generally find some of these remnants still there.
Q. So this is one of the areas that you believe you repaired?
A. Not I believe. Yes, it is one of the areas I repaired.
Q. Fair enough. And do you know which

\section*{area?}
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A. Okay. 108342, no, you cannot see any cobbles in this picture. And if I recognize this area correctly, I wouldn't expect to either. 108343, same. This is an area right by the fence. That's not an area -- it's along the intake channel. So it's not an area where I'd see cobble.
Q. And, Mr. Gnat, the fence in 108343, what fence is that?
A. That is that east fence line. That's that northeast corner.

\section*{Q. So that is not the property line,} correct?
A. That is correct. 108344, no, you cannot see any cobbles in this. Pretty well overgrown. The repairs we put in are holding pretty well. 108345, same area, just another -whenever I do these site walks, I usually try and document some of the areas that we did the repairs on, just to be able to document how they are holding up, and these particular pictures are documenting that and showing how well put in the -- or how well the vegetation has taken over at this point, which is what we want.
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\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]

Page 119
of pictures that go from 108382 through 108393, can you confirm that there are no cobbles visible in any of these pictures?
A. All the way through 108393, these are all, again, pictures of the internal part away from the embankment. So it's at the surface you certainly don't see any pictures -- or don't see any cobbles and haven't seen them in the past, and they are certainly not on the picture.
Q. Thank you. And Complainants move HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. Gale?

MS. GALE: No objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank
you. Complainants' Exhibit 1519 is admitted. No objection.
(Whereupon, Complainants'
Exhibit No. 1519 was admitted into evidence.)

BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. And bear with me a minute here while I flip over.
were discussing the northwest area at Joliet. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you ever seen cobbles in the northwest area?
A. Similar to what we -- what \(I\) was referring to in terms of my walks?
Q. Yes.
A. No. I mean, there are chunks of dolomite. You have got bedrock pretty close to the surface there, and there are some chunks laying around, but not -- I don't view that the same as my embankment walk.
Q. And when you say you don't view that the same as your embankment area, are you saying you don't see cobbles in the northwest area that are similar to cobbles you have seen in the embankment area?
A. I guess I would view that when I'm walking along a channel like the Des Plaines River or Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal or whatever, and you see big chunks of dolomite and limestone, knowing that these things have been ripped through the bedrock to deepen channels and so on for
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navigation, you know, you kind of make that correlation.

Okay. This is from the -- you
know, the process, the construction process.
You're right there by the lock and dam. Up in the northwest area, I'm well away from that, so I can't make that association. I do know that bedrock is fairly shallow. I do know that fill that people use for roads and whatnot includes -you know, in the area coming from local quarries can include dolomite of various sizes and so on.

So when I see a larger chunk or something of dolomite laying on an internal piece, I don't have that connection. I'm not walking right along the bank of a navigational waterway that I know has been dredged.
Q. Earlier today you talked about the northwest area being sampled potentially for construction for a wind break for the coal pile. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Was ash from the northwest area ever used for that wind break?
A. That project, the request for
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proposal went out, but that project never materialized.
Q. So I think you answered my next question, which is, do you know if the wind break was ever constructed?
A. Not to my understanding.
Q. And you also were talking about Powerton earlier today.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were talking about water levels rising, and \(I\) believe it was in relation to the Secondary Ash Basin. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said you never saw -- you yourself never saw water levels 30 feet above the bottom of the ash basin, correct?
A. Above the Service Water Basin, and I believe I said neither myself, nor any of my sampling crews that would go out there. I'd imagine if an entire impoundment was under water, they would let me know.
Q. How many days per year do you go to
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Powerton?
A. I -- there are crews out there doing quarterly sampling, and the sampling around there takes roughly five days. So one week per quarter.
Q. So five days per quarter?
A. Correct.
Q. And four times a year?
A. Correct. And then if we have to do a resampling, you know, we go out there. We also do monthly -- at this point monthly water levels at Powerton as well. So one for another day a month for the months in between the quarters somebody is out there as well, yes.
```

Q. Okay. So your crews, if my math is correct, spend at -- approximately 37 days per year at Powerton?
A. Probably correct, yes.
Q. And we had an exhibit that was the site map of -- I'm sorry. Not the site map, but a KPRG satellite image of Powerton. I don't have the name for it, but can you find that in front of you still?

```
A. Which book would that be in, or
which --
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Q. That would be in book 3.
A. The excerpt from Exhibit 1307?
Q. I believe so. So you have the
excerpt of 1307 in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you please tell me whether there are monitoring wells along the west side of the channels?
A. There is -- there are two channels. There is -- the ash ponds are on -- or the ash basins are on the east side of the eastern most channel shown there. There are no wells to the west of that channel.
Q. And then there is another channel, correct?
A. Correct, there is another channel.
Q. And the second channel is west of the channel next to the ponds?
A. Correct.
Q. And are there monitoring wells along the west side of the western most channel?
A. No.
Q. Are there monitoring wells located in between the two channels?
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A. No.
Q. So when you or your crew are out
there doing the groundwater monitoring, you are not walking between the channels, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And when you and your crew are out there, you are not walking along the west side of the channels when you are doing -- checking the monitoring wells?
A. Correct.
Q. And I want to turn to Waukegan. You discussed Waukegan today, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you discussed the adjustment of the east berm of the East Pond at Waukegan, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What adjustment needed to be made?
A. I wasn't involved on that. I
believe that was part of the inspection. On the stability inspection, I believe that height of the wall had to come down a little bit, but again, \(I\) wasn't part of that project. It was a different firm.
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Q. Is it your understanding that the height of the wall needed to come down for stability purposes?
A. I don't know for the specific purpose, but that's my understanding. You know, again \(I\) was -- our firm did not do that.
Q. But was your firm involved in the construction permit for that adjustment?
A. No.
Q. And I want to refer to Will County now. You testified as to Will County this morning as well, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And your firm has been involved in work for Midwest Gen under the federal CCR rule, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the federal CCR rule came into force in 2015; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Illinois EPA CCR rule came into force later than the federal CCR rule, correct?
A. I believe, 2021.

\footnotetext{
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Q. And there were closure plans for the Will County ponds under the federal rule, correct?
A. Yes. I believe that 2 South, 3

South were under the federal rule.
Q. And you referenced a -- you
referenced a meeting last week for the Will County ponds, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that meeting was for the purposes of the Illinois CCR rule, correct?
A. That, as well as under the federal rule, for corrective action, assessment of corrective measures for Ponds 2 South, 3 South, yes.
Q. And that -- one of the purposes of that meeting was to present an alternatives analysis, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that -- at that meeting, was it communicated that the selected alternative for closure of 2 South and 3 South was cap in place; is that correct?
A. Yeah. I believe the preferred alternative that was identified for the public
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meeting was to cap in place, yes.
Q. Do you know what the preferred
alternative was under the federal rule prior to the Illinois EPA rule going into effect?

MS. GALE: Objection.
Mischaracterizes the documents. There -- there is no preferred alternative under the federal rule. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:

Ms. Bugel?
MS. BUGEL: I'll rephrase.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank
you.
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. Do you know if there was an alternative for closure of Ponds 2 South and 3 South selected for Will County under the federal rule?
A. I believe that you have to identify what you are thinking that the -- the closure might be at that point. What it was back in 2015 and what was developed, I -- honestly, I don't remember. That was more of the engineering side of the house.
Q. Okay. Okay. Moving on.
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documents that are generated as part of these submittals that \(I\) want to -- so, yes, I would have been involved in the geology and hydrogeology aspect of it, and any -- if the -- I don't know if this document includes any of the support modeling? Yes, it does. And I was also involved in the direction and interpretation of some of the modeling efforts in support of the alternatives analysis.
Q. And this -- this is the document that was being discussed at the meeting that you referenced last week, correct?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And you attended that meeting?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you answered questions at that
meeting?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do you know if this document has an appendix that covers cost figures for the closure alternatives?

MS. GALE: Mr. Hearing Officer, we are going to object to the questions about this document. This document is -- you know, there was
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an objection earlier about the lateness of
documents. This document is very recent, and, you know, we -- the Complainants have routinely objected to, you know, surprise and lateness. And so we would also have an objection to surprise and lateness of documents here.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I think
one of them was the recent FOIA request.
But, anyway, Ms. Bugel.
MS. BUGEL: On direct Mr. Gnat
brought up the meeting -- the hearing -- sorry -the meeting of last week; discussed it, raised this very document by referencing that meeting and discussing the goings on, and --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah. I agree. I think -- you know, I think the door was opened.

> And so overruled. You may
continue.
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. So one question. Is there a table
of cost figures for cost estimates for the closure alternatives in this document?
A. I don't think that was included in
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this document. Oh, no, it is, absolutely. Table 2. It appears to be Table 2.
Q. And Table 2 contains the closure alternatives analysis cost estimates comparison; is that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And do you recall any questions about cost estimates being asked at that meeting last week?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. Complainants move for Exhibit 1520 to be admitted into the record. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. Gale? MS. GALE: Objection to relevance. I mean, she talked about one table. Same objections that we have had routinely. This is a pretty large document, very technical. They have talked about one table. This also, again, is a surprise to us, which that has been upheld before, and, you know, we just don't see how it's relevant.

Yes, he testified that he sat in a meeting last week pursuant to the Illinois CCR rule to discuss compliance with that rule, but
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that doesn't make this document relevant to these proceedings, which are related to the compliance with the groundwater rules under 620.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Ms. Bugel?
MS. BUGEL: This -- we have
established that the document pertains to the meeting, and closure alternatives were being discussed at the meeting, and closure alternatives are discussed in the document very generally. In addition, closure alternatives are very relevant to the remedy at issue in this proceeding.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I will
allow one more response, Ms. Gale.
MS. GALE: Well, closure -- again, this is -- closure alternatives are important for this Illinois CCR rule analysis. This is a document acquired by -- under Part 845. This proceeding is not an analysis of compliance with Part 845. This proceeding is related to compliance with 620 and any remedy that may -- the Board may consider.

Now, but again, that doesn't establish that this document is relevant to the
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Board on deciding what its -- what its decisionmaking should be.

MS. BUGEL: May I respond?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Last
time. Thank you.
MS. BUGEL: Okay. The -- this goes
to the heart of this proceeding, is how to address the violations. This goes through closure alternatives for the ponds, which is one option at the Board's disposal for remedy. So this is -they are hand in hand. Even if they are under different legal -- legal framework, they -it's -- all the same options can be considered for both closure and for remedy in this proceeding.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah. I think it's relevant, and it possibly could assist the Board. Midwest's objections are noted for the record, but \(I\) will admit it over objection.

Complainants' Exhibit 1520 is
admitted.
(Whereupon, Complainants'
Exhibit No. 1520 was admitted
into evidence.)
MS. BUGEL: And, Hearing Officer,
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may I have five minutes to confer with co-counsel? We are virtually wrapping up. I just want to make sure I have covered everything.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. We are off the record.
(Whereupon, a short break was taken.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
right. We are back on the record. Thank you.
Ms. Bugel.
BY MS. BUGEL:
Q. Yes. We are referring back to the excerpt of Exhibit 601 from May. And Leah has pulled this out of the boxes for the witness, for Mr. Gnat.

And, Mr. Gnat, just could you please grab Exhibit 1518, which is hopefully still in front of you? And referring to the excerpt of Exhibit 601, you discussed this area of land that is not necessarily owned by Midwest Generation in your testimony in May.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you on the record described the
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area. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Exhibit 601, does this show the property line, and this -- does this show the property line as the Joliet No. 229 station?
A. My understanding is this is the property line that was surveyed and associated with the project there for the Army Corp of Engineers, and that is the property line that -there is that strip of land there that is actually, I believe DNR property or Army Corp of Engineers property, but not Midwest Generation property, correct.
Q. Okay. And Exhibit 601, the expert shows that little strip of land that is not Midwest Gen property?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And referring back to

Exhibit 1518, can you just look at Area 5, please?
A. Area 5?
Q. Yeah, pages 9 and 10.
A. Okay.
Q. And is Area 5 -- let me strike that and rephrase that.
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public comment tomorrow. We have learned that there may be three more people coming.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Three
more out of -- in addition to what?
MS. BUGEL: Initially, we had said two. So we are looking at about four people coming at 1:00, and I just did want to advise that one of the people coming at 1:00 is the Mayor of Waukegan.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
MS. BUGEL: So I just want that to be transparent. In addition, we have had a request for Representative Avelar out in Will County. She would like to come offer comment, but she cannot come at 1:00. She is requesting to come in the morning tomorrow. I do not have a time.

MS. NIJMAN: You know, Mr. Hearing Officer, again, I'm struggling with this, but this happened in the last -- in 2019 as well, and it happened during our week. If they have public comment, it should have been handled during the week that they were presenting their case. Now, it interrupts our case flow. It interrupts now
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several times, apparently. Now, it's not two for three minutes. Now, it's longer. This is becoming -- this shouldn't have been done in our week, and we may well go over then.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah, we may. I mean, it's the Board's policy to have public comment, but I agree with you, Ms. Nijman, that this could have been done during the Complainants' case, and we were told via e-mail about the two or three, and now we may have three more, so \(I\) count five.

MS. BUGEL: Five.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: And it's three minutes a piece?

MS. BUGEL: Five at three minutes a piece. I will note that we -- we ended before. You know, and there was never an argument --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah.
MS. BUGEL: -- about a 50/50 split.
We didn't even use a full week. We were on to Midwest Gen's witnesses by lunch time.

MS. NIJMAN: Which is why they
should have been done --
MS. GALE: You should have done them
\[
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then.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Yeah, we're still on the record. So let's not talk over each other.

I am going to allow it, but, you
know -- and I believe the rules -- I haven't looked at them in a while -- is it's as time allows. And if need be, we will just have to shorten our lunch for a day or two. I mean, I don't know, but --

MS. NIJMAN: Is there a way to do this all at once --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, as part of the --

MS. NIJMAN: -- rather that splitting up our cases?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, you mean as far as bringing the other witnesses in? But she doesn't know when the state rep is coming in.

MS. NIJMAN: And so we have to stop in the middle of a witness because the state rep is coming?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Maybe so,
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Ms. Nijman. That's the way the ball roles.
MS. BUGEL: I have no control over
the state rep's schedule.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I --
neither do I. I agree. The timeliness is not the most ideal. But we will have them on. They can give their three minutes, and we will see what happens. We won't -- we won't mess with your -whether you are doing a direct or not. We will have the state rep wait for a little bit until you are done, so you don't have to stop in the middle of your direct or re-direct or whatnot. Ms. Bugel, if she is doing a cross or Mr. Abel, they can stop. But is that agreed?

MS. BUGEL: Agreed. And I will
advise the state rep that she may have to wait if we are in the middle of --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: If -yeah, we were in the middle of something.

MS. BUGEL: Yeah.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You know, it won't be too long, but we will try to get her in.
\[
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Do you recall those questions?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And -- well, \(I\) will ask this.

Why -- and at the end of borings
for each of these logs, why did the boring end?
A. You know, it's not put on these logs and in a way, shame on us, but knowing this particular effort, this was done with a Geoprobe drilling rig, which is a technology that pounds the sampler down, and this was because of refusal hitting large -- larger cobbles or whatnot that the technology just couldn't get past.
Q. So -- and I'm sorry. So you said -you used the term "Geoprobe." What is a Geoprobe?
A. A Geoprobe is a drilling tool that rather than spinning like an auger does or a rotary-type approach, this is strictly hammering down and hammering a core barrel down literally with a hydraulic hammer.
Q. And where -- and so I see on the boring log, the first one there at the bottom it says, "Use of rig, Geoprobe." Is that what you mean?
A. Yes.
\[
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Geoprobe hits it. If it's large enough, and the Geoprobe is hitting the cobble, you know, just along the side, it will probably break it off or should be able to angle past it, but if you take -- get a large cobble and you hit it head on, you may, in fact, just hit refusal. You won't be able to get past that.
Q. And you mentioned earlier the

Geoprobe is different than -- I think you used the term "auger." What is an auger?
A. Right, a hollow stem auger. It's a different drilling method where you're actually spinning down an auger, and when an auger encounters a cobble-size fraction, it can quite often just go along the side and spin it up the side of the auger and bring it to the surface, but, you know, in terms of limitations for drilling methods, if you get into a big cobble -into a big actual boulder field, hollow stem arguers aren't the best to go through those either, because those are just too big, and it can't bring it up. It's going to sit on top of that boulder and just turn and not be able to get past it.
Q. And so -- but all right.

Well, I am going to actually
give to you an excerpt of Complainants'
Exhibit 12C. And 12C, for the record, was
introduced and admitted in the first hearing, and the -- what we have here is an excerpt of the Hydrogeologic Assessment Report prepared by Patrick Engineering in February of 2011.

Can you turn to the -- so to the first -- sorry. I guess the second page?
A. Yes.
Q. And you see it's for Monitoring Well 9?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you want to turn in your

Exhibit 2 -- excuse me -- binder 2 to
Exhibit 1503?
A. Yes.
Q. And 1503 is a map, right?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. So what monitoring well is on 1503?
A. MW-09.
Q. And so looking at the boring -- and so in exhibit -- Complainants Exhibit 12C, is this
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boring log Monitoring Well 9, the monitoring
log -- excuse me -- the monitoring well in 1503?

```
    A. Yes, it is.
    Q. Okay. So I want you to look at --
so this goes all the way down to 35 feet, right?
    A. Yes.
    Q. What's the difference?
    A. Well, this -- this boring was done
with the hollow stem auger right there on the
drilling method. It says there a 4.25 inch ID
hollow stem auger, has, that signifies a 4.25-inch
inner diameter hollow stem auger.
    So this is that drilling method
that can certainly handle cobbles left that are --
where if it encounters a cobble layer, it can
bring those cobbles up, as opposed to getting
stalled out on them.
    Q. Okay. And, yeah, could you look
at -- in the Patrick Engineering boring log
Monitoring Well 9 at 11 feet?
    A. Yes.
    Q. What do you -- what is -- what is
shown at 11 feet?
    A. Limestone fragments with wet ground
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silty fine to course sand, dry.
Q. And what do the limestone
fragments -- fragments mean to you?
A. Knowing what the bedrock in the area is, it's a limestone dolomite-type bedrock, and so a lot of the soils and so on in this area, and even the materials being used as fill being brought in from offsite will include this type of limestone fragment. It's provided for the weathered bedrock in the area.
Q. In relation to using the pounding of a Geoprobe, and you see limestone fragment at 11 feet, what does that mean?
A. That this material has fragments and -- limestone fragments usually tell me it's, you know, gravel size, maybe a little bit on the larger size of gravel within -- within this material.

So, you know, again, that this is probably within 20 feet or so of bedrock at some point. You know, that you are eventually going to get close to that bedrock, you know, weathered limestone fragments on top of weathered bedrock.
Q. All right. I want to turn to -- you can put that aside. Thank you.

And can you pull out
Complainants' Exhibit 248N?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And this is the

August 27th -- excuse me -- August 27, 2009 inspection report.

Mr. Gnat, after you did this inspection -- well, let's turn to page MWG13-15_19444.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. After the bullet point, first full paragraph where it states, "KPRG met with Allied Landscaping", what was the point -- what was the purpose of meeting with Allied Landscape -- excuse me.
A. To go over the areas and to get their estimate for the necessary materials and labor to do the repairs that we would like them to do to address these areas that were identified.
Q. And were the repairs made?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. And do you recall discussing them at
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the first hearing?
A. I believe we did, and I believe I generally said that we tried to -- I would get the contractor out the same day that I finished the inspection, get their costs, and we were trying to get these repairs done within anywhere of two to four weeks of the initial inspection.
Q. And for the record, the repair that was discussed was Midwest Gen Exhibit No. 800.

Turning to your observations of Area 2, which is on MWG13-15_19443.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see in that Area 2
description where you say -- you describe the size of the gully as 50 feet long, up to 4 feet deep and 10 feet wide, and then you say there is evidence of --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?
BY MS. GALE:
Q. I'm sorry. And then you say there is evidence of ash and slag in the bottom of the gully, G-U-L-L-Y. When you say evidence of ash and slag, what do you mean by that?
A. Well, when -- when I looked on the
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sides, I didn't see any, but in the bottom of the gully where you actually saw -- I saw some -- you know, the exposed dirt, and so I saw some evidence of some -- some ash material kind of sparkly, sandy looking and some cindery material within that soil in the bottom of the gully itself. So that's -- that's what that was trying to describe.
Q. So when you are describing what you observe here in the ash and slag, are you saying that it's a monofill of ash or slag?

MS. BUGEL: Objection, leading.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
right. Can you rephrase, Ms. Gale?
BY MS. GALE:
Q. When you describe the ash and slag at the bottom of the gully and the ash and slag you see -- you saw in these various areas, what is the composition of the ash and slag?
A. It's part of the dirt that -- out of the exposed dirt that \(I\) was seeing. So it's not like it was just all solid ash or a wall of ash or something. It was just dirt with -- to me that was evidence of ash and cinder mixed in with it.
Q. Okay. You can put that aside.


Okay. And I would like you to pull out Exhibit 1513 and Exhibit 1519. We are going to look at those together.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. Are you ready?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, as you -- when you are out here -- so these pictures of your -- are of your -- as you walk along your inspection?
A. Yes.
Q. And, well, what order are the pictures in?
A. Well, I generally -- they should be in consecutive order of when \(I\) start my walk to when I finish it. So, as I am walking down along the embankment from -- in this particular case from west to east, \(I\) would be taking pictures of the embankment, but there are times also when \(I\) would turn around and take a picture looking up away from the -- from the river to -- you know, up -- up into the property itself, so -- but I would track along that way, and then on my way back as I am walking more on the interior of the property, then a sequence of the pictures on the
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interior of the property.
Again, sometimes looking north, sometimes looking south. You know, there will be a time where \(I\) stop in a location, and I'll take a picture north, east, south, west type.
Q. Can you flip -- so in Exhibit 1519, can you flip to MWG13-15-108292?
A. Yes.
Q. If you recall, you were asked questions about this picture and other pictures like it, and the -- and this picture not depicting cobble?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 1513 and go to picture MWG13-15_108293?
A. Yes.
Q. So compared to MWG13-15_108292
compared to 108293, what are you seeing in 293?
A. 293 is showing the embankment. On this particular picture, you can actually make out the cobbles, and some of them are bigger than cobbles, boulders.
Q. And I believe you said your process of going through is you will stop, and you'll take
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pictures in various directions?
A. Yes.
Q. What happened here between these two pictures?
A. Well, this is probably 292 -- or 292
is taken facing north and turn around and 293 facing south.
Q. And then I would like you to then turn to the next photo in 13 -- excuse me -- 1519, MWG13-15_108302 .
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you said that it was hard to see cobbles in this photo, but if you could turn in Exhibit 1513, and turn to

MWG13-15_108305, and comparing MWG13-15_108302 to 108305, what do you see?
A. Well, in the 305, which is a couple of pictures down, so a little bit further to the east along my walk, you can see the boulders and -- or cobbles and so on along the bank there. Well, this is -- the 302 is, you know, a little bit to the west of there, and you can't see it. I mean, certainly not from this angle, a fairly steep bank, lots of vegetation.

\footnotetext{
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
}

\section*{Q. So with lots of vegetation, what's under that vegetation?}

MS. BUGEL: Objection, calls for speculation.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, you
know, he has walked it. Evidently, this looks like it was in the fall. I see a lot of leaves. He can answer, if he is able.

BY THE WITNESS:
A. All right. And, again, even despite what you can't see in these pictures with lots of vegetation taken from a little bit further in, so if I knew I was going to take this picture to document for somebody that, in fact, I would see boulders or cobbles there, this picture would have been taken closer to the thing and focused down on it specifically for that purpose.

That wasn't necessarily for this
purpose. I'm trying to document my walk. If somebody says, "Rich, please document that walk and with each picture take one that makes sure it sees the cobbles that you see there," I would do that. Certainly, what I'm looking for is not as much -- cobbles aren't what's of interest to me.

What's of interest to me is a seep.
And I have no pictures of seeps,
because I have not seen any seeps, and so, you know, I guess, here I kind of sit here, and I'm trying to explain what I'm seeing. The pictures were taken to document the walk, to document whether or not I -- and documenting an erosional feature or if I'm documenting a seep.

If somebody said to me from the get-go, "Rich, walk, and every time you see a boulder, document it," I would have lots of pictures going along here, and ones where I'm not standing 15 feet or 10 feet off the side of the embankment with a lot of vegetation covering the embankment. If you went over there and took a look down, I will -- having walked this, you will see cobbles.

BY MS. GALE:
Q. And all this discussion of cobbles, I believe you testified cobbles were part of an indication to you of -- that there was dredging spoil. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Right. You know, and again, that's just the -- knowing of the construction history
of -- the history of that whole canal area and how all the canals in the areas were done, they were ripped into rock, and to see this type of materials along the sides doesn't surprise me.
Q. And -- but to your knowledge, are cobbles the only type of river spoils that would be seen?
A. No. Certainly there would also be any of the soft sediments, the sands, silts, clay or whatnot there are on top of rock as well. Those all get pulled up in any type of a project like that.
Q. Mr. Gnat, could you pull out book 3, please?
A. Okay.
Q. And can you turn to Exhibits 1515
and 1516?
A. Yes.
Q. And Exhibit 1515 and 1516 are the -just for the record, the river gauges at Peoria Lock and Dam and the Kingston Mines.

Mr. Gnat, how often are these
river gauges measured?
A. The river gauges are measured at
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least on a daily basis.
Q. And so when you look at the historic crests on the bottom of each of those pages, what do the historic crests tell you?
A. To me, that -- so on Exhibit 1515, the oldest date on that is 1943 to 2019, and I believe this was the date -- I'm looking further up graph, created November 27, 2022. So what this tells me, these are the top five with the dates included of what the five highest historic crests were, and this is based on daily measurements.
So that's -- the highest crest ever was 546.57 feet on April 24 th, 2013 based on daily recorded measurements by the USGS and NOAA. MS. GALE: Nothing further, sir.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, Ms. Gale.

Ms. Bugel, re-cross?
MS. BUGEL: We don't have re-cross, but we do have two exhibits left over from this morning that we needed to make copies of.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
MS. BUGEL: And we have prepared
those.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
MS. BUGEL: So, yeah, just for
documentation, we are -- we are distributing a new copy of 1518, which is a demonstrative, and it has the correction that Mr . Gnat wrote on it, and the addition of Area 6 on the last page.

MS. GALE: Wait. Area 6 is on --
MS. BUGEL: No. You are looking at the wrong one. I was talking about --

MS. GALE: I see. Oh, got it.
Okay.
(Whereupon, Complainants'
Exhibit No. 1521 was marked for identification.)

MS. BUGEL: And then we have also distributed what is marked as a new exhibit, 1521, which is the excerpt that Mr. Gnat indicated the property fence line on in black marker, and that one, Complainants move for the admission of 1521 into the record.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. I have 1521 up here? Oh, okay.

THE WITNESS: There is something on the back of 1521 as well, which on -- that's not
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part of what I looked at or anything.
MS. BUGEL: The -- what is on the
back of it -- because it is an excerpt from a previous exhibit. What is on the back of it is the -- and I believe it was 901? It was from 901, and the back of it is what was on the back of 901. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.

Let's take this one at a time.
Ms. Gale, Complainants'
Exhibit 1518 with the corrections as to Area 3, to Area 2 -- is that the only markup you had, Ms. Bugel?

MS. BUGEL: No. The last page has Area 6 added to it. And Mr. Gnat put a black dot where Area 6 is, generally.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
right. Ms. Gale, exhibit -- demonstrative Exhibit 1518?

MS. GALE: We would continue our
objection to the exhibit for the reasons we stated earlier.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank
you. So noted. And, again, I will take it as a demonstrative, 1518. There's really no
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]
substantive probative, but \(I\) think it would assist the Board in their decisionmaking.
(Whereupon, Complainants'
Exhibit No. 1518 was accepted as a demonstrative exhibit.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
right. Here we go. Complainants' Exhibit 1521. Ms. Gale?

MS. GALE: Well, the -- we are a little confused, because the one that we were handed earlier didn't have the second page, and Mr. Gnat said he doesn't know about the second page, but other -- you know, first page only.

MS. BUGEL: I believe the copy we distributed this morning did have the second page, and the reason it has the second page is it's because it's an excerpt from an exhibit. So we pulled it out the way -- that is the way it appears. I mean, it's the page 16 as it would appear in the original Exhibit 901.

But we are referencing -obviously Exhibit 1521 is -- the focus is on page 15, and the marks that Mr. Gnat added for -- so that the Board can see where the fence line occurs
at Joliet 29.
MS. GALE: As long as it's clear to
the Board that Mr. Gnat had nothing to do with the other side.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
Yeah, that's all on the record. It's like déjà vu all over again from five years ago as far as the exhibits. We've got to make them a little cleaner, but the Board is to, I guess, disregard the back side, but Exhibit 1521 is admitted. Thank you.
(Whereupon, Complainants'
Exhibit No. 1521 was admitted into evidence.)

MS. BUGEL: And with that,
Complainants have no further questions.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, Ms. Bugel.

Ms. Gale, any re-re-direct?
MS. GALE: No.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
right. Mr. Gnat, it's been fun.
THE WITNESS: It's been a pleasure.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We'll go
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
\]
off the record.
(Whereupon, a short break was taken.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All
right. We are back on the record. It's approximately 1:46. We are going to have a panel of two witnesses, which is kind of an anomaly for me, but it's been agreed to between the parties.

Gentlemen, if you could raise
your right hand, Kari will swear you in.
(Whereupon, the witnesses, Mr. Dorgan and Mr. Maxwell, were duly sworn.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. Ms. Nijman?

MS. NIJMAN: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm ready.

WHEREUPON:
\[
D O U G L A S \quad D O R G A N
\]
and
M I C H A E L M A X W E L L
called as witnesses herein, having been first duly sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:
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\[
D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N
\]

MS. NIJMAN: So, again, for the
record, we have two witnesses from Weaver
Consulting Group, Mr. Douglas Dorgan and
Mr. Michael Maxwell with agreement as a panel.
Mr. Dorgan, starting with you,
would you describe current employment for both you and Mr. Maxwell?

MR. DORGAN: Mr. Maxwell and I are both employed by Weaver Consultants Group. We are an environmental, civil and geotechnical engineering consulting firm.

MS. NIJMAN: And tell me more about your respective role at Weaver.

MR. DORGAN: So I joined Weaver Consultants in 1995. In 2000, I became a principal in the firm. In 1990 -- or in 2017, I became the firm's co-president. I still serve in that capacity. Throughout my time with Weaver, I have been doing primarily environmental consulting, but I have done a -- quite a few other things as well.
I have led our environmental
practice group. I've led our civil survey and
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geotechnical group, and have been very involved in supporting the other business units within the company as a whole.

MS. NIJMAN: What was the role of Weaver Consulting Group -- and can we just refer to it as Weaver?

MR. DORGAN: Certainly.
MS. NIJMAN: What was Weaver's role in this matter?

MR. DORGAN: We were initially asked to consider the Board's opinion, both the 2019 and 2020 opinion with respect to what would be the appropriate remedy and relief with respect to the findings from the earlier phase of the hearing for the four Midwest Generation stations that have been the subject of this matter.

MS. NIJMAN: And would you explain how you and Mr. Maxwell divvied up, divided up that project?

MR. DORGAN: So Mike and I have collaborated quite closely on the project as a whole. Obviously, there was a lot of historic information to review. We have both been very involved in looking at the record as a whole.
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Where we probably deviated was
Mike -- Mr. Maxwell ended up focusing his attention more on the Will County and Joliet Stations, whereas I focused more on Waukegan and the Powerton Stations. Mike took the lead on some of the technical analysis as well, working with some of our support team.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you have a binder in front of you?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you have that? And it's marked Weaver. Would you turn to the first tab of your binder?

And it is an excerpt from your expert report, which we will mark in a minute. So it's marked -- the CVs are identified and marked as Excerpt of Exhibit 1701.

Do you see that?
(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit
No. 1701 was marked for identification.)

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Turning to the first
page, is this your CV?
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Do you see that?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Would you tell me about your experience with brownfields redevelopment?

MR. DORGAN: So this callout box here is intended to be a summary of my general areas of focus throughout my really career and certainly my time while at Weaver. In particular, I have had a very concentrated focus in the area of brownfields redevelopment. That's been kind of a specialty of mine for quite a few years.

In brownfields redevelopment, we are looking at primarily older, industrial properties that are going through some form of closure or redevelopment, and the purpose is to
evaluate those properties with respect to the long-term uses and whether there is any legacy environmental concerns with these properties and how that might influence the redevelopment of and the future uses of the properties that are undergoing that redevelopment.

MS. NIJMAN: In your view, are the four Midwest Gen stations at issue here brownfields?

MR. DORGAN: I would consider them brownfields. While they may not necessarily going -- be going through a specific redevelopment, they certainly have a long history of industrial use. So they would -- they would fit into that type of classification.

MS. NIJMAN: Next on your list in your CV is the category of Remediation, Design, and Cost Modeling. Would you describe your experience there?

MR. DORGAN: Oftentimes as an
outgrowth of the brownfields work, but not always, we will end up evaluating properties with respect to how to manage the environmental conditions that are characterized. We oftentimes do that using
risk-based strategies, sometimes to preset regulatory-driven closure standards, and I have been involved in all phases of the remediation, both the investigation side, and then the remedial design, the planning for the remedial implementation in terms of putting together technical and general specifications.

> I've been involved in the bidding process; contractor review and selection, and ultimately contractor oversight, and then as the remediation is completed, we are doing a lot of the engineering oversight of that, and then the regulatory reporting to the appropriate regulatory agency.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned remedial measures. Does that -- when you assess a remedial measure, do you consider different types of remedies that might be appropriate?

MR. DORGAN: Certainly. And it can vary, depending upon -- depending upon which regulatory program you are working in. When we are looking at brownfields, we tend to look at it more from the state voluntary cleanup type of a strategy. This isn't a CERCLA site. It's not a
not RCRA site. So those standards don't necessarily apply. And in a situation with a typical brownfield in Illinois, we would do more of an alternatives evaluation. What are the various options we might have, and then what is technically feasible and economically practicable to implement?

MS. NIJMAN: You said just a minute ago that this is isn't a RCRA or CERCLA site. Were you referring to one station, or all stations?

MR. DORGAN: I was referring to all four stations.

MS. NIJMAN: Tell me about the different type of media you work with in the brownfields work.

MR. DORGAN: Pretty much runs the gamut, including groundwater, surface water, sediments, surface waters. We look at -oftentimes, we even get into air sampling, in terms of perimeter air sampling when that is called for.

MS. NIJMAN: And is your experience in Illinois?
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MR. DORGAN: No. I have worked all around the country.

MS. NIJMAN: How much of your experience is in Illinois versus other parts of the country?

MR. DORGAN: I would say the majority of it has been in Illinois, but \(I\) have exposure to a number of other states and other programs, both at the federal and state level.

MS. NIJMAN: Can you estimate how many design projects you have worked on in your career?

MR. DORGAN: It's been in the hundreds.

MS. NIJMAN: And I should say remedial design projects.

MR. DORGAN: That would be the same.
MS. NIJMAN: Also, on your CV you list a groundwater impact assessment. What do you mean there?

MR. DORGAN: So in a groundwater impact assessment, we are looking at, you know, have there been releases at a facility that may have impacted groundwater, and if so, what's the
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condition of the groundwater? What are the groundwater units that are involved? What's the plume condition? Oftentimes we evaluate downgradient receptors that may come in contact with groundwater impacts.

MS. NIJMAN: Does an analysis of risk have anything to do with that -- with that groundwater impact assessment?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, and it kind of dovetails into that next point there, which is the risk-based corrective action.

So we have instances where we are driven towards certain outcomes based upon the regulatory framework. In others, we are working within a context where a risk-based corrective action, RBCA, is more appropriate. We are looking there at what are the concentrations? What are the pathways? What are the receptors that may come in contact with those pathways?

And ultimately, we back into our remedy by concentrating first on what our receptor population and risk is to that receptor population. So that's kind of what I'm referring to there.
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MS. NIJMAN: Is that an Illinois-based concept?

MR. DORGAN: Illinois certainly follows. This is more guidance that came out at the federal level under the risk-based corrective action.

MS. NIJMAN: On this issue of risk-based remediation in Illinois, we have bandied about in other testimony the word, "TACO". You are familiar with that word?

MR. DORGAN: The tiered approach to corrective action objectives?

MS. NIJMAN: And what is the first tier of this tiered approach?

MR. DORGAN: So in Illinois, the TACO program has three tiers. The first tier are a set of default criteria, that you can evaluate site conditions against. If you fall below the default criteria based upon your intended land use, you have no further to go. You have demonstrated that there is no risk, and therefore, the conditions are already managed.

MS. NIJMAN: And do the TACO Tier I standards provide a cleanup standard?
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MR. DORGAN: Yes, they do.
MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned
experience with remediation sites. Do you work with the -- well, we will just take Illinois -Illinois agencies when you plan a remediation of a brownfield site?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, we -- I often
have.
MS. NIJMAN: In the course of remediation, what happens if you disagree with an agency?

MR. DORGAN: Typically, there will be quite a bit of back and forth as you try to strike that balance in terms of bringing the Agency to a comfort level with your overall approach and strategy and the information that you have, and it's not uncommon you made submittals, you get a set of comments back, you respond to those comments, maybe you get further comments, and typically you'll eventually drive to an approval on whatever it is that you are seeking the approval for.

MS. NIJMAN: Have you served as an expert witness in the past?
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experience within the CCR framework as well. MS. NIJMAN: Is that surprising to
you?
MR. DORGAN: Not necessarily.
Certainly, when you have differences of opinion, I suppose there is an instance where you may choose to question qualifications, but that's not something I would do.

MS. NIJMAN: Had you ever met
Mr. Quarles before the hearing -- this hearing in May?

MR. DORGAN: No, I had not.
MS. NIJMAN: And you have never
worked with him before?
MR. DORGAN: I have not.
MS. NIJMAN: Would you detail for us your experience with CCR?

MR. DORGAN: I have been working -well, with coal combustion byproducts for many years predating the CCR rules. Any number of project sites that I have been involved with have had coal combustion residues as a component of the site conditions.

But I also do have experience
working on sites that are exclusively CCB, including a large landfill in northwest Indiana that I have worked on for many years. I have also done a number of CCR closures of regulated units, two recent ones that we have just done in New Jersey.

MS. NIJMAN: Have you worked on CCR to the extent that it is also a part of another site?

MR. DORGAN: Yes. CCR, you tend to run into it especially here in the Chicago area. You run into it pretty frequently, especially as part of the Chicago fill materials that we're dealing with. Pretty much any site we do in the city involves Chicago fill materials, and CCRs are often a component of the materials we are dealing with.

MS. NIJMAN: And to be clear then, we're not -- we're -- how are you referring to CCRs when you are talking about Chicago fill material?

MR. DORGAN: I'm referring to it as just one of the constituents making up a matrix that we're managing.
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MS. NIJMAN: Like a cinder or --
MR. DORGAN: It could be cinder. It could be combusted materials. Historically, many of the buildings downtown were heated with coal, and so you run into coal ash pretty frequently when you are dealing with city sites.

MS. NIJMAN: And going back to one of your comments about site remediations, are you familiar with the term "compliance commitment agreement"?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I am.
MS. NIJMAN: How is that part of a site remediation?

MR. DORGAN: A compliance commitment agreement is generally a voluntary structure that you enter into with the regulatory agency, in this case, the IEPA. That spells out the steps you are going to take to remedy site conditions that are deemed to warrant that. It's a step-by-step process that outlines the individual, as the term says, commitments, that the owner is making to implement to try to address the concerns that have been identified. And those are usually spelled out in quite a bit of detail.
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MS. NIJMAN: Were you present during
Mr. Quarles' testimony in May?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, I was.
MS. NIJMAN: Did you hear
Mr. Quarles say that he thought the CCA was intended to avoid compliance?

MR. DORGAN: I did hear him say that.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you agree with that characterization?

MR. DORGAN: No. When you enter into a compliance commitment agreement, you are taking proactive steps. You are doing it voluntarily. You are doing it in consultation with the regulatory agency. You are agreeing on the proposed course of action. The Agency is agreeing with you, and you are committing to certain follow-up actions.

So I -- I don't see something
that is intending to avoid in -- compliance. I think it's intended to create a framework by which you can demonstrate compliance.

MS. NIJMAN: Mr. Maxwell, turning to you for a moment.
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If you continue on what was Tab 1 in your binder, after Mr. Dorgan's CV, is that your CV?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, it is.
MS. NIJMAN: And is your employment history and education on your CV still accurate?
MR. MAXWELL: The one item that I did want to update was \(I\) was recently licensed in the State of Wisconsin as a licensed professional geologist. So with that addition, that listing of education, certifications is accurate.
THE COURT REPORTER: Could you speak into the mic a little bit?
MR. MAXWELL: Oh, I'm sorry.
MS. NIJMAN: Better?
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. NIJMAN: And what is your -yeah, I think you were tilting so we could see past Kari.
THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry.
MS. NIJMAN: No. Not at all.
What -- and looking at your
professional history, what is your role at Weaver?
MR. MAXWELL: So I serve as the
```
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Chicago Environmental Practice Group operations manager, and we have got a team of 10 to 12 geologists and engineers, that -- work in -- in the Chicago office, and so I assist with -- with managing that group.

MS. NIJMAN: And what is your experience with old industrial properties or brownfields, as we have been referring to them?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So I actually began my career in -- at Weaver in 1996, which was the first year that the site remediation program and TACO program was promulgated. So I started at an interesting time in our industry, and have been able to learn the ropes, if you will, of the SRP and TACO program really right from the beginning of my career.

So I have worked on -- the focus of my practice has been Illinois and Indiana, and have had opportunity to work on probably in the low hundreds of numbers of what will be considered brownfields site investigations, and many cases they lead to evaluation of remediation, and ultimately remediation.
MS. NIJMAN: And similar to
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Mr. Dorgan, what is your experience with designing a remedy for a site?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So, again, having been involved in many, many brownfields, remedy evaluation is sort of a fundamental aspect of assessing brownfields. The process is to assess, to use that information and that data to try to design a -- the proper remedy that is going to be protective of human health and the environment based upon the data that has been collected.

And so there is a process that goes through where certain -- certain technologies are deemed more practicable and feasible than others, and there is a process that gets executed where you ultimately decide on what's best for each individual site based on the site characteristics, and based on the regulator program as well.

MS. NIJMAN: Is that what you and Mr. Dorgan did for the four Midwest Generation stations?

MR. MAXWELL: That was the general process that we undertook, yes, as it relates to
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identifying the appropriate remedy.
MS. NIJMAN: Have you dealt with CCR as a component of remedies you've developed? MR. MAXWELL: I have. MS. NIJMAN: What -- can you explain that further?

MR. MAXWELL: Yep, yep. So, I guess in a couple of different aspects. The first would be, as Mr. Dorgan mentioned, cinders and ash and coal ash are commonly found in almost any site here in the city that we investigate, because of the historical Chicago fire. So those -- those materials are encountered just as a general course of investigating sites here in the city.

And then, secondly, there has
been a -- several coal combustion residual landfills that are permitted under the different regulations, different than brownfield regulations, permitted under state regulations for industrial waste landfills or the federal CCR regulations that were promulgated in 2015.

MS. NIJMAN: Have you also had an opportunity to review Mr. Quarles' reports in this matter?

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

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I have.
MS. NIJMAN: Did you note whether
Mr. Quarles had a discussion about your qualifications?

MR. MAXWELL: Yep. I did notice that he commented on my qualifications.

MS. NIJMAN: And prior to this
matter, had you ever met Mr. Quarles?
MR. MAXWELL: I have not, no.

MS. NIJMAN: And have you ever worked with Mr. Quarles?

MR. MAXWELL: I have not, no.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall what
concerns Mr. Quarles raised about your qualifications?

MR. MAXWELL: He was concerned that my -- that a groundwater monitoring program that I was involved -- that $I$ helped design was rejected by the regulator.

MS. NIJMAN: And was that right?

MR. MAXWELL: Absolutely not. As
Mr. Dorgan mentioned, the -- this type of a process where you are satisfying a particular regulation on behalf of a client is a situation

[^25]where there is oftentimes give and take between a -- the regulator and the consultant in this case. And so that was the case in this particular instance. There was a tactical matter that needed to be resolved, and we ultimately resolved that, and the groundwater monitoring program that Weaver designed at this particular site is actually in play today and is being used to help monitor this particular site.

MS. NIJMAN: How many groundwater monitoring systems do you think you have installed in your career?

MR. MAXWELL: If you count the brownfields, because the brownfields are, you know, less formal and different regulations, many dozens of groundwater monitoring systems at both brownfield sites and sites that are under different -- different regulations in terms of CCR and solid hazardous waste landfills as well.

I think that's an important point, too, because the groundwater monitoring regulations under the CCR rules are mirrored after the Subtitle D and Subtitle C groundwater monitoring regulations for landfills that were --
that have been in place since the mid-90s. So there is -- there is a lot of overlap there, and the CCR rules just came to be in 2015, but I have got experience dating back to the mid-90s in terms of designing groundwater monitoring programs.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Mr. Maxwell, could you please keep your voice up? It's getting --

MR. MAXWELL: I will.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: -- very
soft. Thank you.
MR. MAXWELL: Sure.
(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)

MS. NIJMAN: We were talking about groundwater monitoring systems. Is it common then to -- for those kinds of groundwater monitoring systems that you have installed to get adjustments over time?

MR. MAXWELL: It absolutely is.
Groundwater monitoring -- a groundwater monitoring system is -- it's a dynamic system. It's complex. Groundwater is constantly moving, constantly
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flowing, and as additional information is collected, it's very common for the system to be adjusted based upon new information that might be collected during the course of the program.

So in the particular instance that Mr. Quarles was commenting on, we had -- only had a couple of data points had been collected out of the minimum of eight, and so during the course of finishing out the minimum of eight data points collection, additional information did come to light that did impact how the -- how the comment with the regulator ultimately was resolved. MS. NIJMAN: And you mentioned that -- in that particular matter that your groundwater monitoring system is still being used today?

MR. MAXWELL: To my knowledge, yes. MS. NIJMAN: Is that -- who is doing the monitoring?

MR. MAXWELL: There is another
consultant that this client did bring in to perform the regular day-to-day monitoring. Weaver was hired to essentially do the initial
hydrogeologic investigation and install the
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initial network, design the initial network, collect the minimum of eight groundwater monitoring data points.

But then after that initial work was done, Weaver does not have offices down in this particular part of the state, and so the client opted to go with a consultant that was local in order -- it was a business decision, because Weaver wasn't -- wasn't present in that local market.

MS. NIJMAN: And the -- then the local consultant continued the monitoring of the wells that you had installed?

MR. MAXWELL: That's right.
MS. NIJMAN: Okay. I would move to qualify Mr. Dorgan and Mr. Maxwell as experts in site remediation for this matter.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Abel?
MR. RUSS: Yeah. I have no
objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: So
qualified. Thank you.
MS. NIJMAN: If you would turn back to your binder at tab 2. And I will show you what
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has been marked for identification as
Exhibit 1701. And if you would turn to Appendix B of this report. Appendix B is the list of references. It comes right after your CV.

MR. DORGAN: 81497?
MS. NIJMAN: Thank you. Does this
Appendix $B$ list many of the documents that you cite in your report, Mr. Dorgan?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, it is.
MS. NIJMAN: Are there other
documents that you relied on or use that are not cited here?

MR. DORGAN: There are others that aren't specifically referenced here, but are referenced in our document in the report itself, and then, of course, there has been a number of documents generated since this was created that wouldn't have been referenced at the time this report was published.

MS. NIJMAN: On the last page of this list of references, the second to last item is, "Seymour, John, 2015 July Midwest Gen

Exhibit 903 Expert Report of John Seymour, P.E." Do you see that?

| Page 190 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do. |  |  |  |
| MS. NIJMAN: Who is Mr. Seymour? |  |  |  |
| MR. DORGAN: Mr. Seymour, to my |  |  |  |
| understanding, was an expert that testified on |  |  |  |
| behalf of Midwest Generation in the earlier phases |  |  |  |
| of this matter. |  |  |  |
| MS. NIJMAN: Why is -- why did you |  |  |  |
| review his report? |  |  |  |
| MR. DORGAN: His report helped to |  |  |  |
| outline quite a bit of the historical record that |  |  |  |
| had been generated up until that time. It |  |  |  |
| provided both the historical review of each of the |  |  |  |
| four stations, but it also outlined some of the |  |  |  |
| information that had been exchanged as part of the |  |  |  |
| technical analysis of the sites on behalf of |  |  |  |
| Mr. Seymour. |  |  |  |
| MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall if |  |  |  |
| Mr. Seymour did a trend analysis? |  |  |  |
| MR. DORGAN: I believe he did |  |  |  |
| perform some trend analysis that was referenced in |  |  |  |
| his document. |  |  |  |
| MS. NIJMAN: And do you recall if |  |  |  |
| Mr. Seymour performed a risk assessment? |  |  |  |
| MR. DORGAN: He did, yes. |  |  |  |

[^26]MS. NIJMAN: Do you recognize the
name, Mr. Kunkel?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: I'm going to refer you
to the third page of your references where you list on pages 3 and 4, the third or fourth pages, a series of transcripts. Do you see that,

Illinois Pollution Control Board --
MR. DORGAN: Oh, yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN. -- transcripts? Now,
what were those transcripts of?
MR. DORGAN: I believe these were
transcripts that were created as part of creation of the record in the earlier phase of this matter.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall reviewing testimony of someone named Mr. Kunkel or Dr. Kunkel?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Who is Dr. Kunkel?
MR. DORGAN: I believe Dr. Kunkel
was an expert retained by the Plaintiffs as part of the first phase of this matter.

MS. NIJMAN: Okay. Take a little
side jaunt here for a second. And you heard
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Mr. -- and you were here during the May hearing you already mentioned, correct?

MR. DORGAN: That's correct.
MS. NIJMAN: And you heard Mr. Gnat talk about the difference between filtered versus non-filtered sample results. Do you remember that --

MR. DORGAN: I do.
MS. NIJMAN: -- discussion? And
what did -- what do you recall?
MR. DORGAN: I recall that it gets complicated in terms of the various analytical requirements with respect to the CCAs, the federal CCR rules and the state CCR rules, and so at these stations, both filtered and non-filtered or dissolved samples have to be collected for each of the constituents.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you agree -- well, is there essentially no difference at this site between the filtered versus non-filtered?

MR. DORGAN: For the --
MR. RUSS: Objection. Leading
question.

> HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Rephrase, the constituents.
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Ms. Nijman. Thank you.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall what
Mr. Gnat said, whether there is a difference between filtered versus non-filtered sample results for total dissolved solids?

MR. DORGAN: I believe his testimony was that they are largely the same, very little difference between the two.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you agree with that?
MR. DORGAN: I do.
MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned that you have also looked at additional materials since your report was issued in 2020. What additional information has become available to you?

MR. DORGAN: Well, as Mr. Gnat testified, there has been quite a bit of ongoing work that has been done at each of the four stations pursuant to the federal and state and even the CCR requirements and the CCAs. There has been quite a bit of additional groundwater data collected. There have been alternate source demonstrations prepared. There have been closure plans prepared, permit documents prepared, and then there has been some additional newly
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generated information that has come to our attention with respect to at least one of the stations.

MS. NIJMAN: And you also listened to the hearing, you mentioned?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I did.
MS. NIJMAN: I think you mentioned
new rules that have been proposed, did you, in your listing?

MR. DORGAN: No. I mentioned the current $C C R$, both the federal and state and the CCA obligations. What you may be referring to are the -- there is a state docket for regulation of historic fill, ash fill areas, and now there is a pending federal proposal that has hit the federal register here relatively recently that's -- will provide guidance what happens in some instances in the future.

MS. NIJMAN: Those are the pending proposed -- or the proposed rules for historic landfills? Is that what you are referring to?

MR. DORGAN: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: You were not -- were
you asked to perform a detailed review of the
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materials that were submitted pursuant to the federal or state CCR rules?

MR. DORGAN: No, we have not.
MS. NIJMAN: So how did those submittals fit within your decisionmaking for remedy?

MR. DORGAN: It demonstrated that the steps needed to continue complying with the federal and state $C C R$ requirements are ongoing. They just demonstrate the commitment to continuing to carry forward with meeting those regulatory obligations, and we feel that the continued consistency of application of those regulations was material to the way in which we evaluated the conditions at the four stations.

MS. NIJMAN: And as to the pending new historic fill rules, how do those pending new rule or proposed -- I should say -- proposed new rules impact your analysis in this matter?

MR. DORGAN: Well, we anticipate that these, both state and federal rules, when they are eventually promulgated will apply at least in some instances to various areas of the station, and when those rules are promulgated, we

[^27]would anticipate based upon the history of Midwest Gen continuing to work within the current regulatory framework, that they would apply those as well, and do what is necessary to comply with them.

MS. NIJMAN: We just heard from Mr. Gnat who talked about whether there might be seeps at the -- first of all, how do you define a seep?

MR. DORGAN: Typically, a seep would be a location where a liquid that would be contained within a waste material is finding a preferential migration pathway that it eventually ends up coming to the land surface, and usually exhibits either wet conditions and sometimes stain conditions, depending upon the material that the water is emanating from.

MS. NIJMAN: And did you -- what did you hear Mr . Gnat say about whether there were -whether he saw seeps at any of the four stations?

MR. DORGAN: I believe his testimony was that he has looked for and had the opportunity to observe for the presence of seeps and has not seen any at any of the four stations.

[^28]MS. NIJMAN: Did that help inform
your opinions in this case as well?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, it did.
MS. NIJMAN: Because we have taken
you out of order, before Ms. Shealey could testify, I'm going to ask you about your knowledge of the current status of the -- each of the four stations that Ms. Shealey would have otherwise testified to.

Are you aware of the current status of the stations?

MR. DORGAN: Generally, yes.
MS. NIJMAN: What is happening at Joliet 29, to your knowledge?

MR. DORGAN: So Joliet is anticipating -- they have ceased burning coal a number of years ago. They have been burning natural gas, but it's my understanding that that's likely to end sometime in the current calendar year.

MS. NIJMAN: And as to Will and
Waukegan?
MR. DORGAN: Those both are ceased burning coal as of last year, and it's my
understanding that is intended to continue.
MS. NIJMAN: And does the -- does
that status of those facilities inform your opinions?

MR. DORGAN: It does. It's one more element of our overall evaluation. You know, it tells us that there is not going to be an ongoing source of CCR at these properties, and that certainly is a variable that we would consider.

MS. NIJMAN: Back to your expert report at the second tab in your binder, if you would look at page 4 of your report, Section 1.3 and in the second full paragraph in Section 1.3, did you have a correction you wanted to make on the record here?

MR. DORGAN: Yes. I believe we have a reference there under the -- towards the bottom of it, where it references 12(d). I believe we made an error there in how we referenced that.

MS. NIJMAN: So the parenthesis says (open dumping...) after 12(d). Should that be somewhere else?

MR. DORGAN: That's correct. It would be after $21(a)$ or -- yeah.
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[^29]is a zone of groundwater on a property that is being managed through some sort of remedial program, and that it basically recognizes that there could be exceedances of relevant groundwater standards within that zone, which would not be -constitute -- which would not constitute a violation as long as you are continuing to comply with the requirements of the GMZ.

MS. NIJMAN: Does implementing a GMZ in Illinois, require some sort of action, active action, prior to getting a GMZ?

MR. DORGAN: It does, and, in fact, if you look back at the CCAs, the CCAs had a list of commitments that Midwest Gen had to comply with to address certain conditions at each of the four sites. There is quite a bit of overlap, a little bit of uniqueness as well, and that as long as they complied with those, they could then apply for and have a GMZ approved, which is what they ultimately did. And, of course, as part of the GMZ, there is the obligation for ongoing monitoring of the groundwater. They have to continue to monitor the groundwater under the CCA in order to maintain the GMZ.

[^30]MS. NIJMAN: So is a GMZ alone a
remedy?
MR. DORGAN: No. A GMZ is an acknowledgment of a remedy being implemented to address the groundwater conditions.

MS. NIJMAN: What is your experience dealing with GMZs in Illinois?

MR. DORGAN: We have had other sites that have fallen -- used the GMZ in a similar fashion to allow for the time to both evaluate and remedy impacted groundwater conditions.

MS. NIJMAN: Can you give us an example of something that comes to mind or a site that comes -- a situation that comes to mind in use of a GMZ?

MR. DORGAN: We have had -- we have had Illinois brownfield sites where we ended up recognizing the presence of a groundwater impact. We -- similar to what occurred here, we went in and undertook our remediation. We saw that the remediation was going to take time, applied for GMZs, had them approved, and then with that, we have to file an environmental land use control, which as Mr. Gnat testified, is a document that
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actually attaches to the deed so that any current and future landowner understands that those conditions which preclude the use of groundwater are present.

MR. MAXWELL: Could I build on that just for a moment? We have experience with GMZs at solid and hazardous waste -- or solid waste landfills in Illinois. They are commonly utilized in -- if a site is capped, that's considered the remedy, and then the GMZ is implemented while the cap is -- it takes effect, essentially. So groundwater monitoring takes place during that process, and there is a few different solid waste landfills that we have worked with where that process has played out as well.

MS. NIJMAN: And how -- you are
familiar with the term "monitored natural
attenuation" or "natural attenuation"?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: And we can refer
that -- to that as MNA, which is tricky. How does your experience with GMZs relate to MNA?

MR. MAXWELL: So MNA is the process that's part of the evaluation of the GMZ.
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Typically, I mentioned the cap example. The cap is the active management aspect and the monitoring goes with that in order to evaluate whether or not the cap is actually having, in this example, the intended benefit.

So the GMZ essentially is the regulatory mechanism for properly evaluating the effectiveness of the remedy, or the cap in this example.
(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit No. 1702 was marked for identification.)

MS. NIJMAN: Thank you. If you
would turn to the third tab of your binder. And we will also be showing this on the screen for ease of review. So we have marked for identification Exhibit 1702.

Mr. Dorgan, what is this
document?
MR. DORGAN: This is a presentation that we prepared to provide an overview of the main elements of our report just to put it in a little more visual fashion, a little bit more bullet point-oriented just to help present some of
the technical information in a little more condensed and digestible format.

MS. NIJMAN: And turning to the
first page, just your general approach, and this -- the third page, page 3 -- and the page numbers are on the right-hand bottom corner.

On page 3, what is -- what was
the general approach for assessing the four stations operated by or previously operated by Midwest Gen?

MR. DORGAN: So what we have presented on this slide is when we say general approach, this is the high level overview of the approach we took for the effort at evaluating remedy and relief for the four sites. So it's really composed of three main elements.

The first was establishing the appropriate regulatory framework in terms of what applied to what areas of each of the stations, and certainly, the two primary drivers were the federal and the state CCR surface impoundment requirements, and the regulatory requirements that applied to the regulated units at each of the four stations, and then we also looked at the historic
fill areas that had been identified in previous phases and referenced in the Board's opinion.

And then after that, we kind of moved into looking at the sites themselves, and the background of each of the sites, and the conditions that existed both historically, and currently. A big driver to the point about our having looked at this risk-based corrective action approach, we took a look at what were the potential human -- exposures to both human and ecological receptors.

That's primarily ecologic receptors that may come in contact to the extent there was groundwater leaving the site to a surface water, and then the human exposures, we are looking at primarily is there or will there be groundwater wells that might be used for potable purposes that could then bring a contaminant in contact with the receptor?

So that was our primary focus
with that. And then we took a look at the groundwater quality trends through a statistical analysis. We kind of built on what it had done previously, ran it through some statistical

[^31]testing that's consistent with good -- you know, best practices and recognized by the EPA in the -both the state and federal as a tool, and then we did an evaluation of the downgradient groundwater quality. We did that as just more of that risk-based SRP, TACO-type strategy where the real emphasis is placed on do we have contamination that's coming in contact with receptors?

And then finally we considered the remedial assessment that might be appropriate for each of the four stations. Certainly, the CCR regulations under both the fed and the Illinois to some extent, even though we knew that there was an Illinois program coming, and we knew that there eventually would be a federal program coming for historic fill areas, that was part of our consideration as well.

And, really, we looked at a combination of our risk evaluation, the trends that we are seeing in groundwater downgradient of the -- in the downgradient well network protective of offsite receptors, and then the comparisons to the relevant regulatory standards to guide how we approached our remedy and relief strategy.
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MS. NIJMAN: Can you describe whether you had any concern in your review of the CCR regulations, federal and state? Any concern about conflict with a remedy you might propose?

MR. DORGAN: I think what we saw was especially with respect to the upcoming subdocket at the PCB for the Illinois rulemaking and then now the proposed rule at the federal level, that there is the potential that anything we do now could come in conflict with whatever rule eventually gets promulgated. That's certainly consistent with the history of these four stations where they have kind of been victim of that in the past, having taken voluntary steps with respect to things like redoing their pond liners that eventually had to be redone after the rules came out and established a new standard that they had to meet. So that was a consideration.

MS. NIJMAN: In the absence of any CCR rules that might apply to an area at these stations, what regulatory framework would you apply to the four Midwest Gen stations?

MR. DORGAN: Well, we felt that the best framework available to us was through the
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state's voluntary program, the site remediation program, and its related TACO objectives. There is two separate regulatory programs for those two things, but they dovetail together.

And so that's what we would do at any other brownfield site. A brown -traditional brownfield site doesn't usually fall under some sort of -- it's not a CERCLA site. It's not a RCRA site. So in the absence of these other frameworks, we looked to what would be the most applicable, and we felt in this instance the SRP and TACO type of a framework would be best applied to the conditions at the sites where they weren't already regulated through the CCR rules.

MS. NIJMAN: Okay. Let's go to the next line, Regulatory Framework.

Now, you have already touched on this when you talked about your general approach. Did you divide out the regulatory framework that applies to the impoundments versus historic fill areas on this slide?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, we did. I kind of touched on that a minute ago, which is we recognize -- and others, Midwest Generation and
their consultants -- have previously made determinations in terms of which of their surface impoundments are regulated under either the federal and/or the state programs. And so we saw those continue to apply, and compliance with those requirements would be ongoing.

Certainly, the Board orders
previously were considered in terms of their earlier findings. The fact that we have the CCAs that are still present, and with the GMZs and the related ELUCs that continued to apply, and then, of course, we continue to have data being collected, and it will continue to be collected as a result of the monitoring networks that exist for the regulated units at the site.

So we -- we kind of put that on one side of the ledger, and on the other side of the ledger was these historic fill areas, which had been recognized and documented at an earlier -- earlier phases of this matter, and in those cases, we fell back to general Illinois groundwater standards which would apply; the Illinois SRP and related TACO regulations, certainly the orders of the Board were considered
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as -- for those areas as well, and then we know that we have got this Illinois subdocket that's pending and now a federal proposed rule for these fill areas. So they were considered.

And then, finally, we just looked at what information is available for each of these areas that we can use to frame up our understanding of the conditions for each of those areas and what might be appropriate for managing them going forward.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned a minute ago that Midwest Gen made determinations of which surface impoundments would fall within the rules.

Does that decision get reviewed, to your knowledge, by Illinois EPA?

MR. DORGAN: It's my understanding that they are required to file permits with the IEPA. They file their groundwater reports with the IEPA. So, yes, the IEPA is involved in that decisionmaking.

MS. NIJMAN: And do you know if the Illinois EPA also sends invoices as to ponds that might apply?

> MR. DORGAN: That's my
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understanding, yes.
MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned on the left side of the slide the CCAs, and we have talked about them a little bit. Why were the CCAs at the Midwest Gen station, four stations, relevant to your assessment?

MR. DORGAN: The CCAs had outlined a set of actions that Midwest Gen was required to take at each of their four stations, and by doing so, they were able to then apply for and have approved the GMZ.

So the fact that the GMZs remain in place, which has an impact on our risk analysis in terms of potential groundwater exposure and receptors was an element that was important to our considerations.

MS. NIJMAN: Did the CCAs begin collecting data -- groundwater data? Excuse me. MR. DORGAN: Yes. And the CCAs, they -- Midwest Gen voluntarily agreed to begin looking at their units at the request of the Agency. They agreed to do so. That led to the installation of some groundwater wells, and then eventually that information led to broadening of
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some of that, the groundwater monitoring programs, and then ultimately the federal CCR rules kicked in and brought further framework to the way in which the units at the four stations are being managed.

MS. NIJMAN: You have experience working with CCAs in Illinois?

MR. DORGAN: I do.
MS. NIJMAN: And what types of agreements might be entered into as an example of CCAs? What types of actions under a CCA?

MR. DORGAN: Well, the CC -- most of the CCAs -- we have done some brownfields. We have done landfill sites. We have done corrective action units under the RCRA program. And in each instance, there are -- there is a requirement that something has to be done to allow for the -- you know, you are committing to doing something in exchange for the GMZ. So, generally, there is a remedy that's ongoing as part of a CCA.

MS. NIJMAN: In your opinion, is a CCA a mitigating factor?

MR. DORGAN: In my opinion, it would
be. A CCA is something that you are entering into

[^32]voluntarily. You are going to the Agency and saying, "We are ready to work with you, addressing the concerns that you may have." And so it's a -it's a collaborative process with the regulator before you agree on the actual steps you are going to take. So there is a great deal of communication and interaction with the Agency's concerns, taken into account and then acted on them.

MS. NIJMAN: The next slide that describes your overall process is the Background Site Conditions. We are on slide 5 of Exhibit 1702.

Would you describe what you have
listed here? And I can refer you to Section 1.5 on page 8 of your expert report as well, if you want to refer back and forth.

MR. DORGAN: So, once we kind of framed up the regulatory outline, we moved into looking at the condition of the sites themselves. The background that was available at each of the sites, that first led us to looking at what previous investigations have occurred at each of the sites there has been -- in most instances, a
series of them has occurred over time. Those investigations helped to inform our understanding of the physical and hydrogeologic conditions and the setting at each of the four sites.

They certainly helped in
understanding the surrounding land uses, which are important to our evaluation. They had some useful information about past efforts at identifying offsite receptors, both ecological and groundwater -- potential groundwater or lack of potential groundwater users, and then, of course, the analytical results from the ongoing monitoring that's happened, and some of the historic investigations were an element in totality of how we considered what was going on at the stations.

And then from that, we kind of moved into more of a data analysis and evaluation process. So, now we know where our data is and where it came from. Let's take a look at it. Let's see how it helps inform our understanding of what's going on at these sites, the risks that may exist at the site. So, that was the first step, evaluating the risk through kind of a standard risk model evaluation.

And then we went into quite a bit of detail in looking at the -- into the data itself and the long record of data that we now have, given the period that the groundwater has been monitored at these four stations, and we looked at that data with respect to trends and focused our trend evaluation on the sensitive downgradient receptor population.

MS. NIJMAN: We had been discussing a few moments ago the updated information about each of the stations. Do you recall that?

MR. DORGAN: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: Did you also prepare a summary document of updated information about each of the surface impoundments or ponds at the station?

MR. DORGAN: We did. We kind of felt that a cheat sheet of sorts would be helpful just to track what's going on at each of the sites, and quite a few of the updates that had happened since our original report was issued.

MS. NIJMAN: And I can refer you to the second to last page of this exhibit, 1702.

Is that the table of the surface

[^33]impoundments that you are referencing?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, it is. It would be page 97 in the presentation, numbering continued.

MS. NIJMAN: And who prepared this chart?

MR. DORGAN: Mike and I worked on it together. We had a little bit of a basis of this outline and just kept kind of building onto it as we recognized there was more information to be added.

MS. NIJMAN: So we will discuss this more when we get into each of the stations, but when you heard Mr. Gnat testify earlier, you heard him talk about how each of these stations are located or where each of the stations are located. Do you remember that?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Is it your -- what is
your opinion as to whether the stations are located in industrial areas?

MR. DORGAN: Certainly predominantly
industrial. Some more than others. Waukegan is an example of a heavily industrial area, given its
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surrounding land uses. We do have some residential uses located at a couple of the sites, but in -- relatively distant. Most instances the immediately surrounding properties are in some cases water bodies, other industrial users, some heavy industrial users quarrying operations. It kind of runs -- runs the gamut.

MS. NIJMAN: You also list on this slide potential receptors. Is that the same kind of review as, like, a pathway analysis?

MR. DORGAN: Yes. What -- what we are doing there is there is a concept and risk evaluation which talks about the risk triangle, and that's -- there is -- three things needed to be present for risk to occur. You have to have a contaminant source. You have to have a pathway by which that contaminant can move, and then you have to have a receptor.

So bring the contaminant to the
receptor at concentrations that exceed our relative standard, that could be indicative of risk, but if you eliminate any one of those three things, you don't have a risk. So one of the things that we try to do in these types of
evaluations is look at that risk triangle.
Do we have a contaminant source?
Do we have a pathway? Do we have a receptor? And when you can demonstrate that one of the three of those things is absent, it gives you a good understanding of the true risk posed by the site condition. So that was certainly part of our overall approach towards evaluating risk.

MS. NIJMAN: And is that an approach that you have used in other sites in Illinois with the Illinois EPA?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, it is.
MS. NIJMAN: Turning to the next
slide, slide 6 in Exhibit 1702.
Here you discuss Evaluation of Risk to Surface Water. Can you describe what's happening here?

MR. DORGAN: So I think it's pretty clearly been demonstrated that each of the four sites are proximal to surface water bodies. So understanding the risks that may be posed by the conditions that exist at the sites to those surface water bodies was something that we wanted to understand.

[^34]So in this particular instance,
we looked at the 35 IAC Part 302 Illinois Water Quality Standards, and also the water quality criteria for surface water, published sources that are available from the state, and then we compared the downgradient data to the relevant standards.

So, if there was a water quality standard, we used it, and if not, we used the Illinois chronic water quality criteria, so -- and basically there we are saying, if this groundwater came in contact with this surface water, would there be a risk to the surface water?

And then we, of course, made comparisons to those standards for the monitored constituents, which were primarily the Appendix III and Appendix IV parameters under the current regulatory monitoring program. And then we also looked at the average downgradient concentrations looking at the data set over time to do those comparisons.

So we were looking at what's that average concentration in our monitoring wells relative to these standards, and then we also considered whether there were any potable wells

[^35]that were in use downgradient of the stations.
MS. NIJMAN: And generally, high
level, what did you find?
MR. DORGAN: Generally, we found that we weren't exceeding water quality criteria, and that in each of the four stations there were not potable wells in use that would allow potential receptors to come in contact with impacted groundwater.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall
Mr. Quarles testifying about whether the CCR rules consider risk?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: And if you need to, I can refer you to his rebuttal report as well, but do you agree that the CCR rules do not consider risk?

MR. DORGAN: Oh, I think what he was -- I think what -- if I recall from his testimony at the earlier phase of the hearing is he was making reference to the Illinois groundwater standards that weren't necessarily based on risk, which we disagree with. The groundwater standards are predicated on risk

[^36]models similar to how the federal drinking water standards are promulgated.

So there are any number of risk criteria that are considered; toxicity, duration of exposure, sensitivity to the receptor as far -and in terms of developing those standards. So there is a risk element just to the standards themselves.

MS. NIJMAN: I can refer you to page 45 of your expert report, but you also said it earlier, that Mr. Seymour prepared a risk analysis. Do you recall that?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: So in the first
paragraph of your expert report, which is Exhibit 1701 on page 45, Section 4.4, you actually mention, "A similar statistical risk evaluation was presented in the expert opinion of John Seymour."

Do you see that?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: And what were
Mr. Seymour's findings? And I just mean at a high level.

[^37] came to the same conclusion in terms of his evaluation of the risk to downgradient receptors. He felt that there was an absence of risk posed by the four stations.

MS. NIJMAN: Since Mr. Seymour did a risk analysis, why did you do another one?

MR. DORGAN: It's part of our standard approach towards evaluating these types of sites. We certainly wanted to -- we considered Mr. Seymour's findings, but wanted to look at them independently and also just consider whether there were any change conditions that needed to be considered.

MS. NIJMAN: Mr. Maxwell, turning to you on the question of data evaluation, which is the next slide, how were you involved in conducting the data analysis or evaluation part of this project?

MR. MAXWELL: So I helped organize the statistical evaluation of the data, as has been testified -- as Mr. Gnat testified to. There is -- has been a number of different monitoring programs at the various stations under which data

[^38]has been collected. So I helped oversee the collection of that data, the organization of that data, and we utilized a statistical evaluation software known as Sanitas in order to perform some statistical testing.

And just backing up for a
moment, the constituents that were evaluated -just to offer a little bit more detail, the detection constituents under the 40 CFR 257, Appendix III, as well as the assessment constituents under Appendix IV under 257 was the -- were the constituents that were evaluated.

We also looked at the -- we wanted to look at as much data around the ponds as we could, so we took the historical data and wanted to focus the analysis on what we felt the wells that were the most representative and in terms of our analysis. And that was the monitoring wells that were on the downgradient side of the ponds.

MS. NIJMAN: You note here as one of
your first bullet points that there is a substantial quantity of groundwater quality data for the facilities, and $I$ can refer you to page 26
of your expert report if you'd like to see your discussion there.

What do you mean by that?
MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So there has been quarterly groundwater monitoring occurring at these stations since the first monitoring event was performed in 2010, so we have got at this point over ten years of data at the stations, and there is multiple groundwater monitoring systems at the four stations, multiple monitoring wells, multiple constituents.

When you sum up the sum total of data, it's many thousands of individual data points are available to us to try to evaluate what the conditions are. So there was a substantial quantity of data that was available to us.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you have an opinion about whether existing data at a site should be used to develop a remedy or assess a remedy?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, absolutely. The data is the basis for the remedy, and that really is the -- that's -- that is the basis for designing a remedy.

> MS. NIJMAN: If there are gaps in

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

data for a remedy assessment, can you fill that in as part of your remedy?

MR. MAXWELL: That is a common
approach. It's difficult, and it's not practical in many instances, to answer every single question in terms of how a particular site is characterized. Data gaps are something that are often part of the process as you move from investigation into remedy, and designing and implementing a remedy is an opportunity to fill in those data gaps potentially, to the extent that they may exist.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall
Mr. Quarles stating that he recommended a Nature and Extent Study at the four stations?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall whether he said -- gave us a scope or any idea of what that would consist of?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. My recollection
is that he did not offer much in the way of filling in what that would be. So there really wasn't a lot of definition to that, other than, you know, further investigation.

[^39]MS. NIJMAN: In your opinion, is
there sufficient data to develop a remedy at the
four stations?
MR. MAXWELL: In our opinion, there
is. We feel like we have enough data to -- to
develop a remedy, and I guess I would point out
that the prior two experts felt the same way, and
in the prior phase of the case, they were able to
opine on an appropriate remedy. So we would
agree. We would agree that the data that's
available to us was -- was sufficient.
was called the Mann-Kendall Test, and this is a
test that is referenced in the USEPA statistical
the slide presentation at Exhibit 1702,
Statistical Trend Tending.

[^40]literature. The March 20 -- 2009 Statistical Analysis of Groundwater Monitoring Data at RCRA Facilities Unified Guidance is the applicable reference here. It's a -- it's a quantitative non-parametric test that allows us to come to quantitative conclusions in terms of what the trends are looking like in the data.

And there is five potential
outcomes that result. There is an upward trend, there's a downward trend, there's no trend -- I'm sorry. Let me back up.

There's a downward trend, a statistically significant downward trend, no trend, upward trend, statistically significant upward trend. So there's five potential outcomes, and this is a test that we have utilized on other projects where -- where GMZs have been employed -other projects in Illinois where GMZs have been employed. We have utilized these tests on other CCR landfills that -- where closure had -- that have undergone a closure that have been capped.

And so it offers a -- we think a convenient, robust means of looking at what the overall trends are doing in terms of the
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groundwater quality so that we can make that judgment about whether or not the -- the cap, the remedy, whatever it is, that's the -- the active remedy, whether or not it's being effective or not.

MS. NIJMAN: And this is an analysis that the Illinois regulators also rely on, the Mann-Kendall?

MR. RUSS: Objection, leading.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Sustained.
MS. NIJMAN: Will you describe your experience with Illinois regulators dealing with Mann-Kendall statistical testing?

MR. MAXWELL: We do have at least a couple of different sites that we deal with Illinois EPA that utilize the Mann-Kendall -- the Mann-Kendall testing, and on a regular basis. We have got one site that requires that we do an annual evaluation of the trends that's reviewed annually by Illinois EPA so that we can -- we have some confidence that the cap that has been put on the landfill continues to be -- continues to be effective.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned GMZs.
How do we relate this trend testing back to the GMZs?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. The -- so the GMZs are in place because some type of remedy, the cap being the most obvious example, has been implemented. A GMZ -- the idea behind a GMZ is that you don't get it forever. You have got to be -- the regulation requires that you take steps to demonstrate compliance with the groundwater quality standards. Trend testings show you whether or not you are on the right track.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned the caps as an active potential remedy. In our situation, did you consider whether the liners for the CCAs, re-lining the ponds for the CCAs, were an active remedy?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah, that would fall under the same or a similar category as a cap. The intended outcome of re-lining a pond is to -is to have a benefit to the groundwater quality. So that would fall into the -- a similar category, yes.
MS. NIJMAN: Did you -- have you
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reviewed the annual groundwater reports prepared by KPRG for the stations?

MR. MAXWELL: We did review them at a high level, yes.

MS. NIJMAN: And those reports as I recall -- or let me ask you.

Do you recall whether those
reports have a time versus concentration analysis?
MR. MAXWELL: They do. They have
got those graphs, and I would point out that those time versus concentration graphs, it allows for a visual representation of the patterns over time. However, it's not a quantitative test like the Mann-Kendall test is. So, it's more of a visual presentation that allows one to assess at a very high level what the concentrations of a constituent are doing over time.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned that you looked at the downgradient wells to use in your trend testing, right?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: Is the downgradient
well the same at the four stations as the property boundary?
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MR. MAXWELL: No. It's actually
not. That's one of the elements that makes our -this evaluation conservative, and that is that there is -- there is further opportunity for the groundwater to flow and allow the natural mechanisms of attenuation dispersion to take place, and as those mechanisms take place, the concentrations of the constituents in the groundwater typically will go down, and so that's what makes the analysis that we undertook with the wells further upgradient from the property boundary conservative.

MS. NIJMAN: So, let me to
understand. You would -- usually in a
Mann-Kendall would you usually use the property boundary location?

MR. MAXWELL: That depends on the regulatory program --

MS. NIJMAN: Okay.
MR. MAXWELL: -- would be the way I
would answer that. Under TACO, under a TACO SRP type of approach, the property boundary is the applicable -- is the applicable location. It's the critical location, because that's the point at

[^41]which you lose the control of your property.
So you can put an ELUC, for
example, on your property, and then that would end at your property boundary.

MS. NIJMAN: But that is not the situation here; is that right?

MR. RUSS: Objection.
MS. NIJMAN: Is that the situation with the four stations here, in that you went to the property boundary or not?

MR. MAXWELL: We did not go
to the -- the wells that we assessed for the Mann-Kendall were not at the property boundary.

MS. NIJMAN: I would like you to refer to page 43 of your expert report at Exhibit 1701.

Do you see the first, full
paragraph on page 43? Is that the discussion of the Mann-Kendall data analysis?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. That is the lead-in, yes.

MS. NIJMAN: In looking at the bullet points on page 43, does that list the wells?
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, it does.
MS. NIJMAN: And so -- well, you
tell me. These -- the listing of wells you have for the four bullet points here for the four stations, what are these wells?

MR. MAXWELL: Those are -- those were the monitoring wells that were the subject of the Mann-Kendall testing that was performed.

MS. NIJMAN: Did you use all of the wells in your Mann-Kendall testing, all of the wells at each station?

MR. MAXWELL: We did not use all of the wells. Mr. Seymour, I -- did use all of the wells, and so we were building off of what Mr. Seymour had done, and as mentioned, the -what we feel to be the most critical wells were evaluated, those wells that were on the downgradient side of the ponds.

MS. NIJMAN: On page 44 of your expert report, you have a discussion, again, for each station about the results of the trend testing. Generally, again at a high level -- we will get into more detail -- what did the trend -the Mann-Kendall trend testing show?

[^42]MR. MAXWELL: So, at a high level it showed that the groundwater conditions were generally improving, that there were more -- there were more downward trends overall than upward trends, and that in many cases, there was a no trend conclusion or result. However, in the majority of those instances, that was due to the majority of the data being non-detect, not reported above the laboratory reporting limit.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall
Mr. Quarles commenting that the CCR rules require compliance at the waste boundary when he was discussing your trend testing?

MR. MAXWELL: I do.
MS. NIJMAN: What was he saying
there; do you recall?
MR. MAXWELL: Well, I think he was simply citing the federal CCR rules, and in practice, to put a -- it's just not practicable to put a well right at the waste boundary. Typically, what's done in practice is you get it as reasonably close to the waste boundary as you can, and I think we will see, as we get into our analysis, that the wells that we performed the

[^43]Mann-Kendall evaluation on were sufficiently close to the waste boundary.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you have
Exhibit 1102 in front of you, which is
Mr. Quarles' rebuttal report?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, we do.
MS. NIJMAN: If you would look at
page 31, the carryover paragraph of Mr. Quarles' rebuttal report, and it's on the screen as well. The bullet on the bottom of the page, and then carrying over to page 32 , the remaining bullets. What was Mr. Quarles doing here?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, what he was -sorry.

What he was doing was, I guess, presenting an alternate -- an alternate viewpoint of the way that we had summarized the data.

MS. NIJMAN: And is he -- does he redo your math?

MR. MAXWELL: That's essentially what he does. He makes a point about that -- he indicates that the decreasing trend conclusion he doesn't believe is correct, but what he is not considering is that -- the fact that the
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non-detect or the no trend trends, the majority of those are actually a situation where you have got a non-detect result. And so it certainly is a mischaracterization of the way that we had presented the data in our report.

MS. NIJMAN: So are you saying that Mr. Quarles took the no trend data and assumed it was a downward trend?

MR. RUSS: Objection, leading
question.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Sustained. Rephrase.
MS. NIJMAN: How did Mr. Quarles
interpret your no trend data?
MR. MAXWELL: I believe that he -well, he categorized the no trends together with the upward trends, is what he did, and so that very much mischaracterized the value or the importance of the no trends.

MS. NIJMAN: Did Mr. Quarles perform
a Mann-Kendall trend test?
MR. MAXWELL: No, he did not. At least it wasn't in his report.

MS. NIJMAN: Could he have done so
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with the data available?
MR. MAXWELL: I suspect that he could have, yes.

MS. NIJMAN: On page 32 of
Mr. Quarles' rebuttal report, in the middle of the page, Mr. Quarles says that Weaver, WCG, "failed to include all historically contaminated wells in his statistical analysis." Do you see that?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: And we talked about this a little bit already. What is your response to his criticism?

MR. MAXWELL: That those particular wells aren't necessarily critically important to the evaluation, No. 1. Those wells are -- are further upgradient, and in terms of the risk, those wells are covered under the GMZ under the ELUC, and by the time the groundwater gets further downgradient from those wells, those are the wells that we have evaluated. And so those are the critical wells in terms of the overall trends.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you know whether Mr. Seymour also reviewed all the wells?

MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Seymour did look at all of the wells in his trend analysis, yes.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall what Mr. Seymour's results were in his trend analysis at a high level?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. At a high level he found that the concentrations generally were downward. Not in all instances, but in general.

MS. NIJMAN: Let's go back to the PowerPoint.

Mr. Dorgan, looking at slide 9, the Remedial Assessment Process, can you describe this?

MR. DORGAN: So, we have established the steps that we took leading up to being at this point; most recently, the discussion with Mr. Maxwell about our trend testing. So once we had completed that, we began looking at what is needed here to manage the risks and the conditions that we have identified.

So there were several elements of that evaluation; the first being just the historic nature of $C C R$ at the stations, the length of time that the $C C R$ has been there, the length of
time that these stations have been operating. I think in two instances it's been over 50 years, and I think in two it's been close to 100.

So while it's recognized that there are CCRs present at the sites, most of that has been there for a very long time. And there is a defined mass of material that's present, and that hasn't been changing with time. The
regulated units have been managing ash now for quite while, and so the fact that the conditions are somewhat static was something that was important to our evaluation.

We certainly looked at all the prior assessments. There has been Phase I and Phase II site assessments. There have been various investigations to address specific needs that the stations have had, and then, of course, there has been investigations, too, as part of the compliance with the CCR regulations.

We know that those CCR
regulations are in place, and will continue to be in place. So, to the extent any ash continues to be generated, it will continue to be managed in accordance with those requirements, and with
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surface impoundments, that we understand will be brought to compliance with the CCR regulations.

We've already discussed the fact
that we took a more risk-based approach towards considering the conditions that exist at the site with respect to sensitive offsite receptors and what ultimately would be protective of human health and the environment. And then for those areas where ash has been documented to be present outside of the impoundments, we -- in the absence of any other regulatory framework, we have applied what we think is most relevant, which would be a more traditional SRP TACO-type approach towards it. So that was the basic foundation of how we approached the remedial assessment.

MS. NIJMAN: And if you look at
pages 51 and 52 of your expert report, does that give you a high level review of the proposed remedy for the four stations?

MR. DORGAN: Yes. So after laying
out in detail the things that we have just
summarized in the presentation, we came to some basic conclusions in our report that appear on page 42 -- or 51 and continue on 52 and 53.

[^44]MS. NIJMAN: And, generally, you
mentioned on your slide, slide 9, CCR regulations for further control of surface impoundments. And you have also mentioned CCR for monitoring.

Would you explain how the CCR rules relate to your remedy?

MR. DORGAN: Well, we -- we consider those to be important mechanisms to continue managing risk at the sites, and we would assume and anticipate that the CCR impoundments will continue to conform with the regulations and any modifications to the regulations that may be forthcoming.

And, of course, in most
instances that's going to be closure of the surface impoundments, since most of them are no longer receiving ash. So, well, very recent developments continue to alter the perspective and the approach towards what's going on at these sites. So that -- we anticipate that to continue to evolve, and it's going to have to be adaptive and dynamic.

But, otherwise, we felt that with the conditions that are already in place for
three of the four sites; Joliet, Powerton and Will County in particular, that with the steps that have already been taken with respect to the CCR rules, the steps taken for the CCAs, the fact that we have monitored natural attenuation continuing to occur at those sites, and that we continue monitoring groundwater to evaluate the advancement of the MNA, that we felt that the proper mechanisms were already in place at those three stations to address the site conditions, with the caveat that new rules are coming, and then when they do come, they will have to be evaluated and, perhaps, considered with respect to any modification to that strategy.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned MNA, and I just wanted to -- we talked about it a few minutes ago.

How common is MNA used in
Illinois? How commonly is it used in Illinois as part of the remedial process?

MR. DORGAN: MNA is regularly used in any number of different regulatory programs in Illinois. It's commonly accepted. The Agency does acknowledge MNA as a remedial strategy.

There is also a recognition that MNA takes time. It's not something that occurs -- sometimes it can occur relatively rapidly. Other -- other times it takes longer periods of time.

It's one of the reasons why you
continue to monitor. It's why you have the GMZs in place. It's why you have the ELUCs. We want to -- while MNA takes place, we want to prevent exposures, and therefore, protect human health and the environment.

So, yes, MNA is -- MNA and the absence of risk as a whole are two common Illinois strategies to manage these types of conditions. MS. NIJMAN: Can MNA be applied in Illinois if a portion of the waste is in contact with groundwater?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, it can.
MS. NIJMAN: In what kind of
conditions have you seen that occur?
MR. DORGAN: We have seen that with historic landfill sites. We have seen that with historic industrial process byproducts like slag and foundry sand, plating tailings. Just because a waste material is in contact with the
groundwater doesn't mean it has to be removed. It means that it has to be managed, and MNA is a method to manage the conditions posed by those types of situations.

MS. NIJMAN: You described a few minutes ago something about a mass analysis. Could you describe your mass constituent that you mentioned?

MR. DORGAN: In making the tie-in to this idea that you could have waste below the water table, one of the things that you consider is, what is the waste material? What is the contaminant loading in the waste material? How long has that waste been in contact with the groundwater?

As you can probably envision, there is only a certain amount of, we will call it contamination, in a waste stream, and that as it migrates out of that waste stream, the concentrations in the source will diminish over time. In some instances, it can diminish to the point that it's no longer detected.

The longer it's been in contact with the groundwater conditions, the more time
there's been for mobilizing those contaminants, and what will be left will continue to diminish with time. So an understanding of what the materials are, how much contact there is with the groundwater, how long a period of time that those materials have been in contact with the groundwater are variables that need to be considered with respect to assessing remedy and appropriate actions.

MS. NIJMAN: What is your experience with applying MNA where an exact source of contaminant is not identified?

MR. DORGAN: As you can imagine, some of these brownfield sites can be quite large. It's often difficult to pinpoint every potential source that might exist on a brownfield.

I have an example of a 3100-acre former steel mill in Maryland that's going through a brownfields process. And as you can imagine, with a site that large, we can't always count on identifying every individual source. It's why we evaluate the groundwater on a system basis, and specifically look at the downgradient groundwater concentrations so that if there is an unidentified
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source, we have the ability to pick it up in that groundwater -- downgradient groundwater monitoring network.

But that doesn't mean that we will identify every source over that, in this case, a 3100-acre property. It's just not feasible.

MS. NIJMAN: Now, even if you have a
smaller property than 3100 acres, does that system basis analysis still apply?

MR. DORGAN: It does, yes.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall that
Mr. Quarles discussed some articles about -- EPA guidance documents about MNA?

MR. DORGAN: He did.
MS. NIJMAN: I would like you to
pull out in front of you what was previously marked as Exhibit 1104.

MR. DORGAN: I'm not sure we have that up here.

MS. NIJMAN: Mr. Dorgan, what is
Exhibit 1104?
MR. DORGAN: Exhibit 1104 is a USEPA
document entitled, "Use of Monitored Natural
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

Attenuation of Superfund, RCRA Corrective Action, and Underground Storage Tank Sites" with an effective date of April 21st, 1999.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you -- are you
generally familiar with this document?
MR. DORGAN: I am familiar with this
document.
MS. NIJMAN: I would like you to
look at page 18 of this document. I will give you a Bates number. And if you would -- this is going to be page 18 of Exhibit 1104, which is also Bates No. COMP_67366. And if you would look at the paragraph beneath the bullets. And let me know when you have had a chance to read it.

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I have that.
MS. NIJMAN: What is that paragraph
saying?
MR. DORGAN: It's basically
outlining two scenarios for MNA; one where it's an appropriate strategy, and also where it may not be the best strategy to address site conditions.

MS. NIJMAN: And under the
conditions, what are the conditions where it might be appropriate?
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MR. DORGAN: Well, they lay out three basic expectations. One is -- it says specifically, "Of the above factors, the most important considerations regarding the suitability of MNA as a remedy include: Whether the contaminants are likely to be effectively addressed by natural attenuation processes, the stability of the groundwater contaminant plume and its potential for migration, and the potential for unacceptable risks to human health or environmental resources by the contamination."

MS. NIJMAN: And do the Midwest Generation stations fall into those categories?

MR. DORGAN: We believe we have made the argument that each of those conditions are met, making MNA an alternative approach for these sites.

MS. NIJMAN: And looking in
particular at the bolded language at the bottom of that paragraph, can you read the bolded language?

MR. DORGAN: It says, "Therefore, sites where the contaminant plumes are no longer increasing in extent or are shrinking would be the most appropriate candidates for MNA remedies."


[^45]respect to evaluating MNA, I think there is even references here that, you know, you may have a number of the criteria met, but not all of them, and there is circumstances when the ones that you don't meet could still be supportive of an MNA strategy. So it's certainly when you do, that's helpful, but it's not a requirement by which you can apply these types of strategies.

MS. NIJMAN: How do individual sites need to be evaluated then in comparison to MNA?

MR. DORGAN: Well, I mean, each site has -- is going to have its own unique characteristics. It's going to have its own groundwater flow systems, its own mechanisms for the natural process of MNA in terms of absorption, retardation, attenuation, dispersion, diffusion, and then, of course, the source concentrations, the source materials themselves are going to vary.
So there is multiple
considerations, but in totality, you evaluate that against these criteria to see whether it's an accepted strategy or not.

MS. NIJMAN: The second document
Mr. Quarles referred to in his discussion of MNA
is -- has been marked as Quarles Exhibit 1105.
And do you see that there?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: If you would just look at the title page of Exhibit 1105, which is Bates No. COMP_67391. What does this page say?

MR. DORGAN: Well, this, again, is another USEPA document dated August of 2015, and it's entitled, "Use of Monitored Natural

Attenuation For Inorganic Contaminants in Groundwater At Superfund Sites."

MS. NIJMAN: Are any of the Midwest Gen stations Superfund sites?

MR. DORGAN: No, they are not.
MS. NIJMAN: And what is the difference between a Superfund site and a brownfield site?

MR. DORGAN: To be considered a Superfund site, you've already gone through a hazard ranking process to evaluate the presence of risks, and a risk has been determined to be present, and as a consequence, the evaluation, the response to those conditions is a bit more rigorous than when you can demonstrate that there
aren't risks.
MS. NIJMAN: What types of waste are at Superfund sites?

MR. DORGAN: Typically, waste regulated under CERCLA and also hazardous wastes under RCRA.

MS. NIJMAN: How did you compare the risk level at the Midwest Generation sites with this site -- excuse me.

How did you compare the risk
level at the Midwest Generation sites?
MR. DORGAN: Well, so, at a
Superfund site, there is a technical process that you go through to look at all of these inputs to your risk assessment to create a score, and if you score above a certain result, you are considered to fall under the Superfund requirements.

Certainly, that's not the case.
That process has not happened and hasn't been requested to happen. We have seen that the conditions at the Midwest Gen facility, risks are being controlled. Offsite receptors are being protected. So there is really not a relevant comparison between evaluation under Superfund and
evaluation under a risk-based strategy like what we have done for the four stations.

MS. NIJMAN: You -- we spoke earlier back on slide 9 about the CCR rules adding further control. How do the CCR rule monitoring requirements fit into your remedy assessment process?

MR. DORGAN: So, the data collected from the ongoing monitoring was certainly considered. It's -- I think Mr. Maxwell talked about the thousands. I think at the time our report was generated it was something like 62,000 data points are available. That's a considerable body of evidence to evaluate, which we have done, so -- and that was, what, two years ago now?

So there is more data that has
been collected since, and there is going to be more data collected in the years to come. There's going to be an extensive database by both which to evaluate the appropriate remedy and continue to monitor it going forward. So the ongoing CCR unit monitoring, both the data collected and the data that we are going to be collecting, was a significant consideration on how we evaluated risk
at the site.
MS. NIJMAN: Do the CCR rules for surface impoundments specify an actual cleanup method in the event of a release to groundwater?

MR. DORGAN: No, they don't. They specify that you monitor the groundwater around your regulated unit, and if there is a demonstrated impact that can be attributed to the unit, then an evaluation needs to occur in terms of how to address that, but it does not specify the methods for addressing it. That's site specific and dependent on the unit and the conditions encountered.

MS. NIJMAN: So there are
specific -- once you have a release to groundwater, do the rules tell you what to do about how to remedy the groundwater?

MR. DORGAN: No. They simply
require that you evaluate the groundwater conditions and whether or not they are related to your regulated unit and then take the steps necessary to address the groundwater conditions. MS. NIJMAN: So in this situation with the four Midwest Generation stations then,
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how did you determine what the remedy should be, given a -- the Board's finding of release to groundwater?

MR. DORGAN: We did not specify a remedy for the CCR regulated units themselves. We feel that that's already in a process. That process is moving forward. That process will come to a conclusion at some point, and that as long as the steps needed to comply with that process are being followed, we feel as though the risks are being properly managed.

So we were more holistic in our evaluation, again, taking that more SRP/TACO-type approach of looking at the downgradient and the protection of the offgradient receptors -- or off-property receptors.

MS. NIJMAN: When you considered your remedial assessment for the four stations, how did you consider other types of remedies in your analysis?

MR. DORGAN: A couple different ways that that occurred. First was, as we have indicated previously, there was a historic -- a record, past evaluation and discussions about
remedying that was already in the record that we took a look at. There's some discussion.

Mr. Seymour in particular opined on what remedy was necessary. There had been some reference to earlier evaluations of alternatives that were deemed to be economically unreasonable, which we would agree with; specifically, the idea that mass removal would be kind of a default option.

And then, of course, we looked at from a more traditional alternatives evaluation process under more of an SRP/TACO strategy, we considered what would you normally be looking at? And that normal process takes into account the technical practicability, economic reasonableness, community impact, whether or not it will be successful in addressing the contaminant conditions in the ground, restoring the groundwater.

> So, while that was part of our evaluation, we moved directly to the risk-based strategy that we felt had the best application to the conditions existing at the four sites.

MS. NIJMAN: Did you recall
Mr. Quarles referencing a feasibility study?
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

MR. DORGAN: He mentioned that in his testimony, I believe.

MS. NIJMAN: And what is a feasibility study?

MR. DORGAN: A feasibility study would normally be done under a -- more of a Superfund-type process where you would -- and under RCRA, it's remedial measures evaluation. You are basically looking at the site conditions and running it -- you have to move it through a number of considerations. You have to estimate the costs related to those, and at the end of the day, you end up proposing what you find to be the best option. Much more rigorous, and applicable to those sites where they are regulated under those programs where the risks are more significant, and you are subject to those requirements; whereas, that's not the case with the four sites for Midwest Generation.

MS. NIJMAN: If you would look to the last tab in your binder. We have marked this for identification as Exhibit 1703.
(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit
No. 1703 was marked for
identification.)
MS. NIJMAN: Do you recognize this
document?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: And what is this?
MR. DORGAN: It's my understanding
that these are minutes that were captured by Mr. Kunkel in a communication that he had with Ms. Bugel.

MS. NIJMAN: And just to -- for the record, this is Bates No. COMP_041681. And, again, Mr. Kunkel being the prior expert for Complainants; is that right?

MR. DORGAN: That's correct.
MS. NIJMAN: If you would turn to the second page, COMP_041682, would you read what's in Paragraph No. 2, marked as No. 2 on this page?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, this reads -- J.
Kunkel is on record in his July 22nd, 2014 letter report to Abel Russ that, "The existing ash ponds should be closed. However, Dr. Hennet's

[^46]recommendation of cleanup of existing groundwater contamination using the pump and treat alternative may be interpreted under the proposed USEPA rule as technically impracticable because of the proximity of canals, rivers, and Lake Michigan, which could result in increased water pumping and treatment if that alternative were utilized."

MR. RUSS: I'm going to object to the use of this exhibit. These witnesses don't have any familiarity with it. It's basically hearsay, as far as they are concerned.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Ms. Nijman?
MS. NIJMAN: Yes. Experts may rely on and consider all data available to them. Mr. Dorgan just testified that he considered that other experts in this matter have looked at other remedies, and this is one of the documents he considered to do that.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah, you know, whether it's hearsay or not, I'm going back to the Board's Rule 101 -- what was that -- 626. Yeah, reasonable and prudent person would rely on it. So, thank you. Overruled. You may continue.
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MS. NIJMAN: Do you agree with the assessment about whether a pump and treat remedy at the four stations would be technically impracticable?

MR. DORGAN: I agree with that finding.

MS. NIJMAN: If you would read what's listed at paragraph 6 on this page and carries over.

MR. DORGAN: This paragraph states, "Pump and treat as an option for groundwater restoration probably is not a technically practicable option for the four MWG power plant sites. IEPA prefers natural attenuation for the groundwater contaminants at power plant sites. There are no historical examples of pump and treat being used at ash disposal sites. J.K. will call A.R. tomorrow (8/21/14) to discuss this. It was agreed that for now the ELPC response to Question No. 9 of the Midwest Gen first interrogatory will be silent on pump and treat as a remedial option at the four power plant sites."

MS. NIJMAN: Do you agree with the statement that Illinois EPA prefers natural
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attenuation for groundwater?
MR. DORGAN: I agree that they
commonly approve natural attenuation for groundwater. They will certainly consider other alternatives as well, but this is -- this is one that they commonly accept.

MS. NIJMAN: I move to admit
Exhibit 1703.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Abel?
MR. RUSS: Just same objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
Your objection is noted. I am going to admit it over objection, Exhibit 1703, based on my prior ruling. Thank you.
(Whereupon, Respondent's Exhibit
No. 1703 was admitted into evidence.)

MS. NIJMAN: How did Mr. Kunkel's assessment of pump and treat being technically impracticable impact your remedy analysis?

MR. DORGAN: We came to an
understanding after our evaluation of the information in terms of framing up our historical understanding of the sites and the hydrogeologic

[^47]conditions, that pump and treat wasn't going to be viable. This was another data point that said, there are others that agree with that.

MS. NIJMAN: You had mentioned that you had reviewed Mr. Seymour's previous expert report in this matter?

MR. DORGAN: That's correct.
MS. NIJMAN: And I think you stated a few minutes ago that Mr. Seymour discussed concerns with a remedy. What was the remedy?

MR. DORGAN: I believe in that case he was commenting on a remedy that Mr. Kunkel had suggested, which was a removal option to excavate, haul offsite, and dispose at a landfill of the ash materials outside of the impoundments.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall what Mr. Seymour's concerns were about a removal option?

MR. DORGAN: If I recall correctly, I think his primary concern is he felt that the estimate of costs were significantly underreported, in that there were some key related costs that were excluded from Mr. Kunkel's analysis, and then he felt as though there hadn't

[^48]been an evaluation of community impact, impact to the surrounding roads, the number of trucks that would be required to support that type of an effort. So as a consequence, he did not deem that to be technically practicable.

MS. NIJMAN: And for the record, that's -- the Seymour report was Exhibit 903 in the previous hearing.

Do you agree with Mr. Seymour?
MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: What is your concern about -- or what do you agree with relating to truck travel?

MR. RUSS: Objection, leading.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I didn't hear the question, and I didn't hear the objection, so --

MS. NIJMAN: The question was, what do you agree with with regards to truck travel? What is not a leading question.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah.
Overruled. You may answer, if you are able.
MR. DORGAN: One of the
considerations when you look at a removal action
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is community impact, which is how many trucks are going to have to roll throughout the surrounding neighborhoods on a daily basis to accommodate the removal. Those trucks, you know, give off diesel exhaust and CO2 emissions, and they have an impact on the road conditions. The local infrastructure needs to be adequate to support it.

So, there is a number of
variables that would be considered when looking at that option, and it doesn't appear that that had been the case, and they, in our opinion, would be significant.

MS. NIJMAN: And did you consider some of these factors when assessing applicable remedies for the four Midwest Gen stations?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, we did.
MS. NIJMAN: This might be a good time for a quick break, if anyone needs.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ten
minutes. We are off the record, Kari. Thank you.
(Whereupon, a short break was taken.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Back on
the record, Kari. You may proceed, Ms. Nijman.
L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

Thank you.
MS. NIJMAN: Thank you.
If you could look at your expert report, Exhibit 1701, at pages 21 and 22. It was the second tab on your binder. And if it's helpful for you, for anybody, if you want to just take the text sections out of the binder to refer to as you go forward so it's easier to flip back and forth.

In looking at this Section 2,
what -- would you describe what this is, Mr. Dorgan?

MR. DORGAN: These were several high-level issues that we identified with respect to Mr. Quarles' report and the way in which he -either in our opinion misinterpreted or misapplied certain standards to situations at the four sites.

MS. NIJMAN: In looking at your
first paragraph, Section 2.1, what was your concern there with Mr. Quarles' report?

MR. DORGAN: Well, the way
Mr. Quarles had prepared his report, he consistently made references back to the CCR rules, but wasn't necessarily differentiating what

[^49]circumstances he was referring to. So it was our interpretation of the way that he made those references that he was attempting to apply the CCR rules at both the federal and state level to the entirety of the stations, not just the regulated units, and we don't think that's the correct application.

MS. NIJMAN: And do you recall in his rebuttal report if Mr. Quarles responded to your concern?

MR. DORGAN: He did.
MS. NIJMAN: And do you recall what he said?

MR. DORGAN: He basically felt that we had misinterpreted that, and that he understood that there wasn't an application of the CCR rules outside of the CCR-regulated units themselves.

MS. NIJMAN: In the next section, 2.2 , what was your concern here about whether the impoundments are used for permanent disposal of ash?

MR. DORGAN: I believe that was largely predicated off of the heading to his section of the report which talked about CCR
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impoundments and disposal of ash. And then the way in which he referenced that in his report suggested to us that he felt that the CCR impoundments themselves are being used as a permanent means of disposal, whereas they are really just a treatment mechanism to remove water before being dredged and removed. So that's what we were pointing to.

MS. NIJMAN: And do you recall if, again, Mr. Quarles responded to that concern?

MR. DORGAN: Again, he felt that we didn't construe that correctly, and that wasn't what he was implying.

MS. NIJMAN: The next section, 2.3,
Quarles fails to consider the extensive data record available. What was the concern there? MR. DORGAN: Well, Mr. Quarles in his report and also in his testimony referenced many times to the need for a Nature and Extent evaluation. We interpreted the Board's order that they were seeking identification of a remedy and the appropriate relief related to that remedy as it relates to what was already in the record. So while we understand and Mr. Maxwell testified that
there may be instances where some data gaps need to be filled, we felt that there was an extensive reference that he really didn't reference.

He just kept coming back to, need Nature and Extent, need Nature and Extent, need Nature and Extent, and we felt like there has been a lot of investigation and a lot of data collected at these sites over the last ten plus years that certainly warranted consideration, and we did so.

MS. NIJMAN: On the next page, in Section 2.4 of your expert report, Exhibit 1701, you note, Quarles did not consider -- oh, I'm sorry -- failed to consider specific factors used by the Board.

What were you addressing there?
MR. DORGAN: Well -- and as we
reference later in our report, we were specifically speaking to the Environmental Protection Act Sections $33(\mathrm{c})$ and $42(\mathrm{~h})$, which spell out in the selection of a remedy criteria that should be considered to determine their reasonableness and appropriateness for the conditions that you are addressing. And there

[^50]hadn't been any reference to those criteria in Mr. Quarles' report.

MS. NIJMAN: If you would turn back to Exhibit 1102, which is Mr. Quarles' rebuttal report, and turn to page 25 of that report, there is a paragraph that is there that's got the heading, "Groundwater Elevations for Aquifer Separation." Do you see that?

MR. DORGAN: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you have an
understanding of what Mr. Quarles was trying to say here?

MR. DORGAN: I think Mr. Quarles was being critical of our reference to groundwater elevations in our report with respect to the bottom of the various pond liners suggesting that we were somehow implying that the CCR impoundments in all instances complied with that separation criteria in the rule, which isn't necessarily what we were trying to do.

MS. NIJMAN: And what was he saying about assessing conditions beneath the pond?

MR. DORGAN: So when we referenced to the groundwater elevations with respect to the

[^51]bottom of the ponds, we were looking at the wells immediately around the ponds, which is what you do. And what Mr . Quarles suggested here is that you can't actually determine what the groundwater elevation is, because you don't have a well beneath your pond in order to demonstrate that you don't have leakage and groundwater mounding, and that's just inconsistent with typical procedures and practices. It would not be practical. It would be unwise to have a well through a pond to try to measure groundwater elevations under a pond.

MS. NIJMAN: Well, that's what $I$ was going to ask you. How would you measure groundwater elevations beneath the pond, if not by wells around it?

MR. DORGAN: Well, that's really the only option you have, unless you put a well through your pond, which makes more sense and could create more problems than it solves.

MS. NIJMAN: What kind of problems?
MR. DORGAN: Obviously, you would
have to penetrate your liner. You'd create a preferential migration pathway that could allow

[^52]contamination from the ash within the -- in the ponds to be communicated down to your underlying groundwater. So I can't -- Mr. Maxwell agrees with me. I can't think of an instance where that type of approach has been done.

MS. NIJMAN: I would like to turn to the next slide, slide 10, which is the Joliet 29 Station, and I believe you stated earlier that Mr. Maxwell focused more on Joliet 29.

MR. DORGAN: That's correct.
MS. NIJMAN: Okay. So, turning to page 11 of your PowerPoint at Exhibit 1702. And if you would also keep your expert report out, Exhibit 1701, because we will refer back and forth.

So looking at this slide,
Mr. Maxwell, what is the purpose of laying it out this way?

MR. MAXWELL: So this is a summary
of the background and setting for the Joliet 29 Station, and on the right here is an aerial photo showing the relevant features of this station. And the left side lays out the appropriate background material that we started with as we
started reviewing the materials in developing the appropriate remedy.

MS. NIJMAN: And what were the relevant factors as you go through here for Joliet 29's background and setting?

MR. MAXWELL: So the station
initially began operating in the 1960s, and it wasn't acquired by Midwest Gen until 1999. The station has since ceased burning coal as of 2016, and in terms of the surrounding land use for the station, that has been discussed a little bit already here today, but it's located in a predominantly industrial area.

When you look at what is surrounding the station, off to the north is industrial commercial facilities out beyond vacant property to the north of US Highway 6. Off to the south you have got the Des Plaines River, and on the -- on the opposite side of the river is the Joliet 9 Generating Station, and then when you look at what's going on east and west of the station, on the east side is the Brandon Road Lock and Dam that Mr. Gnat had discussed earlier today. And then to the west is the a prior SRP site that

[^53]was a former industrial site that had gone through the SRP and attained an NFR letter and ultimately redeveloped into a warehouse use there off to the west of the station.

MS. NIJMAN: What does the -- so on your map you have this area in green on the left-hand side. What does that reflect?

MR. MAXWELL: That area in green is the -- is an ELUC, the environmental land use control that, as I understand, Midwest Gen agreed to as part of the -- the remedy associated with the SRP project there on the adjacent property. There was a groundwater -- there was information in that -- in that project file that indicated that groundwater contamination had the potential to come onto the Midwest Gen site.
And so in order to get the -- in
order for the applicant on the adjacent property to get their no further remediation letter, this ELUC was agreed to by Midwest Gen.

MS. NIJMAN: You note in your last bullet that the Joliet 29 is scheduled to cease burning natural gas in 2023, and I think Mr. Dorgan also mentioned that.
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MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. I guess, you know, not -- if a station is no longer producing power, then the -- there is no materials that are currently being produced that need to be sent to the ponds or treated or disposed of. So it's, I guess, a -- a source elimination, if you will, that the -- the station is intending to cease producing power.

MS. NIJMAN: And in the process of -- the remedy process general approach that Mr. Dorgan described, it was dividing the impoundments or looking at the impoundments on one side and the historic areas on the other side.

Did you do that with Joliet 29?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, we did.
MS. NIJMAN: And I can refer you to your expert report on pages 9 and 10, but I would like to go through that handy chart you prepared about the stations.

So the second to last page of your PowerPoint, Exhibit 1702, was the chart that Mr. Dorgan described earlier?

[^54]MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: And is Joliet 29 listed on this chart?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes. It is at the top.

MS. NIJMAN: Would you describe the ponds at Joliet 29?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes. So there are three ponds, and quite simply and easy to remember, they are labeled Pond 1, Pond 2, Pond 3, and none of them are currently receiving any CCR material, and in terms of the CCR regulatory status, Pond 2 is the only pond of the three that fall under either the state or the federal CCR rules, and Pond 2 actually falls under both.
In terms of liners, originally,
all three were lined with a Poz-O-Pac material that dates back to 1978. As part of the CCA process that was referred to earlier, each of the ponds received an upgraded liner that was an HDPE liner in order to enhance the -- the liner of each of the three ponds. 2008 was the -- was the installation date for Pond 1 and 2, and 2013 was the date the HDPE was installed for Pond 3.
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MS. NIJMAN: And looking at the next column on comments, what ponds contain ash at Joliet 29?

MR. MAXWELL: So, currently, none of those three ponds, Pond 1, Pond 2, Pond 3, currently contain CCR. There is -- there has been a couple of different studies that have documented that in the case of Pond 1 and Pond 3, and Pond 2, it's noted here the CCR was removed by November of 2019, and that Pond 2 was presently moving through the closure process under the -- the federal and Illinois CCR rules.

And in this particular case,
there is a pending adjusted standard that is before the Pollution Control Board that is seeking to -- to close this pond and -- via repurposing it so the intent is to close by decontaminating the liner, rather than removing the liner.

And then just finishing out the background information for the table, the groundwater monitoring programs that are implemented related to the ponds. The compliance commitment agreement, the CCA agreement, applies to all three ponds, and there is quarterly
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groundwater monitoring that's taking place in accordance with those requirements.

And then on top of that, there is -- there's CCR monitoring that's occurring related to Pond 2. Both the federal and state CCR groundwater monitoring is occurring for a network associated with Pond 2.

MS. NIJMAN: Okay. Let's turn to slide 12 of your PowerPoint at Exhibit 1702.

What is this map identifying?
MR. MAXWELL: So this is a
summation, a compilation of the historical soil borings, groundwater monitoring wells, sediment locations that have been performed during the -during the investigation history that we reviewed as part of the record.

MS. NIJMAN: Was this also Figure 5
from your expert report?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, it was.
MS. NIJMAN: And why was looking at
all the data in one place relevant to you?
MR. MAXWELL: Well, it gave us a
perspective for the quantity of data that's available. I think it's a nice visual to show it
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on a single map to demonstrate the quantity of the information that we have as a totality.

MS. NIJMAN: We are going to talk about it a little more later, but this map doesn't show what has been referred to as the northeast area on the far, right side of the map?

MR. MAXWELL: That is correct.
MS. NIJMAN: And are you aware of any more recent data about the northeast area?

MR. MAXWELL: There has been some more information that's been collected since our expert report in 2021. It was discussed during the hearing last month, and there were a -- there was an investigation that was performed by the Corp of Engineers, that involved some soil borings along the river bank, and also involved the collection of some sediment data along -- in the river channel itself.

MS. NIJMAN: To your recollection, did the borings show ash?

MR. MAXWELL: The borings along the river bank did not show ash in the boring logs, no.

MS. NIJMAN: To your recollection,
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did the sediment samples show impact from the Joliet 29 Station?

MR. MAXWELL: My recollection is that the -- there was one or two lead results that exceeded the standards, but that was the other metals that were analyzed indicated that the concentrations were below the -- the standards.

MS. NIJMAN: Was there anything to suggest that the lead in the two instances you are referring to related to the Joliet 29 Station?

MR. MAXWELL: No, no. I don't have any reason to suspect that that would be connected.

MS. NIJMAN: Looking at slide 13 of Exhibit 1702, your PowerPoint. What are you identifying here?

MR. MAXWELL: So this is a bullet list of the various different investigations that have occurred through the years at the Joliet station that were shown on the prior slide as a visual. So this simply lists the various investigations that were performed in more of a bullet list.

MS. NIJMAN: And is this in

[^55]chronological order?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, it is.
MS. NIJMAN: Turning to your next
slide, slide 14. Is this the first stage of the investigation you listed on your prior slide?

MR. MAXWELL: That's right. In
1998, it was the first one in chronological order that was -- that was performed.

MS. NIJMAN: And you have noted some factors from this 1998 Phase II. Why was this relevant to you?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, this was the original -- this was the earliest information that was gathered, and we summarize here that there was a good number of borings, monitoring wells, and surface soil samples that were collected, including some sediment samples that were collected.

So a good quantity of data was collected. In particular, we felt that data from monitoring wells, MW-3 and MW-5, was particularly important.

MS. NIJMAN: Can you point those out?
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MR. MAXWELL: So MW-3 is located -if you see the -- the north arrow pointing north, it is off to the upper left from the north arrow. That's MW-3.

And then MW-5 is located -- it's located in the north -- northwest of MW-3. It's the first monitoring well that's located northwest of MW-3.

MS. NIJMAN: And the findings for those wells you have listed on the second bullet here?

MR. MAXWELL: That's right. So Monitoring Well 3 and Monitoring Well 5, there was -- there were groundwater samples that were collected from both of those wells, and they were analyzed for the eight RCRA metals, and those concentrations ended up being below the Class 1 groundwater quality standards.

MS. NIJMAN: Do you know whether it was Midwest Generation who engaged in this 1998 Phase II study?

MR. MAXWELL: My understanding, it was not Midwest Generation. It was the prior owner of the site was the -- as the one that
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engaged the consultant that performed that work. MS. NIJMAN: Is data from 1998 still useful to you?

MR. MAXWELL: It's a data point. It's part of the totality of information that we are looking at. There is a report that documents it. That report was generated by a -- what we know to be a reputable consultant in the industry. We recognize and acknowledge that 1998 is not the same as 2023. However, it's -- it was part of our evaluation in terms of the overall assessment that we made.

MS. NIJMAN: How did the data from 1998 have any relevance to the historic nature of ash at Joliet 29?

MR. MAXWELL: I'm not quite
following.
MS. NIJMAN: Well, let me put it this way. Now, Mr. Dorgan earlier mentioned how long some of the stations had been operating.

What is your understanding of how long Joliet had been operating?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So, Joliet had been operating since the 1960 s as indicated in our
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previous slide, and so the -- the groundwater samples that were collected here, for example, would -- would be representative of impacts, because the potential CCR materials would have been there for quite some time.

There would have been ample opportunity for migration to have occurred to the monitoring wells that were -- that were sampled as part of this -- as part of this assessment. Certainly sufficient time had passed since the beginning of the station to when this data was collected.

MS. NIJMAN: What were the conclusions of the Phase II ESA as listed on your slide 14?

MR. MAXWELL: So the conclusions was that there wasn't a concern as it relates to groundwater ingestion. It was pointed out that there is -- there were no -- although in 1998 there wasn't an ELUC or a GMZ, in 1998, there were no known potable water supply wells that would be a concern. So that was the basis for that.

The industrial land use was
still -- it was still being used for industrial
land use as of 1998, and as a result, there was a low potential for human exposure to constituents of concern because of the industrial land use, and then finally, under Illinois environmental law, there was no -- no further requirement to further investigate or remediate the property was the conclusion in the Phase II.

MS. NIJMAN: Are you familiar with an area referred to sometimes as the southwest historic ash area?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I am.
MS. NIJMAN: And where is that on
this map? I imagine to the southwest.
MR. MAXWELL: That's right. It's
off to the -- so the southwest is the lower left in that map.

MS. NIJMAN: Did this Phase II
provide data that was relevant to you regarding the southwest area?

MR. MAXWELL: We did believe that this information is relevant. Monitoring Well --MW-3, we believe, is downgradient of at least the northwest portion of the southwest fill area. So when you look at the location of that well and the
fact that groundwater from that particular spot, that northwest corner of the southwest fill area, it's going to have an opportunity to laterally spread out the mechanisms that we have talked about before. The dilution, attenuation, advection, dispersion is going to take place, which is going to result in MW-3 representing -samples from MW-3 representing an evaluation of potential impacts from that -- that location of the southwest fill yard.

MS. NIJMAN: And you already
mentioned in your second bullet on the slide the results from MW-3.

Did you compare any of the MW-3
results with current Class 1 groundwater standards?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, we did, and we found that the -- the results from 1998 meet current Class 1 standards.

MS. NIJMAN: Turn to your next slide, slide 15 of Exhibit 1702.

What does this slide represent?
MR. MAXWELL: So this is the -- the 2004 investigation that was a preliminary
investigation that looked at the viability of coal combustion byproduct, or otherwise known as beneficial use of CC -- CCR materials within that northwest area of the station.

MS. NIJMAN: Is this the -- you were here with Mr. Gnat this morning, and he referred to a wind barrier of some kind.

Is your -- what is your
understanding with regard to this area and the wind barrier?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So, my
understanding is that this material was under consideration for beneficial reuse to build this wind berm, or wind barrier, that was discussed this morning by Mr. Gnat. And so this 2004 investigation was simply the preliminary assessment in order to evaluate whether or not the CC -- a CCB approach would be viable.

MS. NIJMAN: You mention on this slide the NLET analysis. And we have heard some testimony about that already. Just briefly, describe what it is.

MR. MAXWELL: So that's the neutral leaching extraction test, and that is a test that
is required by the $C C B$ requirements in the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, and it essentially is -- as the name implies, it's a leach with a neutral pH , which is seven.

MS. NIJMAN: Turning to your next slide, slide 16. What are we seeing in 2005 at Joliet 29?

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. So in 2005, there were some geotechnical borings that were advanced, and there were a total of six. I guess they were probes, and the -- this provided a -kind of a back -- this was, as we understand it, was Midwest Gen sort of trying to understand what they had in terms of the characteristics of the soils in the vicinity of the ponds as part of a preventative maintenance.

There was consideration even dating back to 2005 of install -- of evaluating the condition of the liners and upgrading the liners, and the char- -- the geotechnical characteristics of the soils was a part of that evaluation.

MS. NIJMAN: Turning to the next
slide, slide 17 of Exhibit 1702. This refers to a
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second CCB investigation in the northwest area. What do you mean by that? MR. MAXWELL: Right. So, this was following up on the 2004 CCB investigation that indicated that there was some viability to -- to the CCB approach, and so this was a more thorough investigation of the CCB viability, or beneficial reuse viability, and so it comprised -- it was comprised of 15 additional Geoprobes, and again, they collected composite samples of the vertical interval from each of the probes and had those composite samples analyzed for the NLET leach test in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act in order to evaluate the viability of the CCB material.

And we have got the results on this slide here as well, and the results were at every location other than one, GP-14A, the concentrations from the NLET result or testing were below the Class 1 groundwater quality standards, and the result for copper and lead at GP-14A were above the NLET Class 1 groundwater quality standards.

MS. NIJMAN: So, then, turning to
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your next slide, what happened to the area around 14A?

MR. MAXWELL: So, again, additional investigation and evaluation was performed in order to delineate the extent of the material at 14A that -- that had -- that did not meet the NLET Class 1 groundwater standards. And so they looked at additional borings and probes, test pits, north, south, east and west, of the original GP-14A. They collected composite samples similar to the samples from before and were able to show that -- the extent of the materials that do not meet the NLET Class 1 groundwater quality standards was shown with a hatched area here around GP-14A, and subsequently, they coordinated a total of 52 truckloads of materials that were hauled away to a permitted landfill for proper disposal.

MS. NIJMAN: And why was this removal of importance or relevance to your opinions about Joliet 29?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, it -- it demonstrated that there was a process that -- an investigation process that was performed, that in
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response to the investigation that specific actions were taken in order to address the conditions that were identified in the investigation.

MS. NIJMAN: And what does this tell you about the ash that remains in that area?

MR. MAXWELL: So, the ash that remains in that area, it qualifies as -- for beneficial reuse under the Illinois Environmental Protection Act. The concentrations of the constituents of concern are below the Class 1 groundwater quality standard as it relates to the NLET testing.

MS. NIJMAN: And how does that relate to your analysis of risk?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, it -- it demonstrates that those materials are -- there is not as much risk as if those materials had leached and exceeded the Class 1 groundwater quality standards. The leaching is of a benign nature.

MS. NIJMAN: Turning to slide 19 of Exhibit 1702. What are you showing here?

MR. MAXWELL: So this is a summary of the 2010 hydrogeologic investigation that was
performed by Patrick Engineering. Again, this has been discussed here a number of times during the -- during the hearing, but this was an investigation that was before the $C C R$ rules were promulgated. It was voluntary, performed at the request of the Illinois EPA, and it involved the installation of 11 monitoring wells shown on the diagram here on the right, monitoring wells both north and south of the three ponds.

The -- the investigation
involved the collection of one round of groundwater samples and the analysis of 11 potential CCR-related constituents, and we have the results here on the slide also. The boron concentrations -- and we mentioned boron, because boron, we believe, is a key CCR indicator. So we think that that's particularly important. The boron concentrations in the groundwater were below the Part 620 standards, the Class 1 standards, and they did identify chloride that was present upgradient above the Class 1 standard of 200 milligrams per liter.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned this was done by Patrick. Did you have anything to do with
the locations of these wells?
MR. MAXWELL: No, no, we did not.
We simply reviewed the information and considered it as we looked at the proper remedy.

MS. NIJMAN: In your review of this document, which wells are the upgradient wells?

MR. MAXWELL: MW-11, MW-10, and MW-8 on north and northwest sides of the ponds are upgradient.

MS. NIJMAN: And do you have an understanding of whether those upgradient wells are installed in ash?

MR. MAXWELL: I do. And they are not installed in ash.

MS. NIJMAN: Looking upgradient from Monitoring Wells 8, 10, and 11, we have heard testimony from Mr. Gnat that that's a road.

Are you familiar with that?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I am. I have seen it myself as well.

MS. NIJMAN: Could those wells have been located any further upgradient, if you will?

MR. MAXWELL: No, they couldn't.
There is no space, because they are right up
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against a -- a berm that abuts the highway. So there is just no place else to put them on the property.

MS. NIJMAN: You discuss in slide 19 that -- in your fourth bullet that 11 potential CCR-related analytes were not detected. Would you explain that?

MR. MAXWELL: So the potential
CCR-related analytes, those, as I understand it, were selected at the -- under the -- under discussion with Illinois EPA. They were the constituents that would later become the 40 CFR 257 Appendix III and Appendix IV constituents that are associated with CCR. So there is various specific metals that are associated with -- and other analytes that are associated with CCR as promulgated by the regs later.

MS. NIJMAN: And then you mentioned already that boron was below the Part 620 standards. Did that finding of boron generally stay consistent over time?

MR. MAXWELL: It did. You know, groundwater does -- it's dynamic, but I -- there was a small number of instances historically where
boron may have possibly been higher or lower, but, yeah, for the most part, it is -- it has been below, consistently, the Class 1 standards.

MS. NIJMAN: You also mentioned chloride when you described this slide. Have you assessed the cause or the basis of chloride being found at Joliet 29?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. We have looked into that, the potential source of chloride, and as was discussed here earlier this morning, the highway to the north and northwest of the ponds does -- it's documented to have received road salt, calcium chloride being the primary category or primary type of road salt. And so it seems to -- to make sense the chloride and later the calcium would be -- would be associated with the -- with the road salt that was applied to the highway there to the north.

MS. NIJMAN: I would like to show you or ask you to turn to exhibit -- excuse me -tab 4 in your binder. And this is -- has been marked as an excerpt of Exhibit 1605, because Ms. Shealey was going to discuss it. It is also an agreed exhibit on our list of agreed exhibits

[^56]with the Plaintiffs -- or excuse me -Complainants.

What is this document,
Mr. Maxwell?
MR. MAXWELL: This is an expert opinion that I prepared related to the adjusted standard that -- that is being sought for the Joliet Station.

MS. NIJMAN: And if you would read the date on it?

MR. MAXWELL: It is dated
March 21st, 2022.
MS. NIJMAN: And did you -- you
prepared this, you said?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I did.
MS. NIJMAN: Would you look at and read the Bullet Point No. 2 on this first page, read that out loud?

MR. MAXWELL: "Contaminant transport mechanisms related to migration of chloride from US Highway 6 located north of Pond 2 to the groundwater monitoring wells."

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
Mr. Maxwell, can you slow down a little, please?

[^57]MR. MAXWELL: I apologize.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank
you.
MS. NIJMAN: Let's try it again.
MR. MAXWELL: "Contaminant transport mechanisms related to migration of chloride from US Highway 6 located north of Pond 2 to the groundwater monitoring wells located around Pond 2."

MS. NIJMAN: And is that the opinion you were giving in this report or describes what opinion you were going to give in this report?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes. That -- that set
the table for my opinion there that's presented below that.

MS. NIJMAN: And in the paragraph below, you refer to a different expert opinion. What was that about?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So there were two opinions. There was an opinion -- this was the subsequent opinion that was prepared in response to information that was provided by the Illinois EPA, and so this opinion here was intended to be a response to that. The original

[^58]opinion was from December 6th of 2021, and I can go ahead and read the major conclusion from that December 6th, 2-0-2-1 opinion.

MS. NIJMAN: Yes. Thank you.
MR. MAXWELL: "Our expert opinion in support of Midwest Generation, LLC's opinion for adjusted standard, Joliet 29 Station, dated December 6th, 2021 indicated that groundwater data demonstrated that the groundwater is not impacted by CCR that was historically in Pond 2, nor -- nor indicative of potential sources of CCR outside the pond. The additional information presented herein in response to the above technical issues included in the Illinois EPA recommendation further supports WCG's analysis and opinions."

MS. NIJMAN: And just to be clear, I think you said expert opinion in support of Midwest Generation LLC's..." I think you said opinion, but the word is "petition," right?

MR. MAXWELL: Petition for adjusted standard, correct.

MS. NIJMAN: Yeah. And I would like to refer you to Bates page 122708 in this document. At the bottom of the page --

[^59]MR. MAXWELL: Okay.
MS. NIJMAN: -- there is a heading
that says, "Evaluation of Contaminant Transport of Chloride." Do you see that?

MR. MAXWELL: I do.
MS. NIJMAN: What was the finding of your analysis of the chloride at Joliet 29?

MR. MAXWELL: Our finding was that the chloride -- the source of the chloride that was identified in the -- in the monitoring wells associated with Pond 2 was from the application of road salts on the highway adjacent to the station.

MS. NIJMAN: You mentioned here on the last line that Illinois EPA -- excuse me -the first line under the heading you -- it states, "The Illinois EPA and Midwest Gen previously agreed in 2012 that exceedances of 35 IAC Section 620.410 groundwater quality standard for chloride in groundwater at monitoring wells around Pond 2 are due to road salts applied to US Highway 6 north of Pond 2."

What was your understanding of the agreement in 19 -- or 2012?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So that was
actually cited in the Illinois EPA recommendation regarding the -- the adjusted standard, and that cited to -- so that was referenced by Illinois EPA, and as I recall, that cited to a 2012 letter that was between Midwest Gen and USEPA as the basis for -- for that idea that the chloride is related to the ponds -- or I'm sorry -- related to the highway.

MS. NIJMAN: I'm sorry. You said
USEPA. Illinois EPA?
MR. MAXWELL: Illinois EPA.
MS. NIJMAN: And do you know personally if -- or have you looked into whether the City of Joliet uses calcium chloride on its roads?

MR. MAXWELL: I have. I've looked at their website.

MS. NIJMAN: And what does it show?
MR. MAXWELL: The website indicates that calcium chloride is the type of road salt that they use for -- for the roads.

MS. NIJMAN: Turning back to the
slide presentation PowerPoint at Exhibit 1702, Slide No. 20. What does this reflect?
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MR. MAXWELL: This is the groundwater elevation contour map that was included in the Patrick report on their initial hydrogeologic investigation that shows the groundwater elevation data from their initial groundwater monitoring activities, and they have contoured it in order to show the groundwater flow configuration.

MS. NIJMAN: Looking first at your first bullet, you state -- you have a discussion about potable wells. What was that about?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So they did investigate the -- the presence or absence of potable wells, and the -- the conclusions was that no potable wells were located on the station downgradient of the ponds that would be -- that could be utilized as a source of drinking water.

MS. NIJMAN: And you noted depth to groundwater. Why was that relevant to you?

MR. MAXWELL: That just gave us a sense for how deep the uppermost groundwater unit was, and we reference it here as 29 to 34 feet. It -- that's getting pretty close to the -- to the bedrock by that point. So that just gave us a

[^60]sense for the hydrogeologic setting.
MS. NIJMAN: On the top, right side of this map in the northeast corner, what are those contour lines showing?

MR. MAXWELL: So the way those contour lines are curved, it shows a flow that is from the -- what has been referred to later as the northeast fill area there off to the northeast of this map here in the direction of well -- MW-1, and eventually MW-2 also.

MS. NIJMAN: And why was that relevant to you to show?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, we are showing an arrow here. Just hydrogeology 101 is the flow is perpendicular to the contour lines, and so the idea here is that these wells, at least for this particular monitoring event, showed that MW-1 was downgradient of the area that would later be called the northeast fill area as part of the record.

MS. NIJMAN: And did you see this
general flow more than once in your review?
MR. MAXWELL: We did look in the record to see if there were other examples of --

[^61]of this flow, and we were able to find another one, yes.

MS. NIJMAN: And do you recall me asking Mr. Dorgan about his review of the Kunkel testimony from the first part of the hearing? MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I do.

MS. NIJMAN: And did you also have the review -- opportunity to review some of Mr. Kunkel's testimony from first part of the hearing in this matter?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I did.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall if
Mr. Kunkel testified about the flow from the northeast side of the station impacting these wells?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes. As I recall, Dr. Kunkel made a reference to what is shown on this boring -- or I'm sorry -- this map from Patrick in terms of the flow, on occasion, on a transient case being from the northeast fill area in the direction of pond -- of MW-1 and MW-2.

MS. NIJMAN: And what have been the findings in MW-1 and MW-2 as to the contaminants of concern for ash?
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MR. MAXWELL: There haven't been any consistent concentrations of $C C R$ constituents of concern above the Class 1 standard in MW-1 or MW-2 .

MS. NIJMAN: And why was this groundwater flow direction from the northeast area relevant to your opinions?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, there has been mention of a lack of groundwater and monitoring well and soil boring data from the northeast fill area, and this was at least an example of an instance where at least on a temporary basis, the groundwater flow set-up that is shown here would indicate -- would be useful in terms of looking at MW-1 and whether or not the northeast fill area is having a detrimental impact on the groundwater at MW-1 .

MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall whether Mr. Kunkel said anything about what was done with 95 percent of the ash at the Joliet site?

MR. MAXWELL: My recollection was that the testimony was that 95 percent of it was not disposed at Joliet 29, but was taken across the river to the Joliet 9 site and the -- the -- I

[^62]believe to the -- historically, most of it has gone to the Lincoln Stone Quarry for disposal via a pipe bridge.

MS. NIJMAN: How was that relevant to the conditions at Joliet 29, in your opinion?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, that
demonstrates that historically minimal ash has been -- has been managed in the ponds, and that the majority of the ash has gone offsite. So you are just -- you're just talking about a smaller source volume, potential source volume.

MS. NIJMAN: I would like to refer you to page 35 of the Board opinion, the interim opinion from 2019. And we are going to put that up on the screen, the second full paragraph on page 35.

MR. MAXWELL: Is that Exhibit 1110?
MS. NIJMAN: No. This is the Board opinion, which was up there at some point --

MR. MAXWELL: Okay.
MS. NIJMAN: -- but I'm not sure is there anymore.

MR. MAXWELL: I'm not seeing it.
MS. NIJMAN: Yeah. We will have to

[^63]put it up on the screen. Page 35, second full paragraph on the page. So if you would read that second full paragraph from the opinion, starting, "The environmental groups..."

MR. MAXWELL: "The environmental groups provided a comparison of the median values of boron and sulfate in the monitoring wells with the 90th percentile statewide values from the statewide database. The comparison indicated exceedances of the 90 th percentile statewide value of boron in well MW-11 and sulfate in well MW-09." And then it cites a citation. "All other wells have no exceedances of either boron or sulfate above the 90th percentile values."

MS. NIJMAN: Then, in the next
paragraph on the last line, what is the Board saying about boron in MW-11?

MR. MAXWELL: They say that, "The
Board finds that given that $M W-11$ is an upgradient well and no exceedances of the 90 th percentile statewide value for boring occurred in any other well, coal ash stored in ash ponds or coal ash deposits outside of the ash ponds at the Joliet 29 site are not the likely sources causing boron
exceedances in MW-11.
MS. NIJMAN: So then the Board goes on in the next paragraph to discuss sulfate at MW-9. Do you see that?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: So let's go to your
slide 21 in your PowerPoint at Exhibit 1702. And what does this document reflect, or this page of your PowerPoint?

MR. MAXWELL: So this is an investigation that was performed in 2020 by Midwest Gen in response to the concentrations of primarily sulfate and TDS that were identified in well MW-09. That well stood out a little bit as an outlier in terms of the overall chemistry of groundwater quality at the Joliet site, and the investigation was performed in order to try to get a better assessment of potential -- the potential reason for the sulfate and TDS concentrations that we were seeing in that particular well.

MS. NIJMAN: And what was done as part of the investigation?

MR. MAXWELL: So, a total of 18 soil probes were advanced, and the soil samples --
samples of soil from the probes were analyzed for sulfate, iron, and manganese. They also attempted to take groundwater samples from temporary wells as well, and I believe that those temporary wells ended up being dry. So there was no groundwater samples that were collected, but -- so that was the -- that was what was done.

We discussed or looked at the boring logs from this specific investigation this morning. The results of the boring logs did not identify any CCR materials in the boring logs. MS. NIJMAN: There was some discussion about the depths of the Geoprobe boring logs. Do you recall that from this morning?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you have any concern about the depths of the Geoprobe boring logs? MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. I don't have any major concerns. The MW-9 was advanced to the -- to the bedrock. No CCR materials were identified in MW-09. The fact that we weren't able to get through the obstructions that were identified in some of these borings, I don't think is particularly material as it relates to the

[^64]other data that we have that shows what we believe the source to -- of the TDS and sulfate at MW-9 is.

MS. NIJMAN: Well, let's go to that.
You mention in your fourth bullet, "pH of groundwater in MW-9 is acidic."

Why is that relevant to your
opinions?
MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. So it is
acidic, and in some cases it has been substantially acidic. It's important because that stands out. As mentioned, the sulfate and TDS stands out, but the pH stands out also when you look at the rest of the monitoring wells, and it's acidic, and the important part of that, I believe, is that it -- CCR materials, if you look at the -the neut- -- or the natural $p H$ under the LEAF tests for CCR materials, it's documented that it's basic, not acidic.

> So the fact that you have got acidic pH was something that $I$ think is giving us pause right out of the gate.

MS. NIJMAN: And I can refer you to
page 37 of your expert report where you discuss
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this investigation at MW-09. What were your findings -- or what were the findings? Sorry.

MR. MAXWELL: So what we did was we looked at -- we looked at the soils and what were the sources of the soils there, and what was the mineralogy of the sources of the soils there, and the -- the source of the native soils there is the underlying dolomite bedrock, and there was a citation that identified that there are certain sulfide minerals that are present in that particular dolomite bedrock unit that -- and we have seen, in fact, cobbles of that bedrock in the boring logs in this vicinity. So that is just an indication that this bedrock material is related to these soils.

The sulfide minerals that are part of these dolomite bedrock, when they are exposed to oxygen as you can have when you install a monitoring well and expose the soils to oxygen, whereas previously they weren't before the well was installed, that addition of oxygen to the -to the soils ultimately results in a condition where the -- it oxidizes the minerals, the sulfide minerals, and that ultimately lowers the pH , and

[^65]the lower pH then subsequently mobilizes other constituents that are naturally present in the soil, and, like, sulfates, TDS, cobalt, nickel, these constituents all present as documented in the dolomite bedrock. Once you get the oxidation of the sulfide minerals, as a result of the low pH, it mobilizes these constituents, and ultimately results in the presence of them in the groundwater.

MS. NIJMAN: So I'm looking at page 7 -- 37 of your report in the second, full paragraph, and the last sentence reads, Thus, the sporadic sulfate and TDS groundwater concentrations are naturally occurring in the soil and are not due to station operations, including the presence of $C C R$ in the soil or from a leaking pond."

Do you see that sentence?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I do.
MS. NIJMAN: Is that -- does that
summarize your conclusion?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes. I provided the technical background the last few minutes, but yes, that absolutely succinctly summarizes the

[^66]source of the TDS and the sulfate.
MS. NIJMAN: Do you recall
Mr. Quarles' opinion about this acidic pH?
MR. MAXWELL: I do.
MS. NIJMAN: And what did he say?
MR. MAXWELL: As I recall, it was
sort of a generic reference to acidic pH and these types of concentrations of sulfate and TDS typically being associated with CCR materials. MS. NIJMAN: Do you agree with that? MR. MAXWELL: I don't. As mentioned, basic pH is much more typical of CCR impacts as evidenced by the LEAF leaching data that we have at this site, and so, no, I do not agree with that.

MS. NIJMAN: So, in your opinion, were any of the groundwater results -- excuse me -- any of the results in the area near MW-9 a result of CCR in that area?

MR. MAXWELL: No, no. We believe that what's being detected in the monitoring well there is related to the -- the oxidation of the sulfide minerals from the dolomite.

MS. NIJMAN: And in your opinion,
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did your investigation of MW-9 address the Board's question about MW-9 sulfate?

MR. MAXWELL: I believe it did. I think that the Board -- at the time of the 2019 opinion -- interim opinion, they -- that information hadn't been collected yet, and so the information that was collected in 2020 I think was very useful and allowed us to -- to evaluate the data and come to the conclusions that we were able to come to.

MS. NIJMAN: Let's go back to your PowerPoint Exhibit 1702 and look at slide 22. This concerns -- the caption is, "Ongoing Groundwater Monitoring at Joliet 29." What are you showing here?

MR. MAXWELL: So as part of the record, there is ongoing groundwater monitoring that's taking place at the Joliet 29 Station. There is a total of 12 monitoring wells that are installed around the ponds, and there is multiple groundwater monitoring programs that are being implemented. There is the federal detection or Appendix III constituents that are being evaluated. There is the federal Appendix IV
assessment constituents that are being analyzed for, and then there is also -- on top of that, there is quarterly monitoring that's occurring in compliance with the CCAs.

So this is just a summation of the ongoing groundwater monitoring that's taking place at the station as in compliance with these various items.

MS. NIJMAN: Okay. Turning to your next slide, slide 23. It concerns the northeast historic fill area that we have had a bit of discussion about already. What is the information you had to assess this northeast area?

MR. MAXWELL: So this is what I
would call a -- kind of the sum accumulation or the totality of the lines of evidence of total information that we had at our disposal, a summary of that. We have had a fair amount of discussion this morning about the inspections that have been occurring on a regular basis at the northeast fill area.

So that's the first bullet there is that a regular evaluation is performed as to the top soil cover erosional features that might

[^67]be present in this area of this station. If those erosional features are identified, there has been discussion about addressing those issues and correcting those issues, repairing those issues, if those erosional features are observed.

There is no historical
observation of seeps along the river bank, as testified to by Mr. Gnat. There is heavy vegetation. I think that it was referred to as quite a heavy jungle during certain times of the year. And I can attest to that as well. I visited that and saw that, and conversely, there is a lack of stressed vegetation to suggest that there is substantial harmful leachate or harmful materials in the soils that would be affecting the vegetation.

The sum total of information relates to groundwater flow also. We talked a couple slides ago about the flow in the Patrick depiction of groundwater -- of groundwater elevations, that there is flow from this area to the vicinity of $M W-1$ at Pond 3.

And then this last bullet is
referring to the work along the Des Plaines River
that -- that was done recently last year coordinated by the Corp of Engineers that involved advancing some borings along the river bank, as well as collecting some sediment samples from the -- from the bank -- or the -- the surface of the river.

MS. NIJMAN: Now, we heard this
morning -- also you mentioned the testimony this morning. We heard that there is potentially -there is some evidence of ash that Mr . Gnat had identified in 2009. How does that impact your opinion?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. That was part of the record that we reviewed. That was part of the totality of the information that we were looking at. I believe in our deposition we didn't dispute the idea that some ash is present there, and the information that we do have, however, as just outlined, we believe is sufficient to -- in order to -- to arrive at the remedy that we have put forth for the Joliet Station.

MS. NIJMAN: Is any ash in your -can you provide your opinion about whether any ash found means there is a source to groundwater?

MR. MAXWELL: Any ash found does not indicate automatically that there is a source to groundwater contamination. There has been data that we'll discuss later at other stations where analytical data shows that the concentrations are actually below the TACO remedial objectives in some instances where $C C R$ has been logged in borings. So that is dependent -- you know, the chemistry of the CCR material that might be logged in a boring is -- is one of the driving factors, and so, you know, in many cases, the CCR material could be mixed with soil, as an example.

If it's mixed with soil, the quantities of that mixture is going to dictate whether or not it's ultimately going to result in a source or not. So you have got something that's mostly soil with a little ash, you know, that's less likely to be a source. The opposite would be true for the opposite.

So it really is dependent on the chemistry, and you certainly don't want to assume that any and all CCR that might be present in the boring is going to represent a source to groundwater contamination.


[^68]```
to infiltration?
```

MR. MAXWELL: It's certainly not
a -- it's not considered an engineered clay cap, but it -- it has the potential to minimize infiltration, you know, depending on -- most topsoil is comprised of a mixture, what we call a loam of sand silts and clays. So, you know, the loamier or siltier or clayier parts of the soil are going to serve to minimize infiltration.

The way that it's contoured sloping to the river is going to minimize infiltration. So there are aspects of the cover that are beneficial as it relates to, I guess, separating the -- or minimizing the production of leachate.

MS. NIJMAN: You were present for the testimony of Ms. Shealey in May, I believe, correct?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. NIJMAN: And did you hear her discussion about the Army Corp project to protect from Asian carp?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I did.
MS. NIJMAN: And what is your
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recollection of her discussion about the material that was in this northeast area?

MR. MAXWELL: As I recall,
Ms. Shealey's information was based on discussions with the Corp of Engineers who coordinated that investigation that we were speaking about, their impression was that that material along the river bank there was related to dredge, dredged spoilings from prior dredging along the river.

MS. NIJMAN: In your role as an expert in this matter, had you had other opportunity to speak to Ms. Shealey about what might be in this northeast area, or what she understood was in this northeast area?

MR. MAXWELL: I have. We have had interactions, yes.

MS. NIJMAN: And based on those discussions, do you have any understanding of whether it -- well, there was -- do you recall the discussions in the 1998 ENSR report you reviewed about where ash from Joliet 9 might have gone pre-1966?

MR. MAXWELL: I think there is -the 1998 Phase II, it made an anecdotal, very
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generic reference to ash from Joliet 9 coming to Joliet 29.

MS. NIJMAN: And have you discussed that question with Ms. Shealey?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes. And my impression from that discussion was that that would be operationally challenging; meaning, that it just wouldn't be convenient, as I understood it, to truck CCR material from Joliet 9 across the river across the bridge near the the Brandon Dam just because of the -- primarily because of the haul distance. You would almost have to be doing it on almost a regular basis.

It just wouldn't make a lot of sense because of the haul distance, the nature of that bridge. It just wouldn't be the first option for -- for managing CCR materials on the opposite side of the river, because it just isn't the most convenient means to deal with it is my understanding of her impression of the history.

MS. NIJMAN: And do you agree with that impression?

MR. MAXWELL: It makes sense to me,
yes. The -- you -- in this type of an

> L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.
application, you -- typically what's done is it -it's dealt with in the most convenient manner. You want -- it's the path of least resistance, if you will. So, I mean, from a -- from a logical standpoint, it makes sense that it would be a challenge to continually truck the materials to that -- to that location from the opposite side of the river.

MS. NIJMAN: And, Mr. Hearing Officer, it's 5:20. I'm moving into a whole different area here. I can begin or --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah. Whatever you feel comfortable with or, you know, I'm happy to quit now and continue to tomorrow at 9:00.

MS. NIJMAN: Okay. Let's do that
then.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. We are going to go off the record until tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m., and hopefully, I will remember it's in 16-503. Thank you.
(END OF PROCEEDINGS.)
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