1	S38328						
2	STATE OF ILLINOIS )						
3	) SS. COUNTY OF KANE )						
4	BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD						
5	0						
6	)						
7	Complainants, )						
8	vs. ) No. PCB 95-122 )						
9	OBERWEISS DAIRY, INC., ) RICHARD J. FETZER and JOHNNIE )						
10	<pre>W. WARD, d/b/a Serve-N-Save, ) and RICHARD J. FETZER, ) Individually, )</pre>						
11	Respondents. )						
12	respondents.						
13	CONTINUED REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had and						
14	testimony taken at the hearing of the above-entitled						
15	cause, before Mr. Michael L. Wallace, Chief Hearing						
16	Officer, at the Kane County Courthouse, 100 South Third						
17	Street, Geneva, Illinois, on the 1st day of April, A.D.						
18	1997, at the hour of 9:30 a.m.						
19							
20	PRESENT:						
21	LAW OFFICES OF MURPHY & MURPHY, P.C., by						
22	MR. J. ROBERT MURPHY,						
23	340 North Lake Street						
24	Post Office Box 460 Aurora, IL 60507 (630) 896-9711						
	Sonntag Reporting Service, Ltd.  Post Office Box 147  Geneva, Illinois 60134  1-800-232-0265 FAX 708-232-4999						

1	
2	appeared on behalf of Complainants;
3	ALTHEIMER & GRAY, by
4	MR. SAMUEL T. LAWTON, JR., and
5	MR. MYLES D. BERMAN,
6	Suite 4000 10 South Wacker Drive
7	Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 715-4000
8	and
9	DREYER, FOOTE, STREIT, FURGASON & SLOCUM, P.A., by
10	MR. RICHARD C. SLOCUM,
11	900 North Lake Street
12	Aurora, IL 60507 (630) 897-8764
13	appeared on behalf of Respondent Oberweiss Dairy, Inc.; and
14	TYLER & HUGHES, P.A., by
15	
16	MR. GORDON P. HUGHES, JR.,
17	320 East Indian Trail Aurora, IL 60505
18	(630) 897-0559
19	appeared on behalf of Respondent Richard J. Fetzer.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Pursuant to the direction

- 2 of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, I now call
- 3 Docket No. PCB 95-122.
- 4 This is the matter of Olive Streit and Lisa Streit
- 5 versus Oberweiss Dairy, Inc., Richard J. Fetzer and
- 6 Johnnie W. Ward, doing business as Serve-N-Save, and
- 7 Richard J. Fetzer, Individually.
- 8 May I have appearances for the record, please, for
- 9 the Complainant?
- MR. MURPHY: For the Complainant, whose names are
- 11 Olive and Lisa Streit, S-t-r-e-i-t, J. Robert Murphy, law
- 12 firm of Murphy & Murphy, P.C., Aurora, 60507.
- MR. HUGHES: Good morning, your Honor.
- 14 On behalf of Richard Fetzer, Gordon Hughes, the law
- 15 firm of Tyler & Hughes, P.A., located at 322 East Indian
- 16 Trail in Aurora, Illinois.
- 17 MR. LAWTON: On behalf of Respondent Oberweiss, I'm
- 18 Samuel T. Lawton, law firm of Altheimer & Gray. With me
- is my partner, Myles Berman, and Rich Slocum, all
- 20 representing Oberweiss.
- 21 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Let the record reflect
- there are no other appearances at today's hearing.
- 23 The Board has acted on the motion to voluntarily
- 24 dismiss Amoco Oil Company and Mobil Oil Corporation.

1 It's the Board's practice that we drop those two

- 2 names off of our heading, and we also dropped their
- 3 Counsel from the service list. So to save yourselves
- 4 some mailing costs, you don't have to mail to Amoco and
- 5 Mobil Oil.
- 6 We have several preliminary items to bring up. I
- 7 would note for the record that the Hearing Officer had a
- 8 phone conversation with Mr. Berman, Mr. Lawton and Mr.
- 9 Murphy yesterday morning -- I believe it was around 10:00
- or 10:30 in the morning -- discussing the various
- 11 procedural aspects that have come up in this case.
- 12 I made some preliminary rulings yesterday and will
- 13 place them on the record today.
- 14 With that said, I also did call Mr. Hughes and
- 15 inform him of our conference call, and I regret that --
- 16 I'm not afraid of technology, but I'm not sure how to
- 17 patch in more than two people at a time. Maybe the State
- 18 will fix that at some point.
- 19 Now, before I continue, Mr. Murphy, did you have
- anything that you wanted to bring up?
- 21 MR. MURPHY: In the nature of motions, which I
- 22 believe the Hearing Officer is here to consider today and
- 23 to rule on on the record, I have kind of a housekeeping
- 24 and formal motion, and I believe that it has already

- been -- I'm sure it has already been filed.
- 2 I don't know that there has ever been a response to
- 3 it from any of the adverse parties, but that is, very
- 4 simply, my motion to withdraw testimony that was entered
- 5 only with regard to Mobil.
- 6 Since the Board has ruled on the motion to dismiss
- 7 Mobil, it becomes, I think, totally irrelevant that I
- 8 spent a couple of hours with my engineer on the witness
- 9 stand before the previous hearing officer, and I have
- 10 pointed out in my motion the pages, et cetera, of the
- 11 transcript that are devoted to that testimony.
- 12 They have nothing to do with the remaining
- 13 Respondents, and my motion, therefore, is to merely
- 14 withdraw that testimony from the record.
- 15 That motion has been filed with your Honor as well
- 16 as, I believe, the Board. No, it was directed to your
- 17 Honor, not to the Board.
- 18 MR. LAWTON: May I respond, your Honor?
- 19 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Yes.
- 20 MR. LAWTON: Respondent Oberweiss will very
- 21 vigorously object to that motion; and while it's
- 22 premature perhaps to argue it to you, we would ask leave
- 23 to be able to file a response to the motion that was made
- by Mr. Murphy.

1 As your Honor is well aware, our position from the

- very beginning is that Oberweiss is not responsible for
- 3 the alleged contamination and that the sources of
- 4 contamination include, among others, Mobil and Amoco.
- 5 There was testimony with respect to that by Mr.
- 6 Murphy and by Mr. Mehrens back in 1995 when this matter
- 7 was before the Board, and that is part of the record.
- 8 Among other things, the testimony of Mr. Mehrens
- 9 indicates that there was contamination of groundwater and
- 10 there was contamination of soil that was presumably with
- 11 respect to the Mobil operation. That was what Mr. Murphy
- 12 was trying to establish at that time. We likewise felt
- 13 that there was a basis for finding contamination from
- 14 Mobil.
- 15 I think it would severely prejudice our position
- 16 and our entire thesis of defense to have that testimony
- 17 removed from the record. It's in there. It's damaging
- 18 to Mobil, who is no longer in. It's supportive of the
- 19 position that we've asserted from the very beginning. I
- think it would be a gross mistake to have that removed.
- 21 Now, I don't purport to argue it now. I'm sure Mr.
- 22 Murphy doesn't want to argue it now. We would ask leave
- 23 to file our response, and that will be the basis on which
- 24 our response is made.

1 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: When is your response

- 2 going to be sent in?
- 3 MR. LAWTON: We got it yesterday afternoon even
- 4 after we spoke on the telephone.
- 5 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: You just did receive the
- 6 motion?
- 7 MR. LAWTON: We just received the motion yesterday
- 8 afternoon.
- 9 MR. MURPHY: I think you're thinking of another
- 10 motion, with due respect, Counsel. This motion was
- 11 filed, one of my earlier ones --
- 12 MR. LAWTON: To withdraw?
- MR. MURPHY: Yes, to withdraw the testimony of
- Mehrens.
- MR. LAWTON: If it was filed, it wasn't received.
- 16 It was received after the telephone conversation that we
- 17 had with you and with the Hearing Officer.
- 18 MR. MURPHY: That doesn't say a lot for the U.S.
- 19 Mail.
- 20 MR. BERMAN: In fact, we received two motions
- 21 yesterday, one of which was the motion to withdraw,
- 22 Complainant's motion to withdraw.
- 23 MR. LAWTON: The response to our motion was also
- 24 received.

1 We won't take a great deal of time to respond that.

- 2 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: My time stamp on those
- 3 two motions also shows March 31st in my office in
- 4 Springfield.
- 5 They are dated different dates. They may have been
- 6 received by the Clerk of the Board at different dates. I
- 7 know Mr. Murphy mentioned yesterday that he received one
- 8 of your motions on a later date. So there quite possibly
- 9 is a considerable delay in the postal service.
- 10 All right. Then I will await your written response
- 11 to the motion to withdraw testimony. Obviously, the
- 12 motion to dismiss filed by Oberweiss will have to be
- handled by the full Board. I have Oberweiss' motion to
- 14 dismiss, and then I have the Complainant's response.
- 15 The Board's rules do not allow for a reply, except
- with leave of the Board. You're aware of that.
- 17 MR. LAWTON: We would ask leave to be able to reply
- 18 to that, your Honor.
- 19 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: That would have to be
- 20 directed to the Board.
- 21 MR. LAWTON: Very well. The request.
- 22 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Right.
- MR. MURPHY: I'm sorry, but I'm not quite up on
- 24 what motion you're now talking about.

1 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: I was talking about

- 2 Oberweiss' motion to dismiss.
- 3 MR. MURPHY: Which is before the Board?
- 4 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Which is before the full
- 5 Board, and you've submitted your response.
- 6 MR. MURPHY: Correct.
- 7 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: I was merely pointing out
- 8 that the Board does not allow reply except with leave of
- 9 the Board. So if there are going to be any further
- 10 filings, leave of the Board has to be requested.
- 11 MR. MURPHY: Fine.
- MR. LAWTON: Yes.
- 13 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: There is also the
- 14 Complainant's motion to rejoin the Environmental
- 15 Protection Agency.
- 16 MR. MURPHY: That's a motion to the Board.
- 17 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: That's a motion to the
- 18 Board.
- 19 The Attorney General's Office has replied on behalf
- 20 of the Agency. I do not know if Oberweiss was going to
- 21 respond to that or not.
- MR. LAWTON: We may adopt the position of the IEPA
- 23 on that.
- 24 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: In any event, again, Mr.

1 Murphy, if you wish to reply to the Agency's response,

- 2 you must request leave of the Board to do so.
- 3 Generally, you file your request for leave attached
- 4 with your reply so it's all there for them. Those two
- 5 motions have to be ruled upon by the Board.
- 6 I checked with the Clerk's office. Those two
- 7 motions are not on the agenda for the April 4th meeting,
- 8 so it will be, obviously, at a later meeting.
- 9 There is the motion in limine filed by the
- 10 Complainant and Oberweiss' response to the motion in
- 11 limine. That is directed to the Hearing Officer, and I
- 12 am going to defer ruling upon the motion in limine
- awaiting the Board's ruling on the motion to dismiss.
- 14 It would seem to be somewhat dispositive in terms of
- 15 Mr. Eric Portz's letter. I certainly -- at this point in
- 16 time the Board has not taken a position that it is bound
- 17 by the Agency's letter. So since that's part of the
- 18 motion to dismiss, we should at least wait to see what
- 19 the Board says on that before I will rule on the motion
- in limine.
- 21 The other item is the addition of a new witness. I
- 22 checked the docket. Apparently, that motion to
- 23 supplement and add a new witness was filed March the 6th
- 24 with our Clerk's office.

1 MR. MURPHY: There is no motion to that effect. I

- 2 was responding to --
- 3 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: I mischaracterized it.
- 4 Wasn't it entitled "Complainant's Supplemental
- 5 Discovery"?
- 6 MR. MURPHY: I was carrying out the directions of
- 7 the Hearing Officer in the January hearing.
- 8 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: That's correct. I
- 9 mislabeled that. It's not a motion. It's Complainant's
- 10 supplement. Our Clerk's office has that docketed as
- 11 March 6th.
- 12 I have Oberweiss' objection. I believe it's
- 13 entitled "Motion to Bar or in the Alternative Continue
- 14 for Further Discovery." That was docketed on March 20th
- 15 by the Clerk of the Board.
- 16 As I said yesterday, my research indicates that
- 17 the -- it seems to be an either/or situation. If you
- 18 wish to proceed with that particular witness, then I am
- 19 going to allow additional time for further discovery.
- 20 It appears, from the Board's rules and supplemented
- 21 by looking at the New Illinois Supreme Court Rules, that
- that probably is the most appropriate thing to do.
- In light of that, we did discuss some certain
- 24 scheduling aspects of this new witness. There is

obviously no way to do any discovery during the four or

- 2 five days we had scheduled for hearing.
- I do agree that we have been doing this hearing in
- 4 somewhat fitful starts, and I regret that we have to do
- 5 that. I would like for it to go a little smoother, but
- 6 it's not; and the only thing that I think is reasonable
- 7 to do is that we do continue the hearing for the further
- 8 discovery of this witness.
- 9 Mr. Murphy, you did indicate that you did intend to
- 10 proceed and use him.
- 11 Secondly, since the motion to rejoin the Agency and
- 12 the motion to dismiss are pending before the Board, I
- 13 further feel -- and for the purpose of the record, I will
- do this on my own motion -- that it's better to continue
- 15 these days of hearing to a later date and allow the Board
- 16 to rule on those two motions.
- 17 That way I think that conserves our resources
- 18 better. To the extent that we would spend four days here
- 19 and the Board would grant the motion to dismiss, everyone
- 20 would have been put out quite a bit; and to the extent
- 21 that if the Board adds the Agency as a party in interest
- or as a party, I would prefer that they have the
- 23 opportunity to participate in the continued hearings if
- 24 the Board let's them in.

1 Now, if the Board denies the motion to dismiss and

- 2 the party is not -- the Agency is not joined as a party,
- 3 we're pretty much back at the same square we were; but
- 4 the Respondents will have the opportunity to do the
- 5 further discovery, certainly, on the new witness.
- 6 Again, that pretty well sums up everything. We just
- 7 need to try to set some new dates. I am very hopeful
- 8 that the Board will rule at the end of the April meeting
- 9 or, at the earliest, the first meeting in May. So we
- 10 could hopefully get going again the end of May, 1st of
- June, depending on everyone's schedules. I know we have
- 12 to schedule way out in advance to try to catch everyone.
- 13 With that said, Mr. Murphy, if you want to comment on
- 14 any of that, you may do so.
- 15 MR. MURPHY: On the record, naturally, I want to
- 16 show the objection of the Complainants to the allowance
- 17 of time for further discovery, which, I take it, is in
- 18 the Hearing Officer's ruling on the motion that was filed
- 19 by Oberweiss for additional time.
- 20 I take it that you have thereby essentially said
- 21 you're going to let me add this witness, but you're going
- 22 to deny their motion to disqualify him for earlier
- 23 nonperformance or whatever they characterize it as; but
- in the alternative, you are going to say and have said

1 that Oberweiss should have the opportunity to depose this

- 2 witness.
- I do say on the record that we have offered
- 4 verbally -- in our conversation with the Hearing Officer
- 5 yesterday and with Oberweiss Counsel, we have offered to
- 6 make that witness available for a deposition at any time
- 7 that could be agreed on this week.
- 8 In response to that Oberweiss was taking the
- 9 position that they need at least 21 days or something
- 10 like that to be prepared to depose the witness.
- 11 That being the case, the whole thing is kind of on
- 12 hold, I gather, and that's fine. We will make him
- 13 available when we get into the scheduling of depositions,
- 14 which, I take it, will kind of hang on the scheduling of
- 15 the next hearing date.
- 16 I'm sorry if I'm a little confused about all the
- 17 scheduling, but it's at least a little simpler now with a
- 18 couple fewer respondents in the picture and having made
- 19 my record as far as the new witness is concerned and
- 20 having -- also wanting to make my record that I basically
- 21 object to the continuance of this because I was ready to
- 22 proceed this week and today, but I will live with that
- and that's fine. We can get a new date.
- I don't have a picture of what kind of timing the

- 1 Hearing Officer is talking about, except in your last
- 2 words I think you indicated that we should start looking
- 3 at dates after the end of May.
- 4 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: That's correct.
- 5 MR. MURPHY: That's probably it.
- 6 If that is true, it's only a suggestion, but perhaps
- 7 they should be given -- or I should be given a date
- 8 before the end of May in which this deposing of the
- 9 additional witness can take place.
- 10 If that's also true, they have indicated in their
- 11 responses to my discovery supplement that they also have
- 12 a new witness on the subject that my new witness is going
- to be testifying about. I believe that was a geologist
- 14 by the name of Imse, I-m-s-e.
- 15 So I would like -- at the time that we fix a time to
- 16 depose Lyle Bruce, who is my expert, I'd like the same
- 17 time to apply to making Mr. Imse available for my
- 18 deposing of him.
- 19 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Mr. Lawton?
- 20 MR. LAWTON: We have no objection to the basic
- 21 program suggested by Mr. Murphy.
- Our request for additional time, of course, was
- 23 responsive to the idea of his permitting Mr. Bruce to
- 24 have a deposition and then proceeding with his testimony

1 the following day. That was the thrust of why I asked

- 2 for additional time.
- 3 We would also like, since Mr. Imse's involvement in
- 4 this case would be responsive to that of Mr. Bruce, to
- 5 schedule it so that Mr. Bruce's deposition would precede
- 6 Mr. Imse, but beyond that we have no problem with it.
- 7 MR. MURPHY: I have no objection to that order of
- 8 the witnesses. That's fine.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Yes, Mr. Hughes?
- 10 MR. HUGHES: On behalf of Mr. Fetzer, I would
- 11 object to any other witnesses being allowed at this time
- 12 either on behalf of Oberweiss or on behalf of the
- 13 Complainants.
- 14 We're in, I believe, the third or fourth or fifth
- 15 day of trial. In the middle of trial he dismisses --
- 16 Complainants dismiss out certain entities, which we
- 17 believe may have caused the contamination.
- 18 Now he uses their expert, which they originally had,
- 19 and now uses it to bootstrap himself up when his case is
- 20 failing on the merits halfway through the trial. I think
- 21 that puts my client in a definite disadvantage.
- 22 By the way, I think if you read back the record, I
- 23 don't think that you said -- and I could be wrong, but I
- don't think that you said that you're granting the motion

1 to allow this additional witness. You said, "If I should

- 2 grant this witness, it would only be fair if we allowed
- 3 additional time to depose that witness."
- 4 So I'd like to suggest to this Court that that
- 5 witness be barred as well as the witness that Oberweiss
- 6 has set forth. It would severely prejudice my client.
- 7 We have to prepare a case. We have gone through the
- 8 dates of trial.
- 9 It would in essence put us in a situation of if Mr.
- 10 Murphy's witness testifies, as I believe he may, as a
- 11 hired gun witness, we then are going to have to hire
- 12 someone to counterbalance that.
- 13 We didn't think it was necessary because the other
- 14 witness that Mr. Murphy had, who was in the process of
- 15 testifying when we last quit, said nothing and had
- 16 nothing on the record that there was any contamination
- 17 from the subject property, so there was no liability on
- 18 my client in that case.
- 19 If now we're getting, at the last twelfth hour,
- 20 another expert witness, we're going to go back to the
- 21 beginning of discovery. I can assure you that that's
- 22 going to happen because if that expert witness says what
- I think he's going to say, then I think we may have to
- look for an expert witness, a geological witness.

1 I think those witnesses are then going to have to be

- 2 deposed; and depending on what those expert witnesses
- 3 say, even the expert witness from Oberweiss, depending on
- 4 what they say, we may have to have other witnesses then
- 5 come forward.
- 6 I think it's highly irregular, unfair and
- 7 prejudicial to my client to allow either Mr. Murphy's or
- 8 Oberweiss' expert witnesses, especially when we're in the
- 9 middle of the trial.
- 10 I've never heard of that before. I just don't see
- 11 where that should be allowed. It would prejudice us
- 12 severely; and based upon that, I would object to this
- 13 Court allowing any expert witnesses that haven't already
- 14 been disclosed come forth and testify in this case.
- 15 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: All right.
- MR. MURPHY: May I respond?
- 17 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Yes.
- 18 MR. MURPHY: I think this objection -- which,
- 19 again, is not to a motion of mine because I haven't made
- 20 a motion. I've merely followed the orders as they have
- 21 come down to supplement my discovery.
- 22 It is true, as Counsel says, of course, that I have
- 23 in effect adopted a witness that came from another party
- 24 who is no longer in the case.

1 That being the case, though, we should realize that

- 2 that same witness was essentially in the discovery
- 3 sequence that was furnished by Amoco or by Mobil,
- 4 whichever one it was; but that witness was duly listed,
- as it were, not by name but essentially by predecessor,
- 6 and your Honor already granted -- it was Amoco.
- 7 Your Honor granted Amoco's motion at the last
- 8 hearing to substitute their current geological expert
- 9 witness, which is an employee of Amoco, for the one that
- 10 had been listed.
- 11 Now, no effort had been made -- in the years that
- 12 this has been to the Board, no effort had been made by
- 13 either Oberweiss or Mr. Hughes to seek the testimony of
- 14 that geological witness that was available for being
- 15 deposed. Those had been furnished as a descriptive
- 16 furnishing a long time ago, and all that's happened is
- 17 that there is a different employee of Amoco in the
- 18 picture.
- 19 Yes, we have retained his services, and we're going
- 20 to put him on. As far as that is concerned, that really
- 21 only brings me to the description of this proceeding at
- 22 the Pollution Control Board of which your Honor is the
- 23 Hearing Officer.
- 24 This has indeed been cut up. I'm not blaming any of

- 1 the parties for the way it has been cut up. It has
- 2 happened, and we're facing it, but it has been anything
- 3 but launched upon a three- or four-day trial, as Mr.
- 4 Hughes would put it.
- 5 What it has been is a couple of times we have been
- 6 before a Hearing Officer of the Board, and those times
- 7 that we have been before the Hearing Officer have been
- 8 spent largely in presentation by one party or another and
- 9 ruling by the Hearing Officer on the presentation by one
- 10 party or another of technical argumentative motions,
- 11 which are essentially calculated to delay the time when
- 12 the merits will be reached.
- 13 We have not yet reached the merits. The only thing
- 14 that was reached, by way of discussion and testimony, on
- 15 the merits was my presentation of the testimony of Robert
- 16 Mehrens, the engineer that I had put on the stand.
- 17 All that we had discussed in Mr. Mehrens' testimony
- 18 was not the defendant Mobil, not the defendant Oberweiss,
- 19 but strictly what he had found in the FOIA material that
- 20 had been furnished by Mobil.
- 21 He did not say -- he did not testify in any way that
- there was any kind of tracking or migration of the
- 23 admitted existing soil and water involvement from the
- 24 Mobil site. He told what the FOIA material said, and

- 1 that was all.
- 2 We asked at the termination of that time when he was
- 3 on the stand whether or not we should proceed with his
- 4 testimony as to another defendant, and that was by, I
- 5 think, agreement of Counsel. I don't remember the exact
- 6 thing, but it was decided that we were going to terminate
- 7 for that day. He's never been back on the witness stand.
- 8 Your Honor knows that our plan was that when this
- 9 resumed on the merits, we were going to put Mr. Mehrens
- 10 back on the stand; and then we would hear what his
- 11 testimony about the site in question is, and that's the
- 12 Oberweiss site.
- Now, it's been a long time before the Board, and I
- 14 think it would be essentially carrying out the concept of
- 15 lack of responsibility, which we've heard time and time
- 16 again from Oberweiss, as to their position whether they
- 17 are an owner or operator or anything else, but they're
- 18 saying that the merits of this case are that there is no
- 19 responsibility on their part.
- 20 Mr. Fetzer is riding on them, and that's fine. He's
- 21 entitled to do that. They're all in the same site, but
- 22 so far no one has had a chance to say anything about
- 23 whether or not that site was the source of the
- 24 contamination of the third-party citizens Complainants,

- 1 the Streits.
- 2 If we are to be barred from bringing in the one
- 3 witness that is finally available to us to show that
- 4 there is a direct causal connection between that site and
- 5 its leaks of product and the water that was contaminated
- on the Streits' property, then all that says is fine,
- 7 there is no way of getting any kind of effective
- 8 enforcement of the environmental law in this proceeding
- 9 or in this forum.
- 10 So that's fine, whatever everybody feels it is going
- 11 to be, but I'm still taking the position that as I hear
- 12 you today and as I heard you yesterday, we were going to
- 13 have the opportunity to present that witness when we do,
- 14 if we ever do, get to the merits of this thing, and I'm
- 15 going to insist on that as part of the rulings that we
- 16 hear today.
- MR. HUGHES: May I respond again to that?
- 18 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Briefly.
- 19 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, when Mr. Murphy says that
- that witness was available to us a long time ago, that's
- 21 an incorrect and untruthful statement.
- 22 That particular person was not, and we may have made
- 23 a decision at that time to depose or not to depose that
- 24 witness. That's up to us.

1 But now in the fourth day of trial -- I think it's 2 four days -- and after the Complainant has called four witnesses, both plaintiffs, his own expert witness that 3 4 he disclosed many years ago and that we took the 5 depositions of and found, quite frankly, his testimony to 6 be so lacking that at the end of the plaintiffs' case we 7 were going to make a motion, and we thought we'd be 8 successful in that motion, and we didn't need to do 9 anything further, now at the last moment after we're in 10 trial he then pops another witness on us after he's 11 already paid money to settle the case with Amoco -- or 12 he's already been paid by Amoco to settle the case. 13 I think that's highly prejudicial and totally unfair 14 to my client, who has gone through the discovery process, 15 deposed witnesses, prepared their case, and at the 16 twelfth hour now when his witness -- his expert witness 17 is failing on the stand, we then have to have another 18 witness that he's got. I'm telling you that this is going to result in a 19 20 situation where we're going to go all the way back through discovery once again because whatever these two 21

Sonntag Reporting Service, Ltd.
Post Office Box 147
Geneva, Illinois 60134
1-800-232-0265 FAX 708-232-4999

expert witnesses, if your Honor allows them to, say, we

then are going to ask for an opportunity to call our own

witness -- expert witness and have him rebut what these

22

23

24

- 1 expert witnesses say.
- 2 Then they're going to have to take the deposition of
- 3 my expert witness, and we're going to get into a year and
- 4 a half from now we may have a hearing. That's
- 5 ridiculous. My client is entitled to a hearing right
- 6 now, not a year and a half from now.
- 7 I think that this thing has been pending for years,
- 8 years, and my client is running up an extremely large
- 9 bill for my services. It's totally unfair for him to --
- 10 for the plaintiff to come in at the very last and have
- 11 another expert witness.
- 12 It's my understanding that discovery had been closed
- off. That's why we started the trial.
- 14 If discovery hadn't been closed off and, Mr. Murphy,
- if this witness had been disclosed to us so many years
- 16 ago, why didn't you take his deposition? Why didn't you
- 17 list him as an expert witness?
- 18 Because then I would have taken his deposition if he
- 19 had listed him as an expert witness. If he was available
- 20 to us at that time, he certainly was available to Mr.
- 21 Murphy at that time.
- I would strongly and strenuously object to that
- 23 witness being allowed to testify.
- 24 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Thank you.

- 1 Mr. Lawton? Mr. Berman?
- 2 MR. LAWTON: I don't intend to prolong this.
- 3 It's a little hard to answer Mr. Murphy's assertions
- 4 because he has pretty much argued his whole case while
- 5 we've been sitting here.
- 6 You'll recall that our initial request on our motion
- 7 to bar was that that be the case, Mr. Bruce be barred.
- 8 The concept of taking his deposition was an alternative
- 9 in the event the Board and your Honor concluded that he
- 10 should not be.
- 11 In that respect, we have the same viewpoint that Mr.
- 12 Hughes expressed. There has been nothing dilatory about
- anything that Oberweiss has done. It's not up to us to
- 14 prove Mr. Murphy's case. We've been here. We've filed
- 15 what was required to be filed, and we have been ready to
- 16 proceed.
- We're not the ones that introduced a new witness,
- 18 and that is a major aspect of this proceeding. So that
- 19 we feel that while the witness is not appropriately
- 20 before us because he was a representative of a party that
- 21 was withdrawn from the case and he now is shifting his
- 22 position to go after another defendant, we are prepared
- 23 to go ahead, pursuant to your Honor's orders, but we do
- 24 adopt Mr. Hughes' viewpoint with respect to the

- 1 introduction of this witness.
- 2 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: I understand that
- 3 probably in the confines of a court that might be highly
- 4 irregular. In the confines of an administrative body,
- 5 it's not all that unusual.
- 6 I'm going to allow Mr. Murphy to call Mr. Bruce as a
- 7 witness. I'm going to allow Oberweiss to call Mr. Imse
- 8 as a rebuttal witness.
- 9 Mr. Hughes, if you want to find an expert to rebut
- 10 any of that, you're free to do so.
- 11 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I'd like to request, then,
- 12 that I not have to disclose any expert witness until we
- 13 take his expert witness' deposition. I don't think I
- 14 should be put in that position. I don't know what he's
- 15 going to say.
- 16 How can I get a witness until I know what he's going
- 17 to say?
- 18 MR. MURPHY: I have no objection.
- 19 MR. HUGHES: Respectfully, I think it's highly
- 20 irregular to allow that witness to testify.
- 21 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: It may be highly
- 22 irregular, but I'm going to allow this to proceed. I'm
- 23 not going to bar the witness.
- I'm going to give you the opportunity, as you sit

- 1 there today -- if you say that Mr. Fetzer has not
- 2 retained the services of any witnesses, then, you know, I
- 3 guess I'm kind of at a loss as to what kind of defense
- 4 Mr. Fetzer was going to put on at some point in this
- 5 anyway.
- 6 MR. HUGHES: Let me address that because I don't
- 7 want to let that go on unanswered.
- 8 We don't have to put on any defense. They have to
- 9 prove their case. In taking the discovery deposition of
- 10 their expert witness, he says that he tested the whole
- 11 property, and there was no leakage from the site
- 12 location.
- 13 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: That's not in evidence
- 14 yet.
- 15 MR. HUGHES: I'm telling you that I'm going to
- 16 represent to the Court that that's what his discovery
- 17 deposition says; and that being the case, he had no case.
- 18 Mr. Murphy had no case.
- 19 I didn't have to do a thing. All I had to do was
- 20 sit here and, at the end of his case, make the
- 21 appropriate motion. That being the case, we didn't need
- to do discovery. We didn't need to have an expert
- 23 witness. Now by this ruling you're changing the whole
- 24 ball game.

1 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: If that's how you

- 2 perceive it, that's how you perceive it. We might as
- 3 well get over it and move forward on setting another
- 4 schedule.
- 5 MR. HUGHES: But I don't want to be barred from or
- 6 that I have to set an expert witness or any other
- 7 discovery.
- 8 I want to have it left open so that once we take
- 9 those discovery depositions, at that time I can make the
- 10 decision for my client whether we should or shouldn't.
- 11 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: To the extent that -- you
- 12 know, we're reopening this for essentially two
- depositions. Now, if you can't live with that, you can't
- live with it, but that's what we're doing.
- 15 We do need to set a new schedule, and we might as
- 16 well start thinking about that. It's not my plan to keep
- 17 prolonging this. I dislike this as much as any of you,
- 18 but that's the way it is. We might as well move on to
- 19 scheduling.
- 20 So let's go off the record.
- 21 (There followed a discussion
- 22 outside the Record.)
- 23 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Back on the record.
- 24 We've had a lengthy off-the-record discussion on

scheduling and many varied other things. The Hearing

- 2 Officer is ruling today that the Complainant, Olive
- 3 Streit, may add Lyle Bruce as a witness and that at this
- 4 time Oberweiss has identified a Mr. Imse as a rebuttal
- 5 witness.
- 6 I will reopen discovery to the extent of taking Mr.
- 7 Bruce's deposition and Mr. Imse's deposition. I will
- 8 further reopen discovery to the extent for Mr. Hughes'
- 9 client, Richard Fetzer, to look at the new information
- 10 and make a determination as to whether Respondent Richard
- 11 Fetzer will need to name an additional witness as a
- 12 result of the prior two witnesses.
- 13 We will schedule a telephone conference on June 30,
- 14 1997, at 11:30 A.M. Mr. Berman's office will initiate
- the call to the Hearing Officer, the Complainants,
- 16 Attorney Mr. Hughes, Mr. Slocum.
- 17 If there are any other parties, then you should
- notify Mr. Berman, but I think that's all; is that
- 19 correct?
- 20 You mentioned off the record that if you wanted
- 21 clients present, they should be at the respective
- 22 attorney's office because that makes it easier.
- MR. BERMAN: It's preferable for clarity of the
- 24 phone call.

1 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: If you're going to have

- 2 clients or other persons present, it would be preferable
- 3 to have them in your office, and we will identify
- 4 everyone on the phone.
- 5 Tentatively, between now and June 30th, I would hope
- and expect the parties to proceed on this reopened
- 7 discovery. Mr. Murphy will attempt to provide documents
- 8 concerning his new witness by May 1st. Depositions of
- 9 Mr. Bruce will follow that, if necessary.
- I guess I should also note for the record that I
- 11 anticipate that the Board will rule on the pending
- 12 motions within the next two to three meetings. That
- 13 would -- the next meetings are April the 3rd, which they
- 14 will not rule on April 3rd. The next one is April 17th
- 15 and May 1st and May 15th.
- 16 It would be my anticipation that the Board would
- 17 rule, at the very latest, by May 15th. The depositions
- and procedures do not have to be taken prior to the
- 19 Board's ruling. Once the Board does rule, I would want
- 20 the parties to get together, do the scheduling and get
- 21 those two depositions out of the way.
- 22 I guess after those two depositions, Mr. Hughes will
- then review the material, make a determination and inform
- 24 the Hearing Officer and the parties whether or not he has

- 1 future plans for an additional expert.
- 2 It looks like we probably won't be continuing
- 3 evidentiary hearings until sometime into the fall. If
- 4 there are any other objections to discovery, please file
- 5 them with me.
- 6 MR. BERMAN: May I have one moment, please?
- 7 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Yes.
- 8 (There followed a discussion
- 9 outside the record.)
- 10 MR. BERMAN: Oberweiss would respectfully request,
- 11 with respect to the verbal order that you are just about
- 12 to finalize, that with respect to the testimony of John
- 13 Imse, that we amend your verbal order ever so slightly to
- 14 say that Oberweiss be permitted to call a rebuttal
- 15 witness.
- 16 The reason for my suggested amendment is that given
- 17 we haven't seen any document from Lyle Bruce and we don't
- 18 have a clue as to what his testimony may be or will be,
- 19 I'm certain that Oberweiss will call a rebuttal expert,
- 20 and I believe that that rebuttal expert will be John
- 21 Imse.
- 22 But if Mr. Bruce heads off in some different
- 23 direction, we may need a different rebuttal expert, not
- in addition to Mr. Imse but instead of.

1 So I would respectfully ask that your order be

- 2 modified only insofar as to say that Oberweiss -- that
- 3 all of this will happen and that Oberweiss will provide a
- 4 rebuttal expert, and we can even go so far as to say we
- 5 presume it will be John Imse.
- 6 By the way, I don't expect Mr. Imse will have any
- 7 documents to provide. I believe that his testimony, such
- 8 as it is, and his deposition testimony will be based on
- 9 documents that are already in the record. So
- 10 documentarily, I don't think the Imse -- or the
- 11 rebuttal -- the Oberweiss rebuttal expert will be much --
- 12 will need to provide much by way of documents.
- I would only ask that we be allowed to call a
- 14 rebuttal expert and not necessarily that we be locked
- in to John Imse.
- MR. MURPHY: No objection.
- 17 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: What is your time frame
- 18 of identifying after?
- 19 MR. BERMAN: I wouldn't -- 21 days. I can find
- 20 somebody from the stable that quickly. 21 days after the
- 21 deposition of Mr. Bruce, after the close of Mr. Bruce's
- 22 deposition. I wouldn't need more --
- 23 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: All right.
- 24 MR. BERMAN: -- if at all.

- 1 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: All right. Then I
- 2 will -- Oberweiss may call a rebuttal witness, who you've
- 3 previously identified as John Imse. Leave is granted to
- 4 call someone other than Mr. Imse if necessary.
- 5 MR. BERMAN: Thank you.
- 6 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Is there anything else
- 7 anyone wishes to bring up at this time? All right. Then
- 8 thank you.
- 9 MR. MURPHY: Is it necessary -- I ask -- I don't
- 10 mean to prolong this unnecessarily, but is it necessary
- 11 that I have kind of an open court order that subpoenaed
- 12 witnesses are still continued without the service of a
- 13 new subpoena?
- If it is, I want such an order. If it isn't, then
- 15 forget I said anything.
- MR. LAWTON: We have no objection to that.
- 17 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: To the extent that you
- 18 may be subpoenaing the Agency people when we reconvene,
- 19 we probably should send out a subpoena to those
- 20 individuals.
- 21 MR. MURPHY: I've been working on what I felt was a
- 22 reasonable living together with some Counsel from the EPA
- 23 that said that after I've paid his witness about three
- 24 witness fees already, that I wouldn't need to do that

- in a subpoena, I have to do it in a subpoena.
- 3 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: Well, that's totally up
- 4 to the Agency because the Agency has been known to move
- 5 to quash a subpoena.
- 6 MR. MURPHY: Right, right.
- 7 MR. LAWTON: As to non-Agency deponents, we would
- 8 provide whomever we have without the need for subpoena,
- 9 and I would assume you would do the same.
- 10 MR. MURPHY: Yes. I've asked Mrs. Oberweiss to be
- 11 present and available.
- 12 Thank you, your Honor. Nothing further.
- 13 HEARING OFFICER WALLACE: All right. Thank you
- 14 very much.
- 15 (Whereupon, the hearing was
- 16 continued sine die.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	STATE OF ILLINOIS ) ) SS.					
2	COUNTY OF DU PAGE )					
3						
4	I, Jean S. Busse, Certified Shorthand Reporter					
5	No. 84-1860, Registered Professional Reporter, a Notary					
6	Public in and for the County of DuPage, State of					
7	Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand					
8	the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter and that					
9	the foregoing is a true, correct and complete transcript					
10	of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.					
11	IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my					
12	hand and affixed my notarial seal this day of					
13	, A.D. 1997.					
14						
15						
16	Makawa Dublia					
17	Notary Public					
18	My Commission Expires					
19	June 3, 1997.					
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						