			Page 1
1	ILI	LINOIS POLLUTION CONTRO	L BOARD
2			
3	IN THE MATTER	OF:	
4			
5	PROPOSED AMENI	DMENTS TO GROUNDWATER	Docket No.
6	QUALITY (35 II	LL. ADM. CODE 620)	R22-18(A)
7	FOR 35 ILL. AI	DM. CODE 811, 814	
8			
9		HEARING	
10	DATE:	Tuesday, September 16	, 2025
11	TIME:	10:30 a.m.	
12	BEFORE:	Hearing Officer Chloe	Salk
13	LOCATION:	Michael A. Bilandic B	uilding
14		160 North LaSalle Str	eet, Room N502
15		Chicago, IL 60601	
16	REPORTED BY:	Haley Goodwin	
17	JOB NO.:	7543763	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	ALSO PRESENT (Cont'd):
3	Jacqueline Cooperider, Senior Public Service
4	Administrator - Illinois Environmental Protection
5	Agency (by videoconference)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Veritext Legal Solutions

				Page	5
1	IND	E X			
2	WITNESSES:	DX	CX	RDX	RCX
3	ERIC BALLENGER				
4	By Mr. Rao	13			
5	By Ms. Tipsord	19			
6	By Ms. Tin	20			
7	BRAD HUNSBERGER				
8	By Mr. Rao	29			
9	JOSHUA RHOADES				
10	By Ms. Zwick	33			
11	By Mr. Sievers	49			
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					

			Page 6
1		EXHIBITS	
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	ID/EVD
3	Hearing:		
4	Exhibit 1	Pre-Filed Testimony from	
5		National Waste & Recycling	
6		Association	12/12
7	Exhibit 2	Pre-Filed Answers from	
8		National Waste & Recycling	
9		Association	12/12
10	Exhibit 3	Pre-Filed Answers from	
11		Land & Lakes Company	28/28
12	Exhibit 4	Pre-Filed Testimony from	
13		Land & Lakes Company	29/29
14	Exhibit 5	Pre-Filed Answers from	
15		Illinois Environmental	
16		Protection Agency	32/32
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1	Ρ	R	0	С	Ε	\mathbf{E}	D	I	Ν	G	2

2.0

2.2

THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. We will start seeing as it's 10:30. Good morning and welcome to this Illinois Pollution Control Board Hearing. My name is Chloe Salk, and I am the hearing officer for this rulemaking proceeding entitled "In The Matter Of: Proposed Amendments to Groundwater Quality (35 Illinois Administrative Code 620)."

The board docket for this rulemaking is R22-18(A). Also present today from the board are Chair of the Board Barbara Flynn Currie, Board Member Michelle Gibson.

In Springfield via videoconference we have Board Member Michael Makowski -- who seems to have just stepped out -- and Board Member Angela Tin.

Present today from the board staff are fellow Hearing Officer Attorney Advisor Vanessa Horton, Chief Environmental Scientist [sic] Anand Rao, and Environmental Scientist Essence Brown. And in the audience today we have General Counsel Marie Tipsord. This hearing is governed by the board's procedural rules under Section 102.246.

Of those rules, all information that is relevant and is not repetitious or privileged will be

admitted by the hearing officer into the record.

2.0

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

For the sake of our court reporter, please speak clearly and avoid speaking at the same time as another person so that we can help produce a clear transcript. If you are asking a question, please state your name and the organization you represent prior to any questions.

Also, in talking about sections of the code, please spell out the section letter, such as 620.101D as in dog.

Court Reporter, please feel the -- free to stop me or anyone at any point if we are going too fast, talking too softly, or if you need something repeated.

There is a notepad to sign up for public comments if you wish. So if there are any members of the public in person here today, please go ahead and write your name on the list. Also, anyone can submit written public comments on the board's

Clerk's Office Online System or COOL. The board weighs oral and written public comments equally.

Notice for this hearing was posted on August 14, 2025, in The Chicago Sun-Times; and on August 15, 2025, in The State Journal-Register.

On January 6, 2022, the board requested pursuant to Section 27B -- as in boy -- of the Environmental Protection Act that the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, or DCEO, conduct a study on the economic impact of the proposed rules.

The letter requested that DCEO provide their response by February 20, 2022. The board has received no response from DECEO [sic].

On December 7, 2021, the environmental -- Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, or IEPA, proposed that the board amend Part 620 of its groundwater quality regulations. On March 20, 2025, the board adopted amendments to Part 620, including groundwater quality standards for six per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances or PFAS.

On January 23, 2025, the board opened this subdocket to explore the economic reasonableness and technical feasibility of applying the Part 620 PFAS standards to Part 811 and 814 landfills.

On May 15, 2025, the board directed any party to provide information and comment on relevant cost information and also welcomed any proposed amendments to Part 811 and 814 that would address concerns with the adoption of the Part 620 standards.

2.0

2.2

The board received pre-filed testimony from the National Waste & Recycling Association, or NWRA, and Land & Lakes Company. The board also received a comment from IEPA. On August 6, 2025, the hearing officer issued a set of non-exhaustive written questions. On August 11th, Land & Lakes Company, IEPA, and NWRA filed written responses to these questions.

On September 10th, the hearing officer issued a set of follow-up written questions directed to IEPA. On September 15th, IEPA filed written responses to these questions. These responses were not required, but they are very helpful in expediting the hearing, and the board appreciates the time and effort of IEPA staff and counsel.

As to the order of today's proceedings, we'll first call Eric Ballenger with NWRA, then Brad Hunsberger with Land & Lakes Company, and then IEPA.

After being duly sworn in, the pre-filed testimony

```
Page 11
1
     will be entered into the record as if read under
     Section 102.424F -- as in foxtrot -- of the board's
 2
 3
     procedural rules.
                    We will then turn to questions for each
 4
 5
     witness. After finishing with witness questioning,
     I'll ask if there are any comments from members of the
6
     public. I anticipate taking a ten-minute break around
8
     10:30 a.m. if we're still going by then --
9
                    MS. BROWN: You mean 11:30 --
10
                    MS. HORTON: Yeah --
11
                    THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, sorry.
12
                    11:30, my bad -- and then breaking for
13
     an hour from -- lunch from noon to 1 p.m.
14
     haven't finished by then, we'll take an afternoon
15
     break around 3 p.m. and end around 5 p.m.
16
                    Okay. Are there any questions about
17
     the order of today's proceeding? Okay. Hearing none,
     we'll move on to swearing in the witnesses.
18
19
     right. We will start with Eric Ballenger with NWRA.
2.0
                    Would the court reporter please swear
     in the witness.
21
22
                    THE REPORTER:
                                    Okay.
23
                    Could you please raise your right hand?
24
     //
```

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com

888-391-3376

Page 12 1 WHEREUPON, 2 ERIC BALLENGER, 3 called as a witness and having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but 5 the truth, was examined and testified as follows: Thank you. 6 THE REPORTER: 7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. As 8 mentioned earlier, the pre-filed testimony is entered 9 into the record as if read and is entered as Hearing 10 Exhibit 1. 11 (Hearing Exhibit 1 was marked for identification and received into 12 13 evidence.) 14 THE HEARING OFFICER: Since NWRA 15 previously pre-filed answers, we will also enter those 16 into the record as if read and enter them as Hearing 17 Exhibit 2. 18 (Hearing Exhibit 2 was marked for identification and received into 19 evidence.) 2.0 21 THE HEARING OFFICER: So we'll go up to 22 follow-up questions. Does anyone from non-board entities have any follow-up questions? Okay. Seeing 23 24 none, we'll go on to any board follow-up questions?

	Page 13
1	MR. RAO: Yeah, we had a couple of
2	questions directed generally to both witnesses.
3	MS. TIPSORD: Chloe?
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes
5	MS. TIPSORD: Chloe, could you move the
6	microphone closer to Anand? We can't hear him.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes.
8	THE WITNESS: Yeah
9	MR. RAO: Can you hear me now,
10	Marie?MS. TIPSORD: Yes. Thank you.
11	MR. RAO: Okay
12	THE WITNESS: Thanks.
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. RAO:
15	Q The first question is would a phased
16	implementation of Part 620 standards be feasible for
17	Part 811 and 814 landfills?
18	A Are you asking if by adding those rules it
19	would be feasible for 811 and 814 sites to comply?
20	Q Yes.
21	A Yes, it would be feasible.
22	Q Do you have any suggestion as to how a
23	phased implementation would occur? Or what NWRA
24	thinks you know, how these standards could be

Page 14

implemented for -- for 811 and 814 landfills?

2.0

A Well, I guess it depends
on -- there -- there have been two different
discussions on how PFAS would be added to our
programs. There seems to be some contradictory
statements on how they'd be -- would be applied.

Our assumption would be that the 620 -- that PFAS would be added to -- eventually added to our detection groundwater monitoring programs as well as our leachate sampling programs.

As part of IEPA testimony, they referenced that the sampling for PFAS would be added only if a particular monitoring well goes in an assessment program, but that we would have to monitor for PFAS as part of an initial background sampling program for our site.

But as I stated, there is some confusion on behalf of NWRA whether it is just going to be added as part of an assessment program or as referenced in -- excuse me, but in reference -- as referenced in the IEPA's response.

I'm -- I'm trying to see
which -- these -- this is IEPA's response to questions
that were raised in May -- on May 15th.

And as part of their response, they state "If PFAS constituents are detected in the leachate, then those PFAS constituents would be required to be added to a facility semi-annual detection monitoring program unless a demonstration is made and approved by IEPA."

So that's a little bit contradictory to stating that it would only be added to an assessment program if basically a well goes into assessment, then it would be added. So there is some confusion on behalf of our organization on whether or not PFAS will be added to a program.

And it makes a big difference for us because adding a -- the costly PFAS monitoring to a -- an entire detection program for the lifetime of the facility and in post-closure here is much different than just adding it as part of any assessment that may or may not occur.

Okay. In Agency's most recent responses to Board questions, which was filed yesterday, the agency said that it still intends to do a rulemaking for landfills in terms of implementing these PFAS standards. Do you think that rulemaking would be the place for these kinds of issues to be addressed?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

A Are you referring to just 811, 814? Or is 807 also included in that?

2.0

Q I think now that, you know, the issues related to 8 -- 807 has also been raised, I'd assume all landfills under all three parts should be addressed.

A I certainly think -- and I'm only speaking for the 811/814 portion of it. I think certainly as part of any new rulemaking procedure that -- that includes our -- you know, includes the industry, there certainly could be discussions and -- and a better understanding of -- of how -- how PFAS monitoring will be implemented.

And I think it would be important to have that discussion certainly on how it -- again, on how it would be implemented and what particular program it would go under.

Q Okay. Would there be any confusion in terms of how PFAS standards would be implemented if the current exemptions in 620 are removed before changes are made to the landfill rules?

A If -- well, that's -- that's a great question. If the -- if the exemption is removed, then all -- as far as I understand, all of our 811 and 814

facilities will immediately have to begin a PFAS monitoring program at a minimum for background analysis to get background statistics based on that.

2.0

And then we would also -- it would also affect leachate analysis as well as future groundwater impact assessment modeling efforts for any particular facility that is currently going through any sort of expansion or even a greenfield-type site.

So -- or in during five-year reviews in which we have to update the GIA, this will have an immediate effect on that process if -- if the exemption is removed prior to having any discussion about rule changes. So I -- I -- it is my belief that there will be an immediate effect.

Q Thank you for that clarification. We have one more question. Are you aware of any other state landfill programs where PFAS have been implemented on a -- you know, with a compliance schedule for landfills?

A So for the states that I am affiliated with, I work -- that I work with, none of the states that I currently work with, and especially in Region 5, currently have a PFAS monitoring program that is part of the detection monitoring program.

And then when -- when I say "detection," I mean a general -- the general monitoring program that goes on for the landfill that would have to be done either semi-annually or quarterly per the permit.

So there are some states, for example Michigan and Minnesota, that have ranked particular sites that may or may not be concerned for PFAS, and they have added PFAS to that particular program. But there is not as far as I'm aware of any statewide monitoring program for PFAS in the states that I work in as of yet.

Q Okay. Thank you. You said that you're not speaking for the Part 807 landfills. So would Mr. Hunsberger have anything to say about --

THE HEARING OFFICER: We'll get there, we'll get there --

MS. HORTON: He hasn't been sworn in --

MR. RAO: Huh?

MS. HORTON: He hasn't been sworn in

20 yet --

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, we'll get

22 there in a minute, Anand.

MR. RAO: Oh. Okay. Oh. I thought

24 | they were answering as a panel.

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

```
Page 19
1
                    THE HEARING OFFICER: No. We'll --
 2
                              Okay --
                    MR. RAO:
                    THE HEARING OFFICER: -- just have him
 3
     sworn in next.
 4
                    MR. RAO: Sorry about that.
 5
6
                    THE HEARING OFFICER: No, it's okay.
7
     Will you pass over the microphone --
8
                    MR. RAO:
                              Okay --
9
                    THE HEARING OFFICER: -- just so they
10
     can hear me --
11
                    MS. TITSORD: Chloe?
12
                    THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes?
13
                    MS. TIPSORD: Well, I just -- I have one
14
     quick question.
15
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
16
     BY MS. TIPSORD:
17
          0
               You mentioned the states you work for.
18
     Could you specify -- to the extent you're aware of can
19
     you specify what states those are?
2.0
               Yeah. And if -- if you want, I can just
21
     give you a brief -- brief background on who I am and,
22
     like, what I -- so I -- I represent
23
     Republic -- Republic Services. I'm a -- a
24
     hydrogeologist for them, and -- and I work in a number
```

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

Page 20

of different states.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

And I can give you -- so for -- so the states that I currently work in in terms of handling groundwater compliance, leachate compliance -- I also work on Superfund sites and remedial activities -- would include Illinois, of course; Indiana; Michigan; Minnesota; Ohio; Missouri; Oklahoma; Nebraska; Kansas; and Texas.

Q Thank you.

A I hope I have all but yes, so --

MS. TIPSORD: Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

Angela, did you have a question?

MS. TIN: Yes --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, go ahead.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MS. TIN:

Q So let me ask you again. On these other states, the -- the PFAS monitoring is not in detection monitoring, it's in the assessment monitoring; is that right --

A Well, each -- each state obviously does things different, but there is no statewide program in those states that requires landfills to monitor for

Page 21

PFAS on a detection monitoring basis. There are individual sites that have it based on whether impacts have been identified or based on ranking systems.

For example, in Minnesota they've gone through the process of ranking sites that are -- that are more of a concern than others based on liner design, based on no liners, based on whether or not heavy PFAS-laden waste has been distributed in those facilities.

Michigan has added kind of a ranking process as well or has requested PFAS monitoring -- again, a request, not a -- not a rule at this point. So some sites have complied, other sites have not added that to their program yet. So there's no statewide consistent program that has been added --

Q Thank you --

2.0

A -- for those states that I worked in at least.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Were there any other questions? No? Okay. We'll go on to the next witness.

Thank you very much.

So we will have Brad Hunsberger with Land & Lakes Company next.

	Page 22
1	Would the court reporter please swear
2	in the witness?
3	THE REPORTER: Okay.
4	Please raise your right hand
5	WHEREUPON,
6	BRAD HUNSBERGER,
7	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
8	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
9	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
10	THE REPORTER: Thank you so much.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So we will
12	also enter Land & Lakes pre-filed testimony into the
13	record as if read
14	MS. HORTON: They have something that
15	they're going to say
16	THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, sorryMS.
17	TIPSORD: Chloe
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes?
19	MS. TIPSORD: Sorry, but you're going
20	to have to stop and first hear Mr. Hunsberger would
21	like to give a brief summary of his testimony.
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.
23	Yeah, if you could just keep it to
24	under five minutes, please.

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

1 MS. TIPSORD: Yes --

2.0

THE WITNESS: All right. I am Brad Hunsberger. I'm the vice president and director of hydrogeological services with Andrews Engineering.

Andrews is a civil and environmental engineering firm located in Springfield, founded by the IEPA's first manager of the permit section of the Division of Land Pollution Control.

I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Geology, and I'm a professional geologist in the State of Illinois. I'm responsible for management and oversight of geologic- and hydrogeologic-related services for the company.

I've been at Andrews for 38 years, in which the vast majority of projects related to solid waste and compliance. I'm providing testimony on behalf of Land & Lakes Company. Land & Lakes is the operator of Land & Lakes 1 and 2 located in Cook County, Illinois. It's been closed since 1994, over 30 years ago.

It currently is in post-closure care.

It's regulated pursuant from the Illinois

Administrative Code Part 807. The Part 807 landfills

are existing landfills that generally ceased accepting

waste on or before October 9, 1993, the date the Part 811 regulations became effective.

2.0

In my experience, Part 807 sites were constructed, operated, and closed in the same manner as the Part 814, Subpart D sites -- one of the differences being the close-by date requirements and then the length of the post-closure care period.

Post-closure care and monitoring are typically the same between Part 807 and Part 814, Subpart D sites.

The board should exempt Part 807 landfills from compliance with the Part 620 PFAS standards because it is not economically reasonable to these old landfills to certify completion -- virtual connectivity interruption --

THE REPORTER: Oh, that means he's breaking up. Can you --

MR. RAO: Yeah --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Sorry. Could you go back like two sentences, please? You were breaking up a little bit.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

The board should exempt our 807 landfills from compliance with the Part 620 PFAS standards because it is not economically reasonable

closure if compliance with the new PFAS standards are

24

now added as a necessary condition to the certification of completion of post-closure repair.

2.0

Part 807 landfills, like Part 811 and 814 landfills, are subject to the Part 620 quality standards absent the exemption.

This has been confirmed by the board and the Illinois Appellate Court. Part 807 landfills must demonstrate the groundwater in the vicinity of the site meets new part 620 PFAS standards for background concentrations to certify the post-closure care period has ended.

There are 97 Part 807 landfills that have not completed the post-closure care period. Of these, 34 are closed but not certified closed, and 63 are not -- are -- are in post-closure care.

My written testimony includes a list of landfills provided by the Illinois EPA from a Freedom of Information Act request. Some of the landfills are publicly owned or orphaned sites with no owner managing site.

Part 807 landfills generally do not have composite liners or leachate collection systems.

Part 807 landfills ceased accepting waste over 30 years ago and are not generating revenue.

Part 807 sites were designed, developed, and closed in accordance with regulations and policies applicable -- that time. None of the Part 807 landfills monitor for PFAS constituents.

To impose new extremely low PFAS groundwater quality standards as a condition of post closure now after the fact will virtually guarantee most of these sites, if not all of them, will never be able to certify that post-closure care has been completed.

I would not be surprised if many owners of the Part 807 landfills simply walk away leaving the sites to the State of Illinois to manage.

My testimony includes responses to the board's questions as they pertain to 807 landfills, including cost estimates for PFAS monitoring and corrective action for typical 807 landfills. Those were included in Tables 1 and 2.

The cost will likely have no termination date given the extremely low standards, pervasiveness of the PFAS constituents, design of the landfills, and lack of economic resources to treat PFAS.

807 sites have been included in the 620

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

2.0

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

	Page 29
1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.
2	Oh, and we will also enter in your
3	pre-filed testimony as Hearing Exhibit Number 4.
4	(Hearing Exhibit 4 was marked for
5	identification and received into
6	evidence.)
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: So yes, as
8	previously mentioned, we will go straight to follow-up
9	questions if there are any.
10	MR. RAO: Yeah, I just had one
11	question, which I
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: Wait one second,
13	Anand.
14	MR. RAO: Oh.
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. RAO:
17	Q Yeah, I just had one follow-up question, and
18	this was the question I asked earlier about 811 and
19	814. If Part 8 807 landfills were not exempted
20	from Part 620, do you think that a phased
21	implementation would help Part 807 landfills comply
22	with these standards?
23	A Did all that come through?
24	MS. TIPSORD: Do you understand the

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

Page 30

question?

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2 THE WITNESS: Can -- can you repeat

3 | that question, please?

4 BY MR. RAO:

Q Yeah. Can you hear me now?

A I believe so.

Q Okay. What I was asking was if Part 807 landfills were not exempted from Part 620 standards, do you believe a phased implementation would be beneficial for part 807 landfills?

A I'm not sure how that would work because right now the PFAS limits would be added to the annual list that's sampled on second quarter.

And depending upon what the results were, if they exceeded, then background concentrations would need to be derived to justify that the -- are representative of what the facility is contributing to the groundwater. Subsequent to that, then we'd go through the assessment process and corrective action. So I'm not sure if that answers your question.

Q It does. As a follow-up, if Part 807 landfills are required to monitor for PFAS going forward, do you think that monitoring results in -- will help make a better assessment as to what

	Page 31
1	the implications are of these PFAS
2	standard standards?
3	A Of the implications? I yeah, I'm not
4	sure that I understand that question
5	Q No. What I was saying was would it be
6	helpful to have some monitoring data to see what
7	exactly is going on at these landfills before jumping
8	to conclusion that exemption is the only way to go?
9	A I do believe that would be helpful.
LO	MR. RAO: Okay. Thank you.
L1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Are there
L2	any other questions?
L 3	Any in Chicago?
L4	Any in Springfield?
L 5	Okay. Thank you so much. We will go
L6	to IEPA.
L 7	IEPA, do you have someone available to
L8	answer any questions?
L9	MR. RHOADES: Yes, we do.
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right.
21	If you could state your name for the court reporter
22	please.
23	MR. RHOADES: Joshua Rhoades.
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

	Page 32
1	And, Court Reporter, could you please
2	swear in the witness?
3	THE REPORTER: Of course.
4	Please raise your right hand.
5	WHEREUPON,
6	JOSHUA RHOADES,
7	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
8	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
9	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
LO	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
L1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.
L2	So we will enter in your pre-filed
L3	answers the ones that were just filed
L4	yesterday into the record as if read
L5	and assuming that there's no objections?
L6	I just want to check since they were
L7	filed within 24 hours. Hearing none, okay, we will
L8	enter them into the record as if read and enter them
L9	as Hearing Exhibit Number 5.
20	(Hearing Exhibit 5 was marked for
21	identification and received into
22	evidence.)
23	THE HEARING OFFICER: So we will go to
24	any follow-up questions. Anyone in Chicago have any

Page 33 1 follow-up questions for IEPA? 2 Anyone in Springfield? 3 MS. ZWICK: [No audible response.] THE HEARING OFFICER: 4 5 MS. ZWICK: Okay. DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MS. ZWICK: 8 Yes, so this is Ann Zwick. I represent Land 9 & Lakes Company. I just have a few questions for 10 The IEPA had stated -- it was in -- first of 11 all, it was in July -- the July 2025 responses to the board order -- and now just last night -- that they 12 13 don't believe adoption of the Part 620 -- the 14 groundwater quality standards would render compliance. 15 First it was with the Part 811 and 814 landfills, and now it's also the 807 -- technically or 16 17 economically infeasible; correct? Who is that? Is it 18 Joshua? 19 Α That's correct --That's correct. So what's the basis? 2.0 noticed on the documents filed last night -- what's 21 22 the basis for the IEPA's opinion that it's not 23 economically reasonable -- that it is economically 24 reasonable?

- A Okay. So we're not covering the technical aspects? Only the economic aspect?
 - Q Right now I'm on the economics.

A Okay. Well, I -- I -- the -- the economic aspects of it are not a part of my purview as my position. And so to render a decision on what is or is not economically reasonable with regard to groundwater protection is outside the scope of my position and is -- is made -- deferred to board for that kind of decision.

So any -- any claims of economic reasonableness on behalf of -- on behalf of me are from the current implementation of our regulatory programs and how those standards are deemed economically reasonable as well.

Q Okay. I -- you know, in your July 25th responses, you -- the Illinois EPA said -- it was, like, on page 3 -- "cost of compliance should be incremental and manageable" and that they "were not aware of any additional costs for monitoring minus a \$300 sampling cost." Is that true?

A With regard to sampling, yes, there would be the addition of the PFAS constituent compounds.

Q Okay. Now, when -- and then the IEPA also

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

2.0

said that they felt like corrective costs were difficult to estimate, so there weren't any costs in there?

- A We did not provide costs.
- Q You did not provide costs? No? And the IEPA's testimony in economic reasonableness that was filed then, it didn't include any cost estimates for, for example, establishing background concentrations, for quarter sampling, having to put together a supplemental permit application? I didn't see anything in there about that.
 - A No, it did not --
- Q Okay. They -- the IEPA didn't put cost estimates --
- THE HEARING OFFICER: Anand, will you pass that over? The --
- 17 | MR. RAO: Sure --
- 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Sorry,
- 19 | continue --

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

- 20 BY MS. ZWICK:
- Q -- didn't include any cost estimates to verify background value, which could include additional sampling? That wasn't in there?
- A No, that -- that wasn't in there, but I -- I

believe that we spoke to the -- the complexity of putting together such an estimate and that it's going to be dependent on the specific facility, the number of wells that are upgrading, and so it'll be different per -- per facility. But as a -- as a general, the \$300 cost, that's the only --

2.0

Q Right. That's pretty much all that was in there? Yeah, the IEPA, it didn't include anything -- estimate that assessment monitoring or even corrected action?

A I believe we provided some -- some limits on cost based on calculating the worst-case scenario with the number of monitoring wells though.

But we did not provide -- we -- nor could we realistically provide a cost for assessment monitoring for a site that we -- we -- could be one -- would it be one well or multiple wells that would be in a facility? Would it be the entire facility? That would be it.

Q Right. Okay. It's -- when the IEPA had filed that testimony, my understanding is it was filed before you had seen the testimony that was filed by the NWRA and Land & Lakes, which did have very detailed cost estimates on all of those assets.

Page 37

1 That's --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh. Sorry, could you go back? You were breaking up a little bit.

MS. ZWICK: Sure.

BY MS. ZWICK:

Q I just said that the IEPA's testimony that they filed July 25th stating that the -- that they they felt like it was economically reasonable, you had not yet seen the detailed cost estimates that were filed in by Land & Lakes and the NWRA; correct?

A If that's the order of events, then that would be correct.

Q It is. That wasn't taken into consideration because all of those -- all those costs were included. Okay. Just confirming. And then the \$300 sample cost was based on a 2020 report, I believe. Is that correct?

A Is that what it is cited?

Q Yeah, on page 6, I believe, it says "It's based on a 2020 report."

A Then yes.

Q Yeah. Did the IEPA look for anything more recent than that? You know, it's been like -- it's been five years.

Page 38

A Yeah, we did. We also have our own internal lab which matches closely those costs.

Q Okay. All right. And yeah, so then the filing from last night, you've now -- your opinion has now gone to 807 landfills. You were asked by the board if this applies to 807 landfills, and you're saying again that your position as to economic reasonableness extends to 807 landfills; correct?

A That is correct.

Q But yet this recent filing, again, does not have any support that -- you don't have any background data or cost estimates -- virtual connectivity interruption --

THE REPORTER: Oh, she's breaking up --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Sorry, could you go back again? It was breaking up again -BY MS. ZWICK:

Q I'm asking about --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Why is it

21 breaking up so much --

22 BY MS. ZWICK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

Q -- the IEPA has the position as to economic reasonableness extends the Part 807 landfills, but

yet, you know, the IEPA is not providing any cost
estimate to support this belief. Is that
correct -- beyond the \$300 sampling cost?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

A Correct. We did not provide cost estimates in that response.

Q Okay. And then on -- last night the IEPA also said -- stated that it believed it was technically feasible for 807 landfills to comply with the new PFAS standards while describing some significant hurdles. Correct?

You say "Remediation at an unlined landfill can be complex, potentially involving pump-and-treat systems, source removal, or long term-containment."

So you're recognizing there are going to be significant issues, but -- so just to confirm, you know, I know, Joshua, you're aware that the -- you know, the regulatory requirements for 807 landfills -- like, that they were not required to have composite liners; correct?

A That's correct.

Q They're not required to have a composite cap. That's correct?

A That's correct.

Q And so, again, they're not required to have

a leachate collection system; is that correct?

A Correct.

2.0

- Q Correct. So they were not -- they're not required to test for leachate; correct?
 - A That is correct.
- Q And very few have, like, a gas release system; that's correct?
 - A Yes. I would say very few --
- Q You know, and we've -- in that document that was filed from the FOIA request, the IEPA had identified 97 landfills -- 807 landfills that have been unable to prove compliance, you know, with groundwater standards adopted 30 years ago, you know, after they stopped operating.

But is the IEPA stating that it now believes these landfills are capable of designing and operating a groundwater monitoring treatment system to meet these new PFAS standards?

- A In as much for PFAS as the current parameters, which they are -- may or may not already be exceeding and under corrective action, yeah.
- Q But we have ninety-seven 807 landfills that have not been able to certify the end of post-closure care from standards adopted over 30 years ago.

A And I don't think adding PFAS would change that.

2.0

- Q You don't think -- do you think it's going to make it harder for these landfills to certify the end of post-closure care?
- A I didn't say that, no. I -- no, I don't know that it would make it harder or not. I can't speculate on that.

But what I -- what I am saying is that these -- these 807s that are in corrective action or -- or have not been released from their post-closure care obligations -- for those facilities that are in that situation because of groundwater contamination due to the facility, the addition of PFAS doesn't necessarily change the corrective action that has to be undertaken.

Q Okay. Just -- I just have a couple more questions. So just referring to the agency's responses to the board order from August 6th that was filed on August 11th -- you can pull it up real quick. So then page 12 of 18 -- okay.

So I -- and Board questions -- let's look at 8C and pretty much 8D and 8E. The board had asked "Whether all or some of the 34 closed Part 807

awaiting closure certifications are still monitoring groundwater?" And then they went on to say "If not, please comment on the status."

2.0

The agency's response was that groundwater monitoring is required by the permits. So it -- the agency really didn't answer the question, which is, "Are the closed Part 807 landfill monitoring?" Can you answer that question?

A I don't -- I don't -- I don't understand what -- how we didn't answer that question.

Q Yeah, 8 -- the 80 -- the 8C, it says "Please clarify whether all are some of the 34 closed Part 807 landfills awaiting closure certification are still monitoring groundwater?" "Are they?" is the question.

The agency's response is that groundwater monitoring is required. I mean, is the IEPA aware of how many landfills aren't monitoring, aren't sampling?

A I -- I am not aware of any that -- that are not sampling --

- Q Oh, you're not --
- A -- groundwater conditions set per Part 807.
- Q Oh, it's your understanding that all the -- all of these 807 landfills -- these 34 closed ones are all sampling?

A That's what's required in their permits -- is to sample.

Q I guess the difference being what is required versus what is actually, you know, happening. It's my understanding that not all of them are sampling. Is that your understanding?

A No, it is not.

Q It's not? Again, it's my understanding that a lot of them can't afford it. They can't afford it, so they're not doing it. The IEPA is not aware of that?

A I would have to follow up to -- to find out what facilities you're -- you're talking about that are not -- that are not following their permit requirements for sampling. I'm not aware of any right now --

Q Okay. Yeah. It's my understanding that there are a number of 807s that -- they just can't afford it anymore. You know, it's been 30 years and -- but anyways, yeah, if you could get more information about that, that would be great.

But I have the same questions about -- now we're at the 63 Part 807 landfills that are in post-closure. Is the IEPA aware whether some or all

Page 44

of those landfills are not continuing to sample?

- A I'm not aware of facilities that are -- that are not sampling --
 - Q That are not -- okay.
- A Yeah, and of course if they're in post-closure, their obligations are --
- Q Yeah, that -- I -- then maybe IEPA might want to look into it again. It's my understanding that it's a cost issue that, you know, it's been 30 years since landfills like that have generated revenue -- for 30 years -- and some have stopped sampling. So -- all right.

And then just a couple more. I had a question about that list of 807 landfills that was provided by the agency pursuant to that FOIA request and that has been filed. Do you know when that list was last updated?

- A The list that you received from FOIA?
- O Yes.

2.0

- A I -- I don't know without looking at it, no.
- Q Yeah. Is it possible that maybe some of those landfills -- maybe those -- maybe the list is not accurate? Are there landfills on that list that are known to the agency that are no longer being

	Page 45
1	actively managed by an owner or an operator?
2	A I'd have to review the list to answer that
3	question. I'd have to look through the
4	Q Okay. Do you know which landfills are being
5	monitored by the State?
6	A I know that there are landfills monitored by
7	the State on that list.
8	Q Yeah?
9	A But I don't know the extensively exhaustive
10	list of of which ones those are. And then the FOIA
11	list is is from provided in what response?
12	Q With it was in Mr. Hunsberger's
13	testimony. We filed it as part of his testimony.
14	Okay. It sounds like it may be worth taking a closer
15	look at that list. I just have one just follow-up
16	question. So we've established that based on that
17	list that there are 97 Part 807 landfills that
18	still
19	THE REPORTER: I can't hear her
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: Sorry, could you
21	repeat your question please? It was breaking up
22	again.
23	MS. ZWICK: Sure.
24	

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

BY MS. ZWICK:

2.0

- Q So we've established based on this list from the IEPA that there are -- based on that list that there are 97 Part 807 landfills that have not completed post-closure care, not been certified as post-closure repair completion. And they must certify compliance with these Part 620 groundwater standards in order to do so; correct?
 - A That's correct -- correct. Yeah.
- Q So is it the agency's expectation, just from reading what has been filed, that many of these facilities will have to seek, like, an adjusted standard or a variance from the PFAS Part 620 standards in order to be able to certify compliance with these standards?
- A With the alternative being the broad regulatory exemption, yes.
- Q And so, I mean, what is the -- for these
 Part 807 landfills, what is the adjusted standard and
 process? What does that entail for them?
- A I am -- I am not intimately familiar with the adjusted standard process to speak on -- on all of the aspects of it, but it involves petition in front of the Illinois Pollution Control Board --

	Page 47
1	THE REPORTER: Can you ask him to speak
2	up?
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: Sorry, can you
4	speak up when you're answering the questions, please?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes. I responded that
6	I'm not intimately familiar with the adjusted standard
7	process to speak on that now, but I can say that it
8	does involve petition to the Pollution Control Board.
9	BY MS. ZWICK:
10	Q You probably have to hire an attorney;
11	correct?
12	A I I mean, I don't know, I
13	Q Maybe to file something with the board
14	A Correct
15	Q Represent may have to hire an expert to
16	help proving an adjust you know, the petition;
17	correct? If you're going to ask for the adjusted
18	standard
19	A You know, like, maybe attorneys
20	Q So it's you know, it's likely going to be
21	costly for an 807 landfill that hasn't generated
22	revenue in 30 years. Is that correct? There's going
23	to be a cost involved?
24	A There could potentially be a cost involved

Page 48

given the scenario you -- yes.

2.0

- Q And the result is uncertain for the landfill. Correct? We don't know that the agency or the board is going to grant this. Correct?
- A That is true. We do not -- the IEPA does -- does not have control over what the board does or does not approve with regard to an adjusted standard.
- Q Yeah. So if they can't get the adjusted standard, then the Part 807 landfills are just going to need to continue to monitor for these new PFAS groundwater standards really for as long as they can afford it; correct?
- A I -- well, they would -- they would have to. If they want to be in compliance, then they would have to monitor for as long as they're on their permit.
- Q Okay. Is the agency going to provide any type of financial assistance to -- for the monitoring or even kind of like corrective actions for these landfills -- these 807 landfills that have not -- revenue in over 30 years?
- A I -- I can't say whether or not that would be the case. There's -- there's a fund for the cleanup. I can't speak on that.

	Page 49
1	MS. ZWICK: Okay. Just one second.
2	Okay. I have no further questions. Thank you for
3	your time.
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you.
5	Are there any other questions?
6	MR. SIEVERS: [No audible response.]
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes.
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. SIEVERS:
10	Q Mr. Rhoades, Scott Sievers. I am an
11	attorney for the National Waste & Recycling
12	Association. You're here today as a witness on behalf
13	of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency;
14	correct?
15	A That is correct.
16	Q And you're prepared here today to speak on
17	the subject of technical feasibility; is that right?
18	A [No audible response.]
19	Q But you are not here to speak on the subject
20	of economic reasonableness; is that right?
21	A That is correct.
22	Q Does agency have a witness here today to
23	speak on the topic of economic reasonableness?
24	A No.

Page 50 1 MR. SIEVERS: The agency does not. 2 No further questions. Okay. Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. 3 Just checking if there's any other follow-up 4 5 questions? Okay. Seeing none, we'll go to public 6 7 For the record, does anyone have any public 8 comments they would like to offer today? 9 Anyone in Chicago? 10 Anyone in Springfield? Okay. 11 And then just checking also if there's anyone today who did not pre-file testimony but would 12 13 like to offer testimony? Okay. Hearing none, I'd 14 like to go off the record for a moment to discuss some 15 procedural issues. 16 (Discussion held off the record.) 17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. 18 We will go back on the record to adjourn. 19 THE REPORTER: Okay. 2.0 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So copies of today's transcript will be available no later than 21 Monday, September 29, 2025. When the board receives 22 23 the transcript, it will promptly posted to COOL, from

which it can be viewed and printed.

24

today's hearing will be due September 30th. And before it takes action on the agency's proposal, the board will open a post-hearing comment period, which will tentatively end on October 13th. When the board receives the transcript, we will issue a hearing officer order confirming this deadline.

Filings with the board, whether paper or electronic must be also served on the hearing officer and on those persons on the service list.

Before filing, please check on COOL or with the board's clerk to ensure that you have the most recent version of the service list. Are there any other matters that need to be addressed at this time?

MS. TIPSORD: [No audible response.]

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes?

MS. TIPSORD: October 13th is a

holiday.

2.0

THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, is it? Okay. Well, we will make it the 14th then. All right. Good catch. Thank you, Marie.

Okay. So we will have the post-hearing period end on October 14th. Please disregard the previous date. All right. Any other questions or

```
Page 52
     matters that need to be addressed? All right.
 1
 2
     Neither seeing nor hearing any, thank you to everyone
     for participating. This hearing is adjourned.
 3
                     (Whereupon, at 11:25 a.m., the
 4
                     proceeding was concluded.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
```

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

CERTIFICATE

I, HALEY GOODWIN, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

HALEY GOODWIN

Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois

2.4

Veritext Legal Solutions

1

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

2 I, ETHAN SIEGEL, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from the digital audio 3 4 recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the 5 6 proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and 7 ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in 8 which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a 9 10 relative or employee of any counsel or attorney 11 employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

ETHAN STEGEL

Ethan Sign

[**& - 811**] Page 1

&	18 41:21	30th 51:2	620.420e. 28:10
	19 5:5	312 2:10	63 26:14 43:23
& 3:4,7,11,13	1993 24:1	32/32 6:16	630 2:7
6:5,8,11,13	1994 23:19	33 5:10	6th 41:19
10:7,8,11,23 21:24 22:12	2	34 26:14 41:24	7
23:17,17,18		42:12,23	-
33:9 36:23	2 6:7 12:17,18 23:18 27:18	35 1:6,7 2:3,3	7 9:14 7543763 1:17
37:10 49:11	20 5:6 9:12,18	7:8	
1	2020 37:16,20	38 23:14	8
	2020 37.10,20 2021 9:14	4	8 16:4 29:19
1 6:4 11:13	2021 9.14 2022 9:6,12	4 6:12 29:3,4	42:11
12:10,11 23:18	2022 3:0,12 2025 1:10 9:4,5	49 5:11	80 42:11
27:18	9:18,21 10:1,9	5	807 16:2,4
102.246. 7:22	33:11 50:22		18:13 23:23,23
102.424f 11:2	23 9:21	5 6:14 11:15	24:3,9,10,22
10:30 1:11 7:3	24 32:17	17:22 32:19,20	25:20 26:3,7
11:8	25th 34:16 37:7	6	26:12,21,23
10th 10:14	27b 9:7	6 9:6 10:9	27:1,4,12,15,17
11:25 52:4	28/28 6:11	37:19	27:24 28:6,8
11:30 11:9,12 11th 10:11	29 5:8 50:22	60 2:7	29:19,21 30:7
41:20	29/29 6:13	60601 1:15	30:10,21 33:16
12 41:21	29674 53:17	60605 2:8	38:5,6,8,24 39:8,17 40:11
12 41.21 12/12 6:6,9	3	620 1:6 2:3 7:8	40:22 41:24
13 5:4	3 6:10 11:15	9:17,18,23	42:7,12,21,23
13th 51:5,17	28:14,15 34:18	10:5 13:16	43:23 44:14
14 9:4	30 23:20 26:23	14:7 16:20	45:17 46:4,19
14th 51:20,23	40:13,24 43:19	24:11,23 25:21	47:21 48:10,20
15 9:5 10:1	44:9,11 47:22	26:4,9 27:24	807 s 41:10
15th 10:16	48:21	29:20 30:8	43:18
14:24	300 34:21 36:6	33:13 46:7,13	811 1:7 2:4
16 1:10	37:15 39:3	620.101d 8:15	9:24 10:4
160 1:14	30113 54:14	620.410f 28:9	13:17,19 14:1
			16:1,24 24:2

26:3 29:18	action 27:17	administrator	analysis 17:3,5
33:15	30:19 36:10	4:4	anand 2:19
811/814 16:8	40:21 41:10,15	admitted 8:1	7:18 13:6
814 1:7 2:4	51:3 53:12,16	adopted 9:18	18:22 29:13
9:24 10:4	54:8,12	40:13,24	35:15
13:17,19 14:1	actions 48:19	adoption 10:5	andrews 23:4,5
16:1,24 24:5,9	actively 45:1	33:13	23:14
26:4 28:7	activities 20:6	advisor 7:17	angela 2:18
29:19 33:15	actually 43:4	affect 17:5	7:15 20:13
814-3620 2:10	added 14:4,8,8	affiliated 17:20	ann 3:9 33:8
8c 41:23 42:11	14:12,18 15:4	afford 43:9,9	annual 15:4
8d 41:23	15:8,10,12	43:19 48:13	30:12
8e 41:23	18:8 21:10,13	afternoon	annually 18:4
9	21:15 25:3	11:14	answer 31:18
9 24:1	26:1 30:12	agency 3:16,19	42:6,8,10 45:2
97 26:12 40:11	adding 13:18	3:22 4:5 6:16	answering
45:17 46:4	15:14,17 41:1	9:16 15:20	18:24 47:4
	addition 34:23	28:2 42:6	answers 6:7,10
a	41:14	44:15,24 48:3	6:14 12:15
a.m. 1:11 11:8	additional	48:17 49:13,22	28:12 30:20
52:4	34:20 35:23	50:1	32:13 51:1
ability 53:10	address 10:4	agency's 15:19	anticipate 11:7
54:7	addressed	41:18 42:4,15	anymore 43:19
able 27:9 40:23	15:24 16:6	46:10 51:3	anyways 43:20
46:14	51:14 52:1	ago 23:20	appellate 26:7
absent 26:5	adjourn 50:18	26:24 40:13,24	applicable 27:3
accepting	adjourned 52:3	ahead 8:23	application
23:24 26:23	adjust 47:16	20:15	35:10
accordance	adjusted 46:12	alternative	applied 14:6
27:2	46:19,22 47:6	46:16	applies 38:6
accurate 44:23	47:17 48:7,9	amend 9:16	applying 9:23
53:9 54:5	adm 1:6,7 2:3,3	amendments	appreciates
act 9:8 26:18	administrative	1:5 2:2 7:7	10:19
	7:8 23:23	9:18 10:4	

approve 48:7 audience 7:20 based 17:3 21:2 approved 15:5 audio 53:8 54:3 21:3,6,7,7	7:16 8:3 9:1,6
approved 15:5 audio 53:8 54:3 21:3,6,7,7	0.12 16 10 21
	9:12,16,18,21
asked 29:18 august 9:4,5 36:12 37:16,20	10:1,6,8,19
38:5 41:23 10:9,11 41:19 45:16 46:2,3	12:22,24 15:20
asking 8:10 4 1:20 basically 15:9	24:10,22 25:20
13:18 30:7 available 31:17 basis 21:1	26:6 33:12
38:19 50:21 33:20,22	34:9 38:6
aspect 34:2 avoid 8:8 bear 8:2	41:19,22,23
aspects 34:2,5 awaiting 42:1 behalf 2:2	46:24 47:8,13
46:23 42:13 14:18 15:11	48:4,6 50:22
assessment aware 17:16 23:17 34:12,12	51:4,5,8
14:13,19 15:8 18:9 19:18 49:12 b	ooard's 7:21
15:9,17 17:6 34:20 39:16 belief 17:13	8:5,24 11:2
20:20 30:19,24 42:16,18 43:10 39:2	27:15 51:12
36:9,15 43:15,24 44:2 believe 30:6,9 b	50y 9:7
assets 36:24 b 31:9 33:13 b	orad 3:6 5:7
assistance b 3:11 6:1 36:1,11 37:16	10:22 21:23
48:18 bachelor 23:9 37:19	22:6 23:2
assistant 3:18 back 24:19 believed 39:7 b	oreak 11:7,15
association 3:4 37:3 38:17 believes 40:15	25:16
3:12,14 6:6,9 50:18 beneficial b	oreaking 11:12
10:7 49:12 background 30:10	24:16,19 25:5
assume 16:4 best 53:10 54:6	25:7,13 37:3
assuming 32:15 19:21 26:10 better 16:11	38:14,17,21
assumption 30:15 35:8,22 30:24	45:21
14:7 beyond 39:3 b	orief 19:21,21
attorney 3:9,11 bad 11:12 big 15:13	22:21
3:13 7:17 ballenger 3:3 bilandic 1:13 b	oroad 46:16
47:10 49:11 5:3 10:22 bit 15:7 24:20 b	orown 2:20
53:14 54:10	7:19 11:9
attorneys 47:19 barbara 2:13 board 1:1 2:6 b	ouilding 1:13
audible 33:3 7:11 2:13,14,15,16 b	ouren 2:7
49:6,18 51:15 2:18 7:4,9,10	
7:11,11,14,15	

[c - confirming] Page 4

c	41:4 46:6,14	closely 38:2	complex 39:12
c 2:1 3:1 4:1 7:1	53:4 54:2	closer 13:6	complexity
calculating	chair 2:13 7:11	25:13 45:14	36:1
36:12	change 41:1,15	closure 15:16	compliance
call 10:22	changes 16:20	23:21 24:7,8	17:18 20:4,4
called 12:3 22:7	17:13	25:2,24 26:2	23:16 24:11,23
32:7	check 32:16	26:10,13,15	25:2,21,24
cap 39:22	51:11	27:7,9 40:23	33:14 34:18
capable 40:16	checking 50:4	41:5,12 42:1	40:12 46:7,14
care 23:21 24:7	50:11	42:13 43:24	48:15
24:8 26:11,13	chicago 1:15	44:6 46:5,6	complied 21:13
26:15 27:9	2:8 9:4 31:13	code 1:6,7 2:3,3	comply 13:19
40:24 41:5,12	32:24 50:9	7:8 8:14 23:23	29:21 39:8
46:5	chief 2:19 7:18	collection	composite
case 36:12	chloe 1:12 7:5	26:22 40:1	26:22 39:19,21
48:23	13:3,5 19:11	come 29:23	compounds
catch 51:21	22:17	comment 10:2	34:23
ceased 23:24	cited 37:18	10:9 42:3 51:4	concentrations
26:23	civil 23:5	comments 8:21	26:10 30:15
certainly 16:7,8	claims 34:11	8:24 9:2 11:6	35:8
16:11,15	claire 3:13	50:7,8	concern 21:6
certificate 53:1	clarification	commerce 9:9	concerned 18:7
54:1	17:15	company 3:7	concerns 10:5
certification	clarify 42:12	6:11,13 10:8	concluded 52:5
25:3 26:2	cleanup 48:24	10:11,23 21:24	conclusion 31:8
42:13	clear 8:4,10	23:13,17 33:9	condition 26:1
certifications	clearly 8:8	complete 8:4	27:6
42:1	clerk 51:12	completed	conditions
certified 26:14	clerk's 9:1	26:13 27:10	42:21
46:5	close 24:6	46:5	conduct 9:9
certify 24:13	closed 23:19	completion	confirm 39:15
25:1,23 26:10	24:4 26:14,14	24:13 25:1,23	confirmed 26:6
27:9 40:23	27:2 41:24	26:2 46:6	confirming
	42:7,12,23		37:15 51:7

Veritext Legal Solutions

confusion	cool 9:1 50:23	54:7,10	deemed 34:14
14:17 15:10	51:11	county 23:19	deferred 34:9
16:18	cooperider 4:3	couple 13:1	degree 23:9
connectivity	copies 50:20	41:17 44:13	dell'aquila 3:18
24:14 38:12	correct 33:17	course 20:6	demonstrate
consideration	33:19,20 37:10	32:3 44:5	26:8
37:13	37:12,17 38:8	court 8:7,16	demonstration
consistent	38:9 39:3,4,10	11:20 22:1	15:5
21:15	39:19,20,22,23	26:7 31:21	department 9:8
constituent	40:1,2,3,4,5,7	32:1	dependent 36:3
34:23	46:8,9,9 47:11	covering 34:1	depending
constituents	47:14,17,22	current 16:20	30:14
15:2,3 27:4,21	48:3,4,13	34:13 40:19	depends 14:2
constructed	49:14,15,21	currently 17:7	deputy 3:21
24:4	corrected 36:10	17:22,23 20:3	derived 30:16
cont'd 3:1,2 4:1	corrective	23:21 28:7	describing 39:9
4:2	27:17 30:19	currie 2:13	description 6:2
containment	35:1 40:21	7:11	design 21:7
39:13	41:10,15 48:19	cx 5:2	27:21
contamination	cost 10:3 27:16	d	designed 27:1
41:14	27:19 34:18,21	d 5:1 7:1 24:5,9	designing
continue 35:19	35:7,13,21	28:7	40:16
48:11	36:6,12,15,24	data 31:6 38:12	detailed 36:24
continuing	37:9,15 38:12	date 1:10 24:1	37:9
44:1	39:1,3,4 44:9	24:6 27:20	detected 15:2
contradictory	47:23,24	51:24	detection 14:9
14:5 15:7	costly 15:14	dceo 9:9,11	15:4,15 17:24
contributing	47:21	deadline 51:7	18:1 20:19
30:17	costs 34:20	december 9:14	21:1
control 1:1 2:6	35:1,2,4,5	deceo 9:13	develop 8:4
7:4 23:8 46:24	37:14 38:2	decision 8:5,5	developed 27:2
47:8 48:6	counsel 2:21	34:6,10	diego 3:21
cook 23:18	3:18,21 7:20		difference
	10:20 53:11,14		15:13 43:3

differences	dog 8:15	employee 53:13	essence 2:20
24:6	doing 43:10	54:10	7:19
different 14:3	due 41:14 51:2	ended 26:11	established
15:16 20:1,23	duly 10:24 12:3	engineering	45:16 46:2
36:4	22:7 32:7 53:5	23:4,6	establishing
difficult 35:2	dx 5:2	ensure 51:12	35:8
digital 53:8	e	entail 46:20	estimate 35:2
54:3	e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1	enter 12:15,16	36:2,9 39:2
direct 13:13	4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1	22:12 28:12,13	estimates 27:16
19:15 20:16	7:1	28:21 29:2	35:7,14,21
29:15 33:6	earlier 12:8	32:12,18,18	36:24 37:9
49:8	29:18	entered 11:1	38:12 39:4
directed 10:1	east 2:7	12:8,9	ethan 54:2,15
10:15 13:2	economic 9:9	entire 15:15	evd 6:2
director 3:6	9:10,22 27:22	36:18	events 37:11
23:3	34:2,4,11 35:6	entities 12:23	eventually 14:8
discuss 50:14	38:7,23 49:20	entitled 7:6	evidence 12:13
discussion	49:23	environmental	12:20 28:17
16:15 17:12	economically	2:19,20 3:9,16	29:6 32:22
50:16	24:12,24 25:22	3:19,22 4:4	exactly 31:7
discussions	33:17,23,23	6:15 7:18,19	examination
14:4 16:11	34:7,15 37:8	9:8,15,15 23:5	13:13 19:15
28:1,2	economics 34:3	49:13	20:16 29:15
disregard	effect 17:11,14	epa 26:17	33:6 49:8
51:23	effective 24:2	34:17	examined 12:5
distributed	effort 10:20	equally 9:2	22:9 32:9
21:8	efforts 17:6	eric 3:3 5:3	example 18:5
division 23:8	either 18:4	10:22 11:19	21:4 35:8
docket 1:5 7:9	electronic 51:9	12:2	exceeded 30:15
28:4	employed	es 53:4	exceeding
document 40:9	53:11,14 54:8	especially	40:21
documents	54:11	17:22	excuse 14:20
33:21		esquire 2:5	exempt 24:10
			24:22 25:20

[exempt - given] Page 7

28:7	f	44:16 45:13	founded 23:6
exempted	facilities 17:1	46:11	foxtrot 11:2
29:19 30:8	21:9 41:12	filing 28:3 38:4	free 8:16
exemption		38:10 51:11	freedom 26:17
16:23 17:12	43:13 44:2	filings 51:8	front 46:23
26:5 28:9 31:8	46:12	financial 48:18	fund 48:23
46:17	facility 15:4,16	financially	further 49:2
exemptions	17:7 30:17	53:15 54:11	50:2 53:13
16:20	36:3,5,18,18	find 43:12	54:9
exhaustive	41:14	finished 11:14	future 17:5
10:10 45:9	fact 27:7 familiar 46:21	finishing 11:5	g
exhibit 6:4,7,10	47:6	firm 3:9 23:6	
6:12,14 12:10	far 16:24 18:9	first 10:22 12:3	g 7:1
12:11,17,18	fast 8:18	13:15 22:7,20	gas 40:6
28:13,15 29:3	feasibility 9:23	23:7 32:7	general 2:21 3:21 7:20 18:2
29:4 32:19,20	49:17	33:10,15	18:2 36:5
existing 23:24	feasible 13:16	five 17:9 22:24	generally 13:2
expansion 17:8	13:19,21 39:8	37:24	23:24 26:21
expectation	february 9:12	flynn 2:13 7:11	generated
46:10	feel 8:16	foia 40:10	44:10 47:21
expediting	fellow 7:17	44:15,18 45:10	generating
10:18	felt 35:1 37:8	follow 10:15	26:24
experience 24:3	file 47:13 50:12	12:22,23,24	geologic 23:12
expert 47:15	filed 6:4,7,10	28:19 29:8,17	geologist 23:10
explore 9:22	6:12,14 10:6	30:21 32:24	geology 23:10
extends 38:8,24	10:12,16,24	33:1 43:12	gia 17:10
extensively	12:8,15 15:20	45:15 50:4	gibson 2:14
45:9	22:12 28:4,12	following 43:14	7:12
extent 19:18	29:3 32:12,13	follows 12:5	give 19:21 20:2
extremely 27:5	32:17 33:21	22:9 32:9	22:21
27:20	35:7 36:21,21	foregoing 53:3	given 27:20
	36:22 37:7,10	53:4 54:4	48:1
	40:10 41:20	forward 30:23	

Veritext Legal Solutions

[go - illinois] Page 8

go 8:22 12:21	guarantee 27:7	38:16,20 45:20	hydrogeologi
12:24 16:17	guess 14:2 43:3	47:3 49:4,7	3:7 23:4
20:15 21:20	h	50:3,13,17,20	hydrogeologist
24:19 28:18	h 6:1	51:2,4,6,9,16	19:24
29:8 30:18	haley 1:16 53:2	51:19,22 52:2	hydrogeology
31:8,15 32:23	53:18	52:3	3:3
37:3 38:17	hand 11:23	heavy 21:8	i
50:6,14,18	22:4 32:4	held 50:16	identification
goes 14:13 15:9	handling 20:3	help 8:4,9	12:12,19 28:16
18:3	happening 43:4	29:21 30:24	29:5 32:21
going 8:17 11:8	harder 41:4,7	47:16	identified 21:3
14:18 17:7	hear 13:6,9	helpful 10:18	40:11
22:15,19 30:22	19:10 22:20	31:6,9	iepa 9:16 10:9
31:7 36:2	30:5 45:19	hereto 53:15	10:12,16,16,20
39:14 41:3	hearing 1:9,12	54:11	10:23 14:11
47:17,20,22	6:3 7:2,5,5,17	hire 47:10,15	15:6 31:16,17
48:4,10,17	7:21 8:1 9:3	holiday 51:18	33:1,10,10
good 7:3 51:20	10:10,14,19	hope 20:10	34:24 35:13
goodwin 1:16	11:11,17 12:7	horton 2:5 7:18	36:8,20 37:22
53:2,18	12:9,11,14,16	11:10 18:17,19	38:23 39:1,6
governed 7:21	12:18,21 13:4	22:14 28:21	40:10,15 42:16
grant 48:4	13:7 18:15,21	hour 11:13	43:10,24 44:7
great 16:22	19:1,3,6,9,12	hours 32:17	46:3 48:5 51:1
25:14 43:21	20:12,15 21:19	huh 18:18	iepa's 14:21,23
greenfield 17:8	22:11,16,18,22	hunsberger 3:6	23:7 33:22
groundwater	24:18 25:5,11	5:7 10:23	35:6 37:6
1:5 2:2 7:7	25:18 28:11,13	18:14 21:23	il 1:15 2:8
9:17,19 14:9	28:15,18,22	22:6,20 23:3	illinois 1:1 2:6
17:5 20:4 26:8	29:1,3,4,7,12	hunsberger's	3:15,18,21 4:4
27:6 30:18	31:11,20,24	45:12	6:15 7:4,8 9:15
33:14 34:8	32:11,17,19,20	hurdles 39:10	20:6 23:11,19
40:13,17 41:13	32:23 33:4	hydrogeologic	23:22 26:7,17
42:2,4,14,15,21	35:15,18 37:2	23:12	27:13 34:17
46:7 48:12			

Veritext Legal Solutions

46:24 49:13	including 9:19	issues 15:24	knowledge
53:20	27:16 28:2	16:3 25:16	53:10 54:6
illinois.gov 2:9	inclusion 28:3	39:15 50:15	known 44:24
immediate	incremental	it'll 36:4	l
17:11,14	34:19	j	lab 38:2
immediately	indiana 20:7	jacqueline 4:3	lack 27:22
17:1	individual 21:2	january 9:6,21	laden 21:8
impact 9:10	industry 16:10	jennifer 2:15	lakes 3:7 6:11
17:6	infeasible	job 1:17	6:13 10:8,11
impacts 21:2	33:17	joshua 3:15 5:9	10:23 21:24
implementati	information	31:23 32:6	22:12 23:17,17
13:16,23 29:21	7:23 10:2,3	33:18 39:16	23:18 33:9
30:9 34:13	26:18 43:21	journal 9:5	36:23 37:10
implemented	initial 14:15	july 33:11,11	land 3:7 6:11
14:1 16:13,16	28:3	34:16 37:7	6:13 10:8,11
16:19 17:17	intended 8:3	jumping 31:7	10:23 21:24
implementing	intends 15:21	justify 30:16	22:12 23:8,17
15:22	interested		23:17,18 33:8
implications	53:15 54:12	k	36:23 37:10
31:1,3	internal 38:1	kansas 20:8	landfill 16:21
important	internet 25:16	keep 22:23	17:17 18:3
16:14	interruption	kind 21:10	39:11 42:7
impose 27:5	24:14 38:13	34:10 48:19	47:21 48:3
inception 28:1	intimately	kinds 15:24	landfills 9:24
include 20:6	46:21 47:6	know 13:24	13:17 14:1
35:7,21,22	involve 47:8	16:3,10 17:18	15:22 16:5
36:8	involved 47:23	34:16 37:23	17:19 18:13
included 16:2	47:24	39:1,16,16,17	20:24 23:23,24
27:18,24 28:9	involves 46:23	40:9,12,13	24:11,13,23
37:14	involving 39:12	41:7 43:4,19	25:1,21,23
includes 16:10	ipcb 2:6	44:9,16,20	26:3,4,7,12,17
16:10 26:16	issue 44:9 51:6	45:4,6,9 47:12	26:18,21,23
27:14	issued 10:10,15	47:16,19,20 48:3	27:4,12,15,17

27:22 29:19,21	little 15:7 24:20	manner 24:4	microphone
30:8,10,22	25:13,14 37:3	march 9:17	13:6 19:7
31:7 33:16	located 23:6,18	marie 2:21 7:20	25:12
38:5,6,8,24	location 1:13	13:9 51:21	mind 8:2 25:15
39:8,18 40:11	long 39:13	marked 12:11	minimum 17:2
40:11,16,22	48:12,16	12:18 28:15	minnesota 18:6
41:4 42:13,17	longer 44:24	29:4 32:20	20:7 21:4
42:23 43:23	look 37:22	matches 38:2	minus 34:20
44:1,10,14,22	41:22 44:8	material 28:4	minute 11:7
44:23 45:4,6	45:3,15	matter 1:3 7:7	18:22
45:17 46:4,19	looking 44:20	matters 51:14	minutes 22:24
48:10,20,20	lot 43:9	52:1	missouri 20:7
lasalle 1:14	low 27:5,20	mean 11:9 18:2	modeling 17:6
law 3:9	lunch 11:13	42:16 46:18	moment 50:14
leachate 14:10	m	47:12	monday 50:22
15:2 17:5 20:4	made 15:5	means 24:15	monitor 14:14
26:22 40:1,4	16:21 34:9	meet 40:17	20:24 27:4
leaving 27:12	majority 23:15	meets 26:9	30:22 48:11,16
length 24:7	make 30:24	member 2:14	monitored 45:5
letter 8:14 9:11	41:4,7 51:20	2:15,16,18	45:6
lifetime 15:15	makes 15:13	7:11,14,15	monitoring
likely 27:19	makowski 2:16	members 8:22	14:9,13 15:4
47:20	7:14	11:6	15:14 16:12
limits 30:12	manage 27:13	mentioned 12:8	17:2,23,24
36:11	manage 27.15	19:17 29:8	18:2,10 20:19
liner 21:6	34:19	meyer 3:13	20:20,20 21:1
liners 21:7	managed 45:1	mic 25:9	21:11 24:8
26:22 39:19	management	michael 1:13	27:16 30:23
list 8:23 26:16	23:11	2:16 7:14	31:6 34:20
30:13 44:14,16	manager 3:3,15	michelle 2:14	36:9,13,15
44:18,22,23	23:7	7:12	40:17 42:1,5,7
45:2,7,10,11,15	managing	michigan 18:6	42:14,16,17
45:17 46:2,3	26:20	20:7 21:10	48:18
51:10,13	20.20		

morning 7:3	ninety 40:22	officer 1:12	28:11 29:1
move 11:18	non 10:10	2:19 7:2,6,17	30:7 31:10,11
13:5 25:9,12	12:22	8:1 10:10,14	31:15,20,24
25:12	noon 11:13	11:11 12:7,14	32:11,17 33:5
multiple 36:17	north 1:14	12:21 13:4,7	34:1,4,16,24
n	notary 53:19	18:15,21 19:1	35:13 36:20
n 2:1 3:1 4:1	notepad 8:20	19:3,6,9,12	37:15 38:3
	notice 9:3	20:12,15 21:19	39:6 41:17,21
5:1 7:1 n502 1:14	noticed 33:21	22:11,16,18,22	43:17 44:4
name 7:5 8:11	number 19:24	24:18 25:5,11	45:4,14 48:17
8:23 31:21	28:14 29:3	25:18 28:11,18	49:1,2,4 50:2,3
national 3:4,11	32:19 36:3,13	28:22 29:1,7	50:5,10,13,17
3:13 6:5,8 10:7	43:18	29:12 31:11,20	50:19,20 51:19
49:11	nwra 10:8,12	31:24 32:11,23	51:22
nebraska 20:8	10:22 11:19	33:4 35:15,18	oklahoma 20:8
necessarily	12:14 13:23	37:2 38:16,20	old 24:13 25:1
41:15	14:18 36:23	45:20 47:3	25:23
necessary 25:3	37:10	49:4,7 50:3,17	ones 32:13
26:1	0	50:20 51:7,10	42:24 45:10
need 8:18 30:16	o 7:1	51:16,19 53:2	online 9:1
48:11 51:14	objections	oh 11:11 18:23	open 51:4
52:1	32:15	18:23 22:16	opened 9:21
neither 52:2	obligations	24:15 29:2,14	operated 24:4
53:11 54:7	41:12 44:6	37:2 38:14	operating
never 27:8	obviously	42:20,22 51:19	40:14,16
new 16:9 25:2	20:22	ohio 20:7	operator 23:18
25:24 26:9	occur 13:23	okay 11:16,17	45:1
27:5 39:9	15:18	11:22 12:7,23	opinion 28:8
40:18 48:11	october 24:1	13:11 15:19	33:22 38:4
nick 3:21	51:5,17,23	16:18 18:12,23	opportunity
night 33:12,21	offer 50:8,13	19:2,6,8 20:12	9:9
38:4 39:6	office 9:1	21:19,20 22:3	oral 9:2
		22:11,22 24:21	order 10:21
		25:5,14,18	11:17 33:12

37:11 41:19	24:3,5,9,9,10	personnel 28:3	47:4 51:11,23
46:8,14 51:7	24:11,23 25:20	persons 51:10	point 8:17
organization	25:21 26:3,3,4	pertain 27:15	21:12
8:11 15:11	26:7,9,12,21,23	pervasiveness	policies 27:3
orphaned	27:1,4,12	27:21	pollution 1:1
26:19	29:19,20,21	petition 46:23	2:6 7:4 23:8
outcome 53:16	30:7,8,10,21	47:8,16	46:24 47:8
54:12	33:13,15 34:5	pfas 9:20,24	polyfluoroalk
outside 34:8	38:24 41:24	14:4,8,12,14	9:20
oversight 23:12	42:7,12,21	15:2,3,11,14,22	portion 16:8
own 38:1	43:23 45:13,17	16:12,19 17:1	posed 8:3
owned 26:19	46:4,7,13,19	17:17,23 18:7	position 34:6,9
owner 26:19	48:10	18:8,10 20:19	38:7,23
45:1	participating	21:1,8,11	possible 44:21
owners 27:11	52:3	24:11,23 25:2	post 15:16
p	particular	25:21,24 26:9	23:21 24:7,8
p 2:1,1 3:1,1	14:13 16:16	27:4,5,16,21,23	25:1,23 26:2
4:1,1 7:1	17:6 18:6,8	28:1,8 30:12	26:10,13,15
p.m. 11:13,15	parties 53:12	30:22 31:1	27:6,9 40:23
11:15	53:14 54:8,11	34:23 39:9	41:5,12 43:24
page 34:18	parts 16:5	40:18,19 41:1	44:6 46:5,6
37:19 41:21	party 10:2	41:15 46:13	51:4,22
panel 18:24	pass 19:7 35:16	48:11	posted 9:3
paper 51:8	period 24:7	phased 13:15	50:23
parameters	26:11,13 51:4	13:23 29:20	potentially
40:20	51:23	30:9	39:12 47:24
part 9:16,18,23	permit 3:15	place 15:24	pre 6:4,7,10,12
9:24 10:4,5	18:4 23:7	please 8:2,8,11	6:14 10:6,24
13:16,17 14:11	35:10 43:14	8:14,16,22	12:8,15 22:12
14:15,19 15:1	48:16	11:20,23 22:1	28:4,12 29:3
15:17 16:9	permits 42:5	22:4,24 24:19	32:12 50:12
17:23 18:13	43:2	25:15 30:3	prepared 49:16
23:23,23 24:1	person 8:9,22	31:22 32:1,4	54:3
		42:3,11 45:21	

[present - read] Page 13

	1		
present 2:12	16:16 17:2,23	publicly 26:19	14:23 15:20
3:2 4:2 7:10,16	17:24 18:2,8	pull 41:20	21:20 27:15
president 3:6	18:10 20:23	pump 39:12	28:2 29:9
23:3	21:14,15	pursuant 9:7	31:12,18 32:24
pretty 36:7	programs 14:5	23:22 44:15	33:1,9 41:18
41:23	14:9,10 17:17	purview 34:5	41:22 43:22
previous 51:24	34:14	put 35:9,13	47:4 49:2,5
previously	projects 23:15	putting 36:2	50:2,5 51:1,24
12:15 29:8	promptly 50:23	q	quick 19:14
printed 50:24	proposal 8:6		41:20
prior 8:12	51:3	qualified 53:7 quality 1:6 2:3	r
17:12 28:3	proposed 1:5		r 2:1 3:1 4:1 7:1
53:5	2:2 7:7 9:10,16	7:8 9:17,19	
privileged 7:24	10:3	26:4 27:6	r22-18 1:6 7:10
probably 47:10	protection 3:16	33:14	raise 11:23
procedural	3:19,22 4:4	quarter 30:13	22:4 32:4
7:21 11:3	6:16 9:8,15	35:9	raised 14:24
50:15	34:8 49:13	quarterly 18:4	16:4
procedure 16:9	prove 40:12	question 8:10	ranked 18:6
proceeding 7:6	provide 9:11	13:15 16:23	ranking 21:3,5
11:17 52:5	10:2 35:4,5	17:16 19:14	21:10
54:4	36:14,15 39:4	20:13 29:11,17	rao 2:19 5:4,8
proceedings	48:17	29:18 30:1,3	7:18 13:1,9,11
10:21 53:3,5,6	provided 26:17	30:20 31:4	13:14 18:18,23
53:9 54:6	36:11 44:15	42:6,8,10,14	19:2,5,8 24:17
process 17:11	45:11	44:14 45:3,16	25:10 29:10,14
21:5,10 30:19	providing	45:21	29:16 30:4
46:20,22 47:7	23:16 39:1	questioning	31:10 35:17
,		11:5	rcx 5:2
produce 8:9	proving 47:16	questions 8:2,6	rdx 5:2
professional	public 4:3 8:21	8:12 10:11,13	read 11:1 12:9
23:10	8:22,24 9:2	10:15,17 11:4	12:16 22:13
program 14:14	11:7 50:6,7	11:16 12:22,23	28:13 32:14,18
14:15,19 15:5	53:19	12:24 13:2	
15:9,12,15			

Veritext Legal Solutions

reading 46:11	recording 53:8	remediation	requested 9:6
real 41:20	54:4	39:11	9:11 21:11
realistically	recycling 3:4	removal 39:13	required 10:18
36:15	3:12,14 6:5,8	removed 16:20	15:3 30:22
really 42:6	10:7 49:11	16:23 17:12	39:18,21,24
48:12	reduced 53:7	render 33:14	40:4 42:5,16
reasonable	reference 14:20	34:6	43:1,4
24:12,24 25:22	referenced	repair 26:2	requirements
33:23,24 34:7	14:11,19,20	46:6	24:6 39:17
34:15 37:8	referring 16:1	repeat 30:2	43:15
reasonableness	41:18	45:21	requires 20:24
9:22 34:12	reflect 8:5	repeated 8:19	resources
35:6 38:8,24	regard 34:7,22	repetitious	27:22
49:20,23	48:7	7:24	responded 47:5
received 9:13	region 17:22	report 37:16,20	response 9:12
10:6,9 12:12	register 9:5	reported 1:16	9:13 14:21,23
12:19 28:16	regulated	reporter 8:7,16	15:1 33:3 39:5
29:5 32:21	23:22	11:20,22 12:6	42:4,15 45:11
44:18	regulations	22:1,3,10	49:6,18 51:15
receives 50:22	9:17 24:2 27:2	24:15 25:4,9	responses
51:6	regulatory	31:21 32:1,3	10:12,17,17
recent 15:19	34:13 39:17	32:10 38:14	15:19 27:14
37:23 38:10	46:17	45:19 47:1	33:11 34:17
51:12	related 16:4	50:19	41:19
recognizing	23:12,15 53:11	represent 8:12	responsible
39:14	54:7	19:22 33:8	23:11
record 8:1,4	relative 53:13	47:15	result 48:2
11:1 12:9,16	54:10	representative	results 30:14
22:13 28:13	release 40:6	30:17	30:23
32:14,18 50:7	released 41:11	republic 19:23	revenue 26:24
50:14,16,18	relevant 7:24	19:23	44:11 47:22
53:9 54:5	10:2	request 21:12	48:21
recorded 53:6	remedial 20:5	26:18 40:10	review 45:2
		44:15	

reviews 17:9	sampling 14:10	seen 36:22 37:9	27:13,24 28:6
rhoades 3:15	14:12,15 34:21	semi 15:4 18:4	28:7,9
5:9 31:19,23	34:22 35:9,23	senior 3:3 4:3	situation 41:13
31:23 32:6	39:3 42:17,19	sentences 24:19	six 9:19
49:10	42:24 43:6,15	september 1:10	skills 53:10
right 7:2 11:19	44:3,12	10:14,16 50:22	54:6
11:23 20:21	san 3:21	51:2	slower 25:15
22:4 23:2	saying 31:5	served 51:9	softly 8:18
25:19 30:12	38:7 41:9	service 4:3	solely 8:4
31:20 32:4	says 37:19	51:10,13	solid 23:15
34:3 36:7,20	42:11	services 3:7	sorry 11:11
38:3 43:15	scenario 36:12	19:23 23:4,13	19:5 22:16,19
44:12 49:17,20	48:1	set 10:10,15	24:18 25:12
50:3,17 51:20	schedule 17:18	42:21	35:18 37:2
51:24 52:1	science 23:9	seven 40:22	38:16 45:20
room 1:14	scientist 2:20	sic 7:18 9:13	47:3
rule 17:13	7:18,19	siegel 54:2,15	sort 17:7
21:12 28:1	scope 34:8	sievers 3:11	sounds 45:14
rulemaking 7:6	scott 3:11	5:11 49:6,9,10	source 39:13
7:9 15:21,23	49:10	50:1	speak 8:8 46:22
16:9	second 29:12	sign 8:20	47:1,4,7 48:24
rules 7:22,23	30:13 49:1	signature 53:17	49:16,19,23
9:10 11:3	section 3:15	54:14	speaking 8:8
13:18 16:21	7:22 8:14 9:7	significant 28:6	16:7 18:13
S	11:2 23:7	39:10,15	specific 36:3
s 2:1 3:1 4:1 6:1	sections 8:13	similarities	specify 19:18
7:1	see 14:22 31:6	28:6	19:19
sake 8:7	35:10	simply 27:12	speculate 41:8
salk 1:12 7:5	seeing 7:3	site 14:16 17:8	spell 8:14
sample 37:15	12:23 50:6	26:9,20 36:16	spoke 36:1
43:2 44:1	52:2	sites 13:19 18:7	springfield
sampled 30:13	seek 46:12	20:5 21:2,5,13	7:13 23:6
_	seems 7:14 14:5	21:13 24:3,5,9	31:14 33:2
	25:13	26:19 27:1,8	50:10

[staff - think] Page 16

staff 7:16 8:3	stating 15:8	surprised	term 39:13
10:20	37:7 40:15	27:11	termination
standard 31:2	statistics 17:3	swear 11:20	27:20
46:13,19,22	status 42:3	22:1 32:2	terms 15:22
47:6,18 48:8	stepped 7:15	swearing 11:18	16:18 20:3
48:10	stop 8:17 22:20	sworn 10:24	test 40:4
standards 9:19	stopped 40:14	12:3 18:17,19	testified 12:5
9:24 10:5	44:11	19:4 22:7 32:7	22:9 32:9
13:16,24 15:23	straight 29:8	53:5	testifying 53:5
16:19 24:12,24	street 1:14 2:7	system 9:1 40:1	testimony 6:4
25:2,22,24	study 9:10	40:7,17	6:12 8:6 10:6
26:5,9 27:6,20	subdocket 9:22	systems 21:3	10:24 12:8
28:8 29:22	subject 26:4	26:22 39:13	14:11 22:12,21
30:8 31:2	49:17,19	t	23:16 26:16
33:14 34:14	submit 8:24		27:14 28:5,21
39:9 40:13,18	subpart 24:5,9	t 6:1	29:3 35:6
40:24 46:7,14	28:7	tables 27:18	36:21,22 37:6
46:15 48:12	subsequent	taft 3:9	45:13,13 50:12
start 7:3 11:19	28:5 30:18	take 11:14	50:13
state 8:11 9:5	substances	taken 37:13	texas 20:8
15:1 17:16	9:20	53:3,12 54:9 takes 51:3	thank 12:6
20:22 23:10	suggestion	talk 25:14	13:10 17:15
27:13 31:21	13:22	talking 8:13,18	18:12 20:9,11
45:5,7 53:20	suite 2:7	43:13	21:16,22 22:10
stated 14:17	summary 22:21	technical 9:23	25:18 28:10,11
33:10 39:7	sun 9:4	34:1 49:17	31:10,15 32:10
statements	superfund 20:5	technically	49:2,4 50:2
14:6	supplemental	33:16 39:8	51:21 52:2
states 17:20,21	35:10	tell 12:4 22:8	thanks 13:12
18:5,10 19:17	support 38:11	32:8	things 20:23
19:19 20:1,3	39:2	ten 11:7	think 15:23
20:19,24 21:17	sure 30:11,20	tentatively 51:5	16:3,7,8,14
statewide 18:9	31:4 35:17	31.3	29:20 30:23
20:23 21:14	37:4 45:23		41:1,3,3

Veritext Legal Solutions

[thinks - worked] Page 17

	I	I	I
thinks 13:24	treat 27:22	undertaken	want 19:20
thought 18:23	39:12	41:16	28:22 32:16
three 16:5	treatment	unlined 39:11	44:8 48:15
time 1:11 8:9	40:17	update 17:10	waste 3:4,11,13
10:19 27:3	trevor 3:18	updated 44:17	6:5,8 10:7 21:8
49:3 51:14	true 34:21 48:5	upgrading 36:4	23:16 24:1
times 9:4	53:9 54:5	V	26:23 49:11
tin 2:18 5:6	truth 12:4,4,5	value 35:22	way 31:8
7:15 20:14,17	22:8,8,9 32:8,8	value 33.22 van 2:7,15	we've 40:9
tipsord 2:21	32:9	van 2.7,13 vanessa 2:5	45:16 46:2
5: 3 :20 13:3,5,10	trying 14:22	7:17	weighs 9:2
19:11,13,16	tuesday 1:10	vanessa.horton	welcome 7:4
20:11 22:17,19	turn 11:4	2:9	welcomed 10:3
23:1 25:7	two 14:3 24:19	variance 46:13	wells 36:4,13
28:24 29:24	type 17:8 48:18	variance 40.13	36:17
51:15,17	typewriting	vast 23.13 verify 35:22	went 42:2
today 7:10,16	53:7	version 51:13	wie 2:15
7:20 8:3,22	typical 27:17	versus 43:4	wish 8:21
49:12,16,22	typically 24:8	vice 3:6 23:3	witness 11:5,5
50:8,12	u	vicinity 26:8	11:21 12:3
today's 10:21	unable 40:12	videoconfere	13:8,12 21:21
11:17 50:21	uncertain 48:2	2:17,22 3:5,8	22:2,7 23:2
51:2	under 7:22	3:10,12,14,17	24:21 25:17,19
together 35:9	11:1 16:5,17	3:20,23 4:5	30:2 32:2,7
36:2	22:24 40:21	7:13	47:5 49:12,22
topic 49:23	understand	viewed 50:24	53:4
transcriber	16:24 29:24	virtual 24:13	witnesses 5:2
54:1	31:4 42:9	38:12	11:18 13:2
transcript 8:10	understanding	virtually 27:7	work 17:21,21
50:21,23 51:6	16:12 36:21		17:22 18:10
54:3,5	42:22 43:5,6,8	W	19:17,24 20:3
transcriptionist	43:17 44:8	wait 29:12	20:5 30:11
53:8	73.17 77.0	walk 27:12	worked 21:17

Veritext Legal Solutions

[worst - zwick] Page 18

worst 36:12
worth 45:14
write 8:23
written 8:24
9:2 10:10,12
10:15,16 26:16
X
x 5:1 6:1
y
yeah 11:10
13:1,8 18:21
19:20 20:15
22:23 24:17
29:10,17 30:5
31:3 36:8
37:19,22 38:1
38:3 40:21
42:11 43:17,20
44:5,7,21 45:8
46:9 48:9
year 17:9
years 23:14,20
26:24 37:24
40:13,24 43:19
44:10,11 47:22
48:21
yesterday
15:20 32:14
Z
zwick 3:9 5:10
33:3,5,7,8
35:20 37:4,5
,