## ORIGINAL

Г

(

(

1	Page 1 BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
2	
3	IN THE MATTER OF: )
4	) R03-19
5	PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO:) (NPDES Rulemaking)
	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ) RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE
6	RULES IN 35 ILL.ADM. ) DEC - 4 2003
	CODE PART 309 NPDES ) STATE OF ILLINOIS
7	PERMITS AND PERMITTING ) Pollution Control Board
	PROCEDURES )
8	)
9	
10	REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS in the
11	above-entitled cause before KATHLEEN J. PACULT, a
12	Certified Shorthand Reporter within and for the
13	County of Cook, State of Illinois, taken on the 19th
14	day of November 2003, at the hour of 10:00 a.m., at
15	100 West Randolph, Room 11-512, Chicago, Illinois.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	TAKEN FOR: L.A. Reporting
24	TAKEN BY: Kathleen J. Pacult, CSR

Page 2 MS. TIPSORD: Good morning, my name is 1 2 Mary Tipsord and I have been appointed by the Board to serve as hearing officer in this proceeding 3 entitled In The Matter Of Proposed Amendments To: 4 Public Participation Rules In 35 Ill. Adm. Code Part 5 309 NPDES Permits and Permitting Procedures Docket 6 number RO3-19. To my right Dr. Tanner Girard, the 7 lead Board member assigned to this matter. Also 8 present are Board Members Nicholas J. Melas and 9 Michael Tristano who have also been assigned to this 10 matter. 11 This is the third hearing to be 12 held in this proceeding. The purpose of today's 13 hearing is twofold. First, this rulemaking is 14 subject to Section 27(b) of the Environmental 15 Protection Act (Act). 415 ILCS 5/27(b) (2000). 16 Section 27(b) of the Act requires the Board to 17 request the Department of Commerce and Community 18 Affairs, now known as the Department of Commerce and 19 20 Economic Opportunity (DCEO) to conduct an economic impact study (EcIS) on certain proposed rules prior 21 to adoption of those rules. If DCEO chooses to 22 conduct an EcIS, DCEO has 30 to 45 days after such 23 24 request to produce a study of the economic impact of

Page 3 the proposed rules. The Board must then make the 1 EcIS, or DCEO's explanation for not conducting the 2 study, available to the public at least 20 days 3 before a public hearing on the economic impact of 4 5 the proposed rules. In accordance with Section 27(b) 6 7 of the Act, the Board has requested by letter dated April 9th, 2003, that DCEO conduct an economic 8 9 impact study for the above-referenced rulemakings. On April 17, 2003, DCEO responded that DCEO does not 10 have the staff resources to perform EcIS studies on 11 Board rulemakings. A copy of the letter is 12 13 available here at the front of the room. The second purpose of this hearing 14 15 is to hear any testimony and allow questions of the Is there anyone that I have not spoken testifiers. 16 17 to that wishes to testify? The order in which we will hear 18 19 testimony is we will start with the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group with Katherine Hodge, 20 and we will follow with Albert Ettinger, who 21 represents the proponent from this rulemaking, and 22 23 also Toby Frevert is here from the EPA if anyone has questions of him. 24

	Page 4
1	Anyone may ask a question,
2	however, I do ask that you raise your hand and wait
3	for me to acknowledge you. After I have
4	acknowledged you, please state your name and whom
5	you represent before you begin your questions.
6	Please speak one at a time. If you are speaking
7	over each other the court reporter will not be able
8	to get your questions on the record.
9	Please note that any question
10	asked by a Board Member of Staff are intended to
11	help build a complete record for the Board's
12	decision and not to express any preconceived notion
13	or bias.
14	Dr. Girard?
15	DR. GERARD: On behalf of the Board, I
16	would like to welcome everyone to the third hearing
17	in this rulemaking. Even though this rulemaking did
18	not come to us as a negotiated rulemaking, I know
19	that the participants have spent a lot of time since
20	it has been introduced to try to come to some
21	agreements on many of the areas, and we are pleased
22	to see that that has occurred, and we look forward
23	to the hearing today to further refine some of the
24	areas of disagreement. And I am sure that we will

 $\left( \right)$ 

(

Page 5 1 have a much better rulemaking because of your time and participation. So, thank you. We look forward 2 to your testimony and comments and questions today. 3 MS. TIPSORD: Mr. Tristano? 4 5 MR. TRISTANO: No. MS. TIPSORD: With that we will begin 6 7 with the testimony. MR. MESSINA: Good morning, my name is 8 9 Alec Messina. I am the general counsel for the 10 Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group. I am here today with Kathy Hodge, who is the executive 11 director for IERG, and we have prepared some brief 12 13 testimony that she would like to present. 14 (Witness duly sworn.) Good morning. My name is 15 Katherine Hodge, and I am Executive Director for the 16 Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group or IERG for 17 short. On behalf of IERG and its member companies, 18 I want to thank the Illinois Pollution Control Board 19 for the opportunity to present this testimony today. 20 21 IERG is a not-for-profit Illinois 22 corporation comprised of some 67 member companies engaged in industry, commerce, agriculture, and 23 other related activities, that are regulated by 24

Page 6 governmental agencies that promulgate, administer or 1 2 enforce environmental laws and regulations. IERG 3 was organized to promote and advance the interests 4 of its members before governmental agencies, such as the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency and the 5 6 Board, as well as before judicial bodies. Moreover, IERG is an affiliate of the Illinois State Chamber 7 of Commerce, which is more than 5,000 members in the 8 State. 9 10 IERG submits the following in response to the proposed rulemaking 11 testimony 12 entitled "Proposed Amendments To: Public Participation Rules in 35 Ill.Adm. Code Part 309 13 14NPDES Permits and Permitting Procedures (R03-19)." IERG first became involved in this 15 matter in the fall of 2002, at which time the 16 proponents began to circulate drafts of the proposal 17 18 to various interested parties, including representatives of the Illinois EPA and members of 19 20 the regulated community. IERG reviewed the 21 proposal, participated in preliminarily hearings 22 held by the Board and reviewed comments and testimony prepared by the various stakeholders, and 23 24 reviewed with great interest the First Notice

Page 7 1 Opinion and Order issued by the Board. In short, IERG concurs with much of the Board's opinion, while 2 still holding reservations regarding the need or 3 justification for this proposal. Further, we 4 believe that there are several areas in the proposal 5 6 that require further illumination on the part of the Illinois EPA through testimony and, potentially, 7 8 additional fine-tuning of the language. 9 Turning then to the First Notice 10 language adopted by the Board, IERG testifies as follows: 11 12 Section 309.105(f) and (q): For the reasons expressed in the Board's Opinion, as 13 14 well as for the reasons set forth in IERG's earlier comments, we concur with the Board's decision not to 15 proceed to First Notice with proposed new Sections 16 309.105(f) and (g). 17 18 Section 309.107(c): IERG agrees that this provision merely codifies a procedure that 19 the Illinois EPA is already in the midst of 20 implementing, and therefore concurs with the Board's 21 decision. 22 23 Section 309.108(c): Conceptually, 24 IERG concurs with the Board's Opinion with regards

Page 8 to this provision, as it remains our understanding 1 that this language is merely a codification of the 2 Agency's current practice, and does not place any 3 additional requirements upon the Agency. We do, 4 5 however, have some questions to ask later today 6 before reaching a full understanding of the potential impact of this language. 7 Sections 309.108(3), 309.117, and 8 9 309.123: Changes to these three sections proposed by the proponents concern the same issue -- the 10 11 Agency record. For a variety of reasons, the Board chose not to include or proceed with changes to 12 13 Section 309.117 and 309.123. As the Board noted in its Opinion, and IERG concurs, all documents that 14 15 would seemingly be covered by these changes must already be a part of the record based on the Board's 16 existing procedural rules. With regards to Section 17 309.108(e), however, IERG requires additional 18 19 information we hope to obtain throughout the day before being able to comment sufficiently on this 20 provision. 21 Sections 309.109(a), 309.112, 22 23 309.119, 309.121, 309.122: All of these sections 24 concern the same issue -- the opportunity for

Page 9 allowing further public comment in certain 1 In our earlier comments, IERG noted 2 circumstances. 3 that we had very significant concerns with these provisions, but were interested in further exploring 4 5 the compromise language included by the Agency in 6 its comments. IERG looks forward to hearing 7 testimony provided by the Agency with regards to this new language (now found in the renumbered 8 9 309.120) and how it will be implemented, and likely will have questions to ask of the Agency. With 10 11 regards to the language stricken or not accepted by 12 the Board in Sections 309.109(a) and 309.122, for 13 the reasons stated by the Board in its Opinion and for those reasons included in other stakeholder 14 15 comments, IERG concurs with the ruling of the Board. With regards to section 309.119, 16 17 IERG appreciates the Board's inclusion of clarifying language pertaining to effective dates at the very 18 19 end of the Section. As mentioned in the comments 20 filed by IERG and other stakeholders, this language 21 was developed and agreed to in a meeting following one of the preliminary hearings scheduled by the 22 23 Board. 24 Section 309.113(a) 5 through 8:

With regards to paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), IERG concurs with the decision of the Board. The same cannot be said for its handling or rationale pertaining to paragraph (5) that requires the Agency to include a summary of changes between the public notice permit and the previous permit.

IERG concurs with comments filed 7 by the Illinois EPA, which is uniquely positioned to 8 offer a position on this matter, and other 9 stakeholders that the language in this new paragraph 10 is both not required and potentially costly and 11 burdensome to the Agency. At a time when the Agency 12 has an existing shortage of resources, and in an 13 environment where a typical permitting action can 14 take years, the Agency should not be forced to 15 allocate additional staff time to a function that 16 can already be completed by a diligent, interested 17 In this instance, the benefit to the party. 18 environment does not equal the cost to the Agency, 19 will likely add to the time and expense of 20 undertaking the NPDES permit writing effort, and 21 will only delay a process which already takes a 22 great deal of time now. 23

Section 309.143(a): This

24

Page 10

	Page 11
1	provision was proposed by the proponents because it
2	is included in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)
3	and is a required element of a state NPDES program.
4	While it is taken nearly verbatim from 40 CFR
5	122.44(d)(1)(i), the proponents' language does not
6	include modifying language found immediately
7	following that section in the federal regulations.
8	IERG believes that Illinois' Section 309.143 should
9	include, in a new subsection (b), additional federal
10	language that further explains an excursion or
11	violation of a state Water Quality Standard. That
12	modifying language found at 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(ii),
13	provides:
13 14	provides: When determining whether a
14	When determining whether a
14 15	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the
14 15 16	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause,
14 15 16 17	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream
14 15 16 17 18	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or
14 15 16 17 18 19	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State water quality standard, the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State water quality standard, the (Agency) shall use procedures
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	When determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State water quality standard, the (Agency) shall use procedures which account for existing

Page 12 1 variability of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the 2 effluent, the sensitivity of the 3 species to toxicity testing (when 4 evaluating whole effluent 5 toxicity), and where appropriate, 6 7 the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water. 8 By including some language found 9 within the federal regulations, but not related 10 language that modifies the original language, the 11 State and the Board runs the risk of creating a 12 situation ripe for misinterpretation. 13 14 Section 309.146(a)(2) and (5): This language was the subject of some discussion at 15 the stakeholder meeting after the second hearing. 16 Again, IERG believes its concerns were addressed and 17 can support the language included by the Board in 18 its First Notice Order. 19 20 That closes my testimony today. Once again, we would like to thank the Board for the 21 22 opportunity to provide testimony in this rulemaking and look forward to participating in the remainder 23 of this process. 24

Page 13 1 MS. TIPSORD: Are there any questions 2 for Ms. Hodge? We will go next to testimony by 3 4 Albert Ettinger. (Witness duly sworn.) 5 6 MR. ETTINGER: I don't have too much to say here. I believe the arguments for the 7 various proposals were presented in earlier 8 language, and I don't want to waste anyone's time 9 going over things that the Board has looked at 10 before. 11 12 I'll say generally we pointed out a number of, shall we say, safety mechanisms on the 13 ship that we thought were broken. I think the Board 14 has fixed many of them. We think there are a few 15 16 that are not fixed, and hopefully we will not come into an emergency for which those become important. 17 I just heard Ms. Hodge's 18 presentation. I am not prepared to react to all of 19 20 them. 21 The one I would react to now is on 22 143 IERG proposes to add an additional sentence or another section to 143 after (a) that would add 23 further language from 40 CFR 122. We have no 24

1 objection to that.

I do have a question of the Agency 2 I want to ask a question about procedure. 3 also. And some of Ms. Hodge's presentation presumes that 4 5 there was going to be agency testimony today or 6 further agency presentations. That's not my 7 understanding. I had one question of the Agency so I am glad they are here, but I was not expecting 8 that we were going to hear a lot from the agency. 9 10 MR. FREVERT: We are here. 11 MR. ETTINGER: So I guess my problem is if we were going to get a whole lot more 12 enlightenment from the Agency, I think it's going to 13 come in the form of the questions that we are going 14 to raise now than any further presentation. 15 That's my understanding. 16 17 With that, what I would like to do is ask just one -- most of this has been hashed over 18 pretty well and if turns out that things don't work 19 out, we can always make another petition. 20 I have one thing here though that I think we should 21 22 clarify. And that's what I would like to do is ask the Agency, does the Agency believe that given the 23 Black Beauty decision that the Agency may reopen the 24

Page 14

Page 15 public comment record or comment period to receive 1 2 further comments if it believes that further submissions may assist the Agency to reach an 3 4 appropriate decision? 5 (Witness duly sworn.) 6 MR. FREVERT: If I understand your 7 question right, you are asking if we believe we have the authority to extend the public comment to a 8 second notice period and potentially even a second 9 round of hearing? 10 11 MR. ETTINGER: Right now we have 12 Section 121 and it provides circumstances in which the Agency shall allow written comment under various 13 circumstances. My question is just whether the 14 Agency feels whether it now has authority that it 15 16 may reopen the record for public comment following a 17 hearing if it feels it is necessary. Yes, I believe we do. 18 MR. FREVERT: 19 MR. ETTINGER: Nothing further of the Agency. 20 21 MS. TIPSORD: Any other questions for 22 the Agency? 23 MR. MESSINA: I have several. With regards to Section 309.108(e), can you please 24

Page 16 explain for the record, briefly touch on how the 1 proposed section would influence the Agency's 2 current practice regarding identifying or 3 incorporating the documents in the Agency record? 4 MR. FREVERT: You are not talking 5 about the language in the first draft, is that 6 7 correct? MR. MESSINA: I am talking about the 8 9 language in the Board's First Notice. 10 MR. FREVERT: Well, I hope it won't require any change at all because I believe in 11 reality that we do that as a matter of practice now. 12 13 MR. MESSINA: And following up on that, and also with regards to Subsection (c) before 14 that, how would the Agency address the use of 15 permitting its best professional judgment in making 16 various permitting decisions? 17 MR. FREVERT: To the extent, I guess 18 19 it all boils down to the science engineering staff, evaluation of all the information and interpretation 20 of that. And, typically, in drafting a permit there 21 are actual review notes or analysis notes that 22 reflect the engineer's analysis and judgment. 23 There are many other factors that go into that permit. 24 SO

Page 17 typically they should be documented in writing in 1 that regard. 2 MR. MESSINA: So then those notes, 3 those engineer notes would be included in whatever 4 5 documents that are made available? Certainly. 6 MR. FREVERT: 7 MR. MESSINA: Moving then to Section 309.113, and specifically (a)5, in the Agency's 8 comments filed after the second hearing, the Agency 9 stated the re-issued permits are considered as 10 stand-alone permits. In other words, the Agency 11 reviews the requests as if it were a request for a 12 new permit. If that's the case, then why would 13 there be a need for providing a summary of change in 14 the public notice permit and the previous permit? 15 MR. FREVERT: From my perspective 16 there is no need for the Agency to the extent -- I 17 quess to the extent that the interested member of 18 the public assumes the regulations and the 19 operational aspects of that facility are the same 20 now as they were five years ago or whenever that 21 permit was originally initiated. It may be some 22 23 benefit in seeing how that permit has changed, but in reality, with ongoing federal requirements for 24

Page 18 1 standard reviews and updates and operational changes and expansions and other things of these facilities, 2 3 many times a renewed permit based on a new permit application, there are some fundamental things that 4 5 will indeed change. And from my perspective, the more accurate and the more beneficial focus is to 6 7 draft that permit based on the current circumstances, not try to go back and modify an old 8 9 permit that probably is out of date and reflects some regulations or operating factors that are not 10 pertinent for what we are considering in the current 11 So from my own personal perspective, from 12 re-draft. 13 our basis and the public basis, it's probably more 14 important the fact sheet indicates what perimeters are being regulated and what the regulation is based 15 16 on, rather than how it relates to a prior permit some five year or more prior to that day. 17 There are, of course, situations 18 where nothing has changed, and it may be a straight 19 renewal, particularly with perhaps some of the 20 smaller environmentally less significant sources, 21 22 but for more of a major or significant mainstream source, there is almost always something that is 23 different from the old permit, and therefore, a 24

1 brand new permit is in order.

2	MR. HARSCH: A follow-up question to
3	that, Toby, on behalf of the Illinois Association of
4	Waste Water Agencies, I take it with respect to
5	309.113 (a)5, you would not have any problem with
6	the deletion of the words "and re-issued" from what
7	has been proposed by the Board?
8	MR. FREVERT: Typically our current
9	practice is when we draft public notices and fact
10	sheets for modified permits, we identify what the
11	modification is. For re-issued permits we try to
12	draft that fact sheet to reflect the new proposed
13	permit and a regulatory basis and operating basis to
14	that, and not in relationship to some out-of-date
15	permit.
16	So I think the concept is great
17	for the modification. For the re-issuance, it is
18	not as appropriate. And it would not be
19	objectionable to the Agency to strike those words.
20	MR. MESSINA: Toby, moving on to
21	Subsection (a)6 then also in 113, what would the
22	Agency include in the fact sheet if the
23	anti-degradation analysis did not apply to a
24	particular permit?

Page 19

Page 20 MR. FREVERT: Typically if it's a 1 renewal or modification where there is no increased 2 activity being authorized, the fact sheet would 3 4 indicate that anti-degragation review is not applicable in that case. 5 Then to section 309.120. 6 MR. MESSINA: 7 My general question is: I was hoping you could explain for the record how the Agency interprets 8 that section, and how it would implement that 9 10 section? I think specifically to try to get that discussion going, I quess the first question would 11 12 be: Does the Agency have to answer -- let me move to that section -- would the Agency have to answer 13 no to all four of those -- actually let me back up. 14 Can you give me some explanation 15 or example of how the Agency plans on implementing 16 that section, the analysis it would seek? 17 I believe as this 18 MR. FREVERT: section is structured, those four sub-paragraphs are 19 examples of considerations or factors the Agency 20 would review in determining whether or not in its 21

judgment, there was value added or benefit or necessity to extend public comment to be public content intent to the federal law. So in that

Page 21 regard, the four obvious factors have been 1 articulated I believe in case law somewhere to give 2 quidance to the concept, and those are factors we 3 consider in reaching our decision and judgment 4 5 whether or not there is indeed merit, benefit and value added in extending public comment. 6 7 Is that a definitive enough answer for you? 8 9 MR. MESSINA: It's a good start. With regards to those four 10 criteria, would the Agency have to answer, no, to 11 all four of those criteria before determining that 12 another public hearing would be necessary? 13 MR. FREVERT: I believe the 14 circumstances that fell within one of those four 15 categories would be enough to justify our actions if 16 17 we decided to extend public comment. MR. MESSINA: I would like to 18 19 follow-up on Albert's question with regard to this Would this section allow for the following section. 20 situation to occur: On the final day of the comment 21 period, a participant in the process would submit 22 23 public comments, would the applicant then have the ability -- would the applicant then have the ability 24

Page 22 to submit a response to that public comment after 1 the close of the public comment period, and could 2 the Agency still utilize that information provided 3 by the applicant? 4 As a matter of practice, 5 MR. FREVERT: to the extent that an issue has arisen during the 6 public comment period that the Agency needs to 7 address, and in order for us to adequately and 8 accurately address that issue, we need to solicit 9 additional information from the data source or 10 secure some kind of information from the permit 11 applicant itself, we in fact need to do that. 12 13 From my own personal perspective the objective when we issue that permit is to get it 14right, and if at the close of the comment period 15 there is a question where we need more information 16 to make sure we get it right, we will get that 17 information. 18 There are some circumstances where 19 the necessity to get that information may be of such 20 a nature that additional public comment opportunity 21 is appropriate, and there are circumstances when I 22 believe that is not the case, and we don't need to 23

extend public comment period to get the information

24

Page 23 1 to address and answer properly the question that had arisen during the initial public comment period. 2 And, typically, I believe as a matter of practice, 3 comments made by the public are directed not only to 4 5 the Agency, but also to the permit applicant, and as 6 the permit applicant and the recipient of that 7 permit application, I believe they are entitled to respond to the comments. 8 Quite frankly, if the comment 9 10 comes in at 5:00 o'clock on the last day of the comment period, then obviously their ability to 11 respond to those comments is going to come over. 12 13 Those are not public comments. Those are 14 supplements to the permit's application in my mind. I have a couple other 15 MR. MESSINA: questions but I need a couple moments. If anyone 16 else has --17 MR. HARSCH: Toby, it's my 18 understanding under 309.120 as currently drafted, 19 before the Agency would make a determination to 20 reopen the public comment period, you first would 21 22 have to make a determination that you had significantly modified the draft permit, the final 23 permit from the terms of the draft permit; is that 24

Page 24 correct, before you would look at the next? 1 MR. FREVERT: You have to repeat that, 2 3 Roy, I was partially focused. MR. HARSCH: 4 It really is a two-part test, is it not? The first test is that there has 5 to be a significant modification in the final permit 6 7 from what was originally public noticed, is that correct? 8 9 MR. FREVERT: I believe I am reading 10 the language the way you have explained it, yes. 11 So can you explain for MR. HARSCH: 12 the record what you would view as examples of 13 significant modifications or changes that would be 14 significant? 15 MR. FREVERT: You know, I can identify some examples, but I'm not sure I could identify the 16 whole litany of possibilities. 17 MR. HARSCH: I understand that. 18 MR. FREVERT: If there are some 19 additional activities taking place within that 20 operation. It has an additional waste source or 21 additional pollutant load that was not evident or 22 not represented in the original application in the 23 original draft permit, that we are now regulating 24

Page 25 another whole entity, and it's a substantially new 1 concept from what was required in the original draft 2 permit and the original round of public comment. 3 MR. HARSCH: A change to an effluent 4 limitation in the permit would not normally be a 5 significant change, would it? 6 I would say a change to 7 MR. FREVERT: an effluent limitation or a monitoring schedule in a 8 permit is a common and typical reaction to public 9 We do that quite often, and that in and of 10 comment. itself is the result of the comment, not the need to 11 duplicate the comment. 12 I am confused by what is MR. MESSINA: 13 meant by item four. It seems to me that anytime you 14 change a permit, you would be attempting to respond 15 to comments made during a public comment period. 16 Can you provide some guidance on 17 how the Agency interprets this subsection or whether 18 it even provides any meaningful criteria by which to 19 judge whether an additional extended public comment 20 period is necessary? 21 To a certain extent this 22 MR. FREVERT: 23 particular language came out of our, for lack of a better word, I'll use the term negotiating session 24

Page 26 with all the interested parties in this case, and I 1 2 believe some of those parties thought there was a 3 perception that this added some additional detail in 4 terms of concepts in the criteria that one would consider by the Agency in determining whether to 5 6 reopen public comment or not. Personally, I think it may be 7 redundant, and I'm not sure it adds a lot more 8 detail in another way it explains some of the prior 9 paragraphs. I'm not sure I could tell you how that 10 directs the Agency or gives the Agency criteria that 11 12 is fundamentally different than subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3). To the extent other people think it 13 14 may, I'm receptive to hearing that. 15 MR. MESSINA: Basically you cannot 16 provide any guidance as to how that's a useful subsection? 17 18 MR. FREVERT: Not at this particular I don't believe it's in conflict with the 19 moment. 20 other language. 21 MR. MESSINA: I have two more 22 questions. Moving to Section 309.143(a), I was wondering if you could explain for the record what 23

24 criteria the Agency would use to make the

.

Page 27 determination embodied in that subsection? 1 MR. FREVERT: What criteria? Let me 2 start with the most common. The most common thing 3 that comes to mind is the terminology that the EPA 4 refers is reasonable potential to exceed water 5 quality standards. And there are a series of 6 analytical techniques and equations and supporting 7 information in federal manuals on how to do that 8 analysis, and what kinds of factors and 9 10 considerations and conservative assumptions to place in those analyses. 11 Typically that reasonable 12 potential analysis is designed to used for existing 13 waste water discharge where there is a historic 14 database, and it's a statistical analysis of the 15 historically based data. 16 In cases where there is a new 17 source and there is no historic database, it could 18 19 be a number of things. We would certainly review the information and the permit application itself, 20 the nature of the operation, the estimates of the 21 waste generated, amount of water used, the 22 waste-generated predictions of what kind of 23 discharge is actually being requested for 24

Page 28 authorization, and compare those discharge 1 2 characteristics to the location they are going to be discharged, and what water quality standards and 3 4 allowances and other water-quality related activities need to be analyzed. 5 Of course, in addition to that, we 6 also incorporate discharge limitations based on 7 federal or state technology efforts. And so this 8 paragraph pertains to those limitations in a permit 9 that are driven specifically by water quality. 10 11 MR. MESSINA: If we could jump back quickly, I missed one question I wanted to ask 12 This is in regard to 108(e). This is a 13 earlier. follow-up to your earlier answer. My question is 14 In providing the documents supporting the simply: 15 decision, is a permit engineer going to have to 16 identify all of the textbooks they have utilized 17 throughout their decision-making process? 18 19 I am trying to understand the limit of what kind of information you are referring 20 21 to. 22 MR. FREVERT: I don't envision requiring my staff to bring in all their college 23 textbooks and list them in every permit they are 24

1 asked to draft.

If there is a particular piece of 2 literature or technical publication that has a very 3 focused and specific utilization in there, we 4 5 definitely want to identify that. To the extent that it's general engineering and mathematical, 6 7 statistical, chemical information, part of their general expertise and commonly available material, 8 we don't intend to itemize those documents into the 9 record. 10 Every now and then we even use a 11 dictionary to make sure we spell our words properly. 12 13 MS. TIPSORD: Any other questions? 14 DR. GIRARD: I have a general question. The concern has been raised that some of 15 the language in this First Notice might add to the 16

workload of the Agency, and thereby, under the 17 current budgetary situation, create a situation 18 where it may take longer to issue these MPDS 19 20 permits. Do you see any of the areas in this First Notice proposal that may add to the Agency workload 21 22 and, therefore, take longer to issue a permit? 23 Again, other than that MR. FREVERT: reference to summarizing an expired permit that's 24

Page 29

Page 30 part of our summary, that probably would add some 1 increment of additional workload. In terms of the 2 other language added, I believe in my mind this 3 language is indeed consistent with the whole concept 4 of public participation in both federal law and our 5 It's a little more perhaps current 6 program. 7 direction and clarity to what's intended, and it probably will mean some increment of additional 8 workload, but I think it's inherent upon us to make 9 it happen. 10 Quite frankly, this program would 11 be a lot easier if there was no public participation 12 program, but there is. Let's try to do it fair and 13 correct and openly. 14 We have capable people. 15 We could read and write and we understand science, and we 16 could write permits, and I believe those permits 17 would be good. I believe there is some advantage to 18 public participation. 19 I think you can make that 20 DR. GIRARD: statement about government in general, but if you 21 did not have public participation, you could do 22 things much more quickly. I don't think it means 23 they would be better. In fact, historically, things 24

Page 31 get worse, so thank you for the comment. 1 2 MS. TIPSORD: Anything further? MR. ETTINGER: I have one question. 3 4 Does it add anything to the Agency's workload when citizens get confused about what's being proposed by 5 a permit and request hearings or make comments 6 because they didn't understand? 7 8 MR. FREVERT: Do you want to answer the question? 9 10 MR. ETTINGER: I can speak as the confused. 11 12 MR. FREVERT: I agree with what you are saying, but I think the more fundamental issue 13 is how much extra effort is going to actually avoid 14 how much inherent confusion is out there any way. 15 16 The best fact sheet we could ever write, the best public notice we could ever put out, 17 the best upfront public outreach we do, we are 18 19 dealing with the full population of the state and there are always going to be people that need a 20 little more explanation that comes with the 21 22 territory. One follow-up, one new 23 MR. HARSCH: question. The very last provision, 309.146(d). 24

Page 32 It's my understanding -- is this a continuation of 1 the Agency's present practice in terms of what's 2 going to be specified as requirements in the permit? 3 MR. FREVERT: Yes, I believe it is. 4 5 MR. HARSCH: And you currently do not tell a municipal treatment plant how to calibrate 6 7 meters or do calibration tests or do BOD tests or anything like that? 8 MR. FREVERT: No, I beq to differ to 9 Both in our specific requirements and 10 some extent. our standard conditions requiring monitoring, there 11 is reference to things like standard methods, 12 improved methods, which indirectly does specify 13 that. 14 15 MR. HARSCH: But you don't specify in the permit what the method is? 16 17 MR. FREVERT: Again, Roy, as a general rule you are correct with individual permits and 18 19 specialty perimeters where there may not be readily available standard methods and a specific method has 20 to be developed, we have the flexibility and 21 authority and indeed the practice of addressing 22 23 those issues on an as needed basis. And some permits have a lot more 24

Page 33 specificity about monitoring requirements than 1 Some permits even require the approval of a others. 2 quality assurance monitoring plant before the 3 monitoring is initiated. So I think our common 4 5 practice is to utilize these requirements to create an extent necessitated by the complexities and the 6 7 nature of the individual practice. A routine pH measurement, we don't go into as much detail. 8 Nothing further. 9 MR. HARSCH: 10 MR. TRISTANO: I have a general question. My question is: Who proposed this rule? 11 MR. ETTINGER: We proposed the rule 12 and after -- I forget whether it was the first or 13 second hearing in April, it became clear that there 14 were some things that we were going to have a hard 15 time agreeing on. Some people had concerns about my 16 17 language. I find that hard to believe, but it happened. So there was a meeting and we were able 18 19 to work with the language and come up with some things, which people were more comfortable with or 20 some people were more comfortable with, particularly 21 between us and the Agency. 22 23 In that meeting, representatives of the regulated community did participate. 24 They

Page 34 made helpful suggestions. They did -- many of their 1 suggestions were accepted. They did not however 2 commit that they would support the rule based on our 3 accepting their suggestions, so they are here to 4 come in after that meeting. However, as a result of 5 that meeting much of the language was agreed to at 6 least between the Petitioner's and the Agency, and I 7 think also to some extent the regulated community 8 9 has accepted some of the rules as proposed as a 10 result of those discussions. 11 MR. TRISTANO: The question was made 12 on section 309.120 about (a)4, and I think the 13 Agency suggested that that was compromised language 14 submitted by one of the participates in the negotiation, and I got from the Agency's answer it 15 16 was not the Agency. 17 I am just curious whose language that was? 18 19 MR. FREVERT: Let me try to clarify. Sierra Club petitioned the Board to initiate the 20 We as a state agency are more or less 21 rule. involved in all rulemakings, and at the close of 22 those initial records when we were looking for First 23 Notice position, we volunteered to try to address 24

Page 35 1 the rulemaking and come up with language that we 2 thought would accommodate most of the issues the 3 Board had to deal with in a fashion that represented 4 a language that we could live with, and also a language that we thought addressed and minimized a 5 6 number of disagreements or conflicts with the other parties. And in that regard, we submitted this and 7 indeed it is our specific recommendations to the 8 Board and some of the words were offered by the 9 parties. 10 Which party? 11 MR. TRISTANO: MR. ETTINGER: Frankly, I can't 12 remember who suggested all the wording. I remember 13 as to 120, I had something else that was proposed. 14 15 Much of my language was taken from the federal 16 procedures. People weren't happy with that. 17 I believe Mr. Sofat came in with a 18 proposal that looked at 120; however, I believe there was further discussions around the table that 19 20 changed 120, and I know line for line what now 21 exists in 120, I can't remember who came up with which words. 22 Towards the end of the 23 MR. FREVERT: 24 discussion Fred Andy recognized that he thought he

Page 36 could take the lead on crafting the words to depict 1 the concept we were discussing, and I believe these 2 exact words came from Fred. 3 MR. TRISTANO: But I want to make 4 sure, one last question, and I think you guys have 5 been very helpful. I want to follow-up. 6 This section is a two-part test, is it not? Because as I 7 understand it, you have to fulfill what is in (A) 8 9 and one or more of what's 1, 2, 3 and 4; is that interpretation correct? 10 MR. ETTINGER: Is that addressed to 11 12 me? 13 MR. TRISTANO: I am seeking information. 14 MR. ETTINGER: In general, I would 15 focus on shall. It says they shall if they 16 17 significantly modify a draft permit and weighing these factors, they feel that further written 18 19 comment is necessary. So that's the way it's 20 drafted as to shall, and so I agree with you, it's a two-part test. If they don't modify the permit at 21 all, then we never consider those factors. 22 23 MR. FREVERT: I would give you a different answer. I don't believe it's a two-part 24

Page 37 1 The Agency makes the determination with good test. cause and reason to extend comment, and in making 2 that determination these are some of the factors and 3 4 the thought process. 5 MR. TRISTANO: Let me make sure. The 6 reason I said it's a two-part test is the first 7 test, as I understand this, is that there was a major modification, significant modification. 8 Now if that's the case, then you look to 1, 2, 3 and 4. 9 10 If there is no modification, the way I understand the language, I want to make sure, 11 you don't look to 1, 2, 3, and 4. 12 13 MR. FREVERT: In that context, I agree 14 with you. 15 MR. SOFAT: The test has to be significant modification, and it is not a logical 16 17 outgrowth of the draft order. And how do we determine that? That's where 1, 2, 3 and 4 comes 18 in. 19 20 MR. TRISTANO: I am done. Thank you. 21 MR. ETTINGER: I have one question 22 actually of Ms. Hodge if she wants to answer it, 23 which is that I asked Toby whether or not he believed the Agency had authority to reopen the 24

1	Page 38 hearing this is not shall, but may reopen the
2	comment period after the hearing if it believes it's
3	necessary. My question to IERG is: Do you agree
4	that the Agency has that authority?
5	MS. HODGE: We have heard the Agency's
6	testimony. We would probably reserve on this until
7	the written comments because I personally can't
8	answer that. I don't know whether they have the
9	authority. We will address that in our comment.
10	MR. ETTINGER: I commend her for being
11	a much more careful and thoughtful lawyer than I am.
12	MR. HARSCH: Sanjay, you invited some
13	clarification on 120, can you provide any further
14	illumination of how subsection 4 is useful.
15	MS. TIPSORD: Before you answer that,
16	we need to have you sworn in.
17	(Witness duly sworn.)
18	MR. SOFAT: Now I forgot the question.
19	One thing I would like to stress here is that this
20	section is not going to be used very often. It's
21	only going to be in situations where and I don't
22	think I could provide a technical example but
23	only where we have situations like Toby tried to
24	explain, which requires additional public

 $\left( \right)$ 

Page 39 participation because the public participation on a 1 particular issue was either totally missing or not 2 adequate at all at the beginning or at the draft 3 4 permit stage. So that is how we envision -- that's 5 how we envision this section to play the role. It's not going to be a frequent use of the section. 6 The whole section is not 7 MR. HARSCH: 8 going to be used very often. Can you provide any further illumination of what subsection 4 might 9 10 mean? 11 Again, it seems any change you 12 make would be responsive to public comments and, therefore, you would always be able to satisfy that 13 condition, or maybe I'm not reading it right. 14 15 I am going to qualify my MR. SOFAT: 16 answer by saying it's not in my legal memorandum right now. But the way I read this condition is 17 18 that it's very similar to number 1. If a condition or a modification efforts because of the comments 19 provided by a party, then it is not going to 20 21 trigger. 22 Like Toby was saying, we are going to get comments and we are going to make changes to 23 24 the permit. That should not trigger 309.120. And I

	Page 40
1	guess 4 is confusing because 1, 2, 3 says the
2	parties could not have reasonably anticipated the
3	final permit and if the answer is yes, then you use
4	it. On the other hand, number 4 says the changes
5	made in the final permit represent an attempt by the
6	Agency, if the answer is yes, then you don't use
7	120.
8	MR. HARSCH: You have covered it. No,
9	no, no and yes.
10	MR. ETTINGER: Or it's a factor to be
11	considered.
12	MS. TIPSORD: Anything further?
13	MR. ETTINGER: I would like to say
14	it's the if someone really wants to cut that,
15	that was, as I said, the result of this discussion
16	and we didn't challenge it because it was part of
17	the discussion, and we thought someone else at the
18	table wanted this. Frankly, I'm not sure which way
19	that 4 will cut in some cases. And I would say
20	again these are factors to consider which is what
21	the rule says. It doesn't you have a whole lot
22	of 1 and a little bit of 2, those would be factors
23	to consider and it doesn't give an automatic
24	trigger.

(

 $\bigcirc$ 

Page 41 Anything further? 1 MS. TIPSORD: Go off the record for a moment. 2 (Off the record 3 4 discussion.) MS. TIPSORD: Back on the record. 5 After a discussion held off the record, the comment 6 7 period will close 45 days after the receipt of the transcript from this hearing. I'll follow with a 8 9 written hearing officer order to all participants 10 notifying them of the closing comment period. At that time, the Board will take into consideration 11 12 all your testimony and the comments and proceed. I want to thank you all. This has 13 14 been a very helpful hearing and I appreciate it. DR. GIRARD: Let me also thank 15 16 everyone for their time and effort. The fact that we have narrowed the areas of disagreement down to 17 such a short list now compared to what they were at 18 the beginning of this rulemaking, is a real 19 testimony to the amount of time and effort that 20 everyone has put into it. And the Board is very 21 grateful that you have reduced our workload in this, 22 23 and it's because you have done so much work and we do appreciate it. Thank you. 24

1	Page 42 MS. TIPSORD: If there is nothing
2	further, we are adjourned. Thank you all.
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	Page 43 STATE OF ILLINOIS )
	) SS.
2	COUNTY OF C O O K )
3	
4	KATHLEEN J. PACULT, being first duly
5	sworn, on oath, says that she is the court reporter
6	who reported in shorthand the proceedings had of the
7	said cause, and that the foregoing is a true and
8	correct transcript of her shorthand notes so taken
9	as aforesaid.
10	
11	
12	Rothleen Lacult
	KATHLEEN J. PACULT, C.S.R.
13	C.S.R. License # 084-004180
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Г

 $\bigcirc$ 

(

A	after 2:23 4:3 12:16	answer 20:12,13	<b>a.m</b> 1:14	41:11,21
ability 21:24,2	<u>4</u> 13:23 17:9 22:1	21:7,11 23:1		<b>Board's</b> 4:11 7:2,13
23:11	33:13 34:5 38:2	28:14 31:8 34:15	<u> </u>	7:15,21,24 8:16
able 4:7 8:20	3.18 41:6,7	36:24 37:22 38:8	<b>b</b> 11:9	9:17 16:9
39:13	again 12:17,21	38:15 39:16 40:3	back 18:8 20:14	<b>BOD</b> 32:7
<b>about</b> 14:3 16		40:6	28:11 41:5	bodies 6:6
30:21 31:5 3		anticipated 40:2	<b>based</b> 8:16 18:3,7	boils 16:19
33:16 34:12	agencies 6:1,4 19:4	anti-degradation	18:15 27:16 28:7	<b>both</b> 10:11 30:5
<b>above</b> 11:18	agency 6:5 8:4,11	19:23	34:3	32:10
above-entitle		anti-degragation	Basically 26:15	brand 19:1
above-referen		20:4	basis 18:13,13	brief 5:12
3:9	14:2,5,6,7,9,13,23	anyone 3:16,23 4:1	19:13,13 32:23	briefly 16:1
accepted 9:11	14:23,24 15:3,13	23:16	Beauty 14:24	bring 28:23
34:9	15:15,20,22 16:4	anyone's 13:9	<b>became</b> 6:15 33:14	broken 13:14
accepting 34:4	16:15 17:9,11,17	anything 31:2,4	<b>become</b> 13:17	budgetary 29:18
accommodate		32:8 40:12 41:1	<b>before</b> 1:1,11 3:4	<b>build</b> 4:11
accordance 3		anytime 25:14	4:5 6:4,6 8:6,20	burdensome 10:12
account 11:22	22:3,7 23:5,20	applicable 20:5	13:11 16:14 21:12	
accurate 18:6	25:18 26:5,11,11	applicant 21:23,24	23:20 24:1 33:3	C
accurately 22	26:24 29:17,21	22:4,12 23:5,6	38:15	<b>c</b> 16:14 43:2
acknowledge	33:22 34:7,13,16	application 18:4	<b>beg</b> 32:9	calibrate 32:6
acknowledge	4:4 34:21 37:1,24	23:7,14 24:23	<b>began</b> 6:17	calibration 32:7
Act 2:16,16,17	3:7 38:4 40:6	27:20	<b>begin</b> 4:5 5:6	came 25:23 35:17
<b>action</b> 10:14	Agency's 8:3 16:2	apply 19:23	beginning 39:3	35:21 36:3
actions 21:16	17:8 31:4 32:2	appointed 2:2	41:19	capable 30:15
activities 5:24	34:15 38:5	<b>appreciate</b> 41:14,24	behalf 4:15 5:18	careful 38:11
24:20 28:5	<b>ago</b> 17:21	appreciates 9:17	19:3	case 17:13 20:5
activity 20:3	<b>agree</b> 31:12 36:20	appropriate 12:6	being 8:20 18:15	21:2 22:23 26:1
actual 16:22	37:13 38:3	15:4 19:18 22:22	20:3 27:24 31:5	37:9
actually 20:14	agreed 9:21 34:6	approval 33:2	38:10 43:4	cases 27:17 40:19
27:24 31:14	37:22 agreeing 33:16	<b>April</b> 3:8,10 33:14	<b>believe</b> 7:5 13:7	categories 21:16
add 10:20 13:	2,23 agreements 4:21	areas 4:21,24 7:5	14:23 15:7,18	cause 1:11 11:16
29:16,21 30	agrees 7:18	29:20 41:17	16:11 20:18 21:2	37:2 43:7
31:4	agriculture 5:23	arguments 13:7	21:14 22:23 23:3	causes 11:15
added 20:22 2	:6 Albert 3:21 13:4	arisen 22:6 23:2	23:7 24:9 26:2,19	certain 2:21 9:1
26:3 30:3	Albert's 21:19	around 35:19	30:3,17,18 32:4	25:22
addition 28:6	Alec 5:9	articulated 21:2	33:17 35:17,18	certainly 17:6
additional 7:8	3:4 <b>allocate</b> 10:16	asked 4:10 29:1	36:2,24	27:19
8:18 10:16 1		37:23	<b>believed</b> 37:24	Certified 1:12
13:22 22:10,		asking 15:7	<b>believes</b> 11:8 12:17	<b>CFR</b> 11:2,4,12
24:20,21,22		aspects 17:20	15:2 38:2	13:24
26:3 30:2,8		assigned 2:8,10	<b>beneficial</b> 18:6	challenge 40:16
address 16:15		assist 15:3 Association 19:3	<b>benefit</b> 10:18 17:23 20:22 21:5	<b>Chamber</b> 6:7
22:9 23:1 34	24 <b>already</b> 7:20 8:16	assumes 17:19	1	<b>change</b> 16:11 17:14 18:5 25:4,6,7,15
38:9	7 <b>10:17,22</b> always 14:20 18:23		<b>best</b> 16:16 31:16,17 31:18	39:11
addressed 12:	7 <b>aiways</b> 14:20 18:23 31:20 39:13	assumptions 27:10 assurance 33:3	<b>better</b> 5:1 25:24	changed 17:23
35:5 36:11		attempt 40:5	30:24	18:19 35:20
addressing 32	22 Amendments 1.5 2:4 6:12	attempt 40.5 attempting 25:15	<b>between</b> 10:5 33:22	changes 8:9,12,15
adds 26:8	amount 27:22	authority 15:8,15	34:7	10:5 18:1 24:13
adequate 39:3	41.00	32:22 37:24 38:4	<b>bias</b> 4:13	39:23 40:4
adequately 22	07.11	38:9	<b>bit</b> 40:22	characteristics 28:2
adjourned 42:	analysis 16:22,23	authorization 28:1	Black 14:24	chemical 29:7
Adm 2:5	19:23 20:17 27:9	authorized 20:3	<b>Board</b> 1:1 2:2,8,9	Chicago 1:15
administer 6:1	27:13,15	automatic 40:23	2:17 3:1,7,12 4:10	chooses 2:22
adopted 7:10	analytical 27:7	available 3:3,13	4:15 5:19 6:6,22	chose 8:12
adoption 2:22	analyzed 28:5	17:5 29:8 32:20	7:1,10 8:11,13	circulate 6:17
advance 6:3	1 1 25.04	avoid 31:14	9:12,13,15,23	circumstances 9:2
advantage 30:	another 13:23	a)4 34:12	10:2 12:12,18,21	15:12,14 18:8
Affairs 2:19	14:20 21:13 25:1	a)5 17:8 19:5	13:10,14 19:7	21:15 22:19,22
affiliate 6:7 aforesaid 43:9	26:9	a)6 19:21	34:20 35:3,9	citizens 31:5

				Page
clarification 38:13	29:15	<b>C.S.R</b> 43:12,13	35:19	envision 28:22 39:4
clarify 14:22 34:19	concerns 9:3 12:17	D	Docket 2:6	39:5
clarifying 9:17	33:16		documented 17:1	<b>EPA</b> 3:23 6:19 7:7
clarity 30:7	<b>concur</b> 7:15	data 22:10 27:16	documents 8:14	7:20 10:8 27:4
<b>clear</b> 33:14	concurs 7:2,21,24	database 27:15,18	16:4 17:5 28:15	equal 10:19
close 22:2,15 34:22	8:14 9:15 10:2,7	date 18:9	29:9	equations 27:7
41:7	<b>condition</b> 39:14,17	dated 3:7	done 37:20 41:23	estimates 27:21
closes 12:20	39:18	dates 9:18	down 16:19 41:17	Ettinger 3:21 13:4
closing 41:10	conditions 32:11	day 1:14 8:19 18:17	Dr 2:7 4:14,15	13:6 14:11 15:11
Club 34:20	conduct 2:20,23 3:8	21:21 23:10	29:14 30:20 41:15	15:19 31:3,10
Code 1:6 2:5 6:13	conducting 3:2	days 2:23 3:3 41:7	draft 16:6 18:7 19:9	33:12 35:12 36:11
11:2	conflict 26:19	DCEO 2:20,22,23	19:12 23:23,24	36:15 37:21 38:10
codification 8:2	conflicts 35:6	3:8,10,10	24:24 25:2 29:1	40:10,13
codifies 7:19	confused 25:13	DCEO's 3:2	36:17 37:17 39:3	evaluating 12:5
<b>college</b> 28:23	31:5,11	deal 10:23 35:3	drafted 23:19 36:20	evaluation 16:20
<b>come</b> 4:18,20 13:16	confusing 40:1	dealing 31:19	drafting 16:21	even 4:17 15:9
14:14 23:12 33:19	confusion 31:15	decided 21:17	drafts 6:17	25:19 29:11 33:2
34:5 35:1	conservative 27:10	decision 4:12 7:15	<b>driven</b> 28:10	ever 31:16,17
comes 23:10 27:4	consider 21:4 26:5	7:22 10:2 14:24	<b>duly</b> 5:14 13:5 15:5	every 28:24 29:11
31:21 37:18	36:22 40:20,23	15:4 21:4 28:16	38:17 43:4	everyone 4:16
comfortable 33:20	consideration 41:11	decisions 16:17	duplicate 25:12	41:16,21
33:21	considerations	decision-making	during 22:6 23:2	evident 24:22
commend 38:10	20:20 27:10	28:18	25:16	exact 36:3
comment 8:20 9:1	considered 17:10	definitely 29:5		example 20:16
15:1,1,8,13,16	40:11	definitive 21:7	<u> </u>	38:22
20:23 21:6,17,21	considering 18:11	delay 10:22	each 4:7	examples 20:20
22:1,2,7,15,21,24	consistent 30:4	deletion 19:6	earlier 7:14 9:2	24:12,16
23:2,9,11,21 25:3	content 20:24	Department 2:18	13:8 28:13,14	exceed 27:5
25:10,11,12,16,20	context 37:13	2:19	easier 30:12	<b>excursion</b> 11:10,18
26:6 31:1 36:19	continuation 32:1	depict 36:1	<b>EcIS</b> 2:21,23 3:2,11	executive 5:11,16
37:2 38:2,9 41:6	contributes 11:17	designed 27:13	economic 2:20,20	existing 8:17 10:13
41:10	Control 1:1 5:19	detail 26:3,9 33:8	2:24 3:4,8	11:22 27:13
<b>comments</b> 5:3 6:22	controls 11:23	determination	effective 9:18	exists 35:21
7:15 9:2,6,15,19	Cook 1:13	23:20,22 27:1	effluent 12:3,5,7	expansions 18:2
10:7 15:2 17:9	copy 3:12	37:1,3	25:4,8	expecting 14:8
21:23 23:4,8,12	corporation 5:22	determine 37:18	effort 10:21 31:14	expense 10:20
23:13 25:16 31:6	correct 16:7 24:1,8	determining 11:14	41:16,20	expertise 29:8
38:7 39:12,19,23	30:14 32:18 36:10	20:21 21:12 26:5	efforts 28:8 39:19	expired 29:24
41:12	43:8	developed 9:21	either 39:2	explain 16:1 20:8
<b>commerce</b> 2:18,19	<b>cost</b> 10:19	32:21	element 11:3	24:11 26:23 38:24
5:23 6:8	costly 10:11	dictionary 29:12	embodied 27:1	explained 24:10
commit 34:3	counsel 5:9	differ 32:9	emergency 13:17	explains 11:10 26:9
		different 18:24	end 9:19 35:23	
common 25:9 27:3	County 1:13 43:2			<b>explanation</b> 3:2 20:15 31:21
27:3 33:4	couple 23:15,16	26:12 36:24	enforce 6:2	
commonly 29:8	course 18:18 28:6	diligent 10:17	engaged 5:23	exploring 9:4
community 2:18	court 4:7 43:5	dilution 12:7	engineer 17:4 28:16	express 4:12
6:20 33:24 34:8	covered 8:15 40:8	directed 23:4	engineering 16:19	expressed 7:13
companies 5:18,22	crafting 36:1	direction 30:7	29:6	extend 15:8 20:23
compare 28:1	create 29:18 33:5	director 5:12,16	engineer's 16:23	21:17 22:24 37:2
compared 41:18	creating 12:12	directs 26:11	enlightenment	extended 25:20
complete 4:11	criteria 11:19 21:11	disagreement 4:24	14:13	extending 21:6
completed 10:17	21:12 25:19 26:4	41:17	enough 21:7,16	extent 16:18 17:17
complexities 33:6	26:11,24 27:2	disagreements 35:6	entitled 2:4 6:12	17:18 22:6 25:22
comprised 5:22	<b>CSR</b> 1:24	discharge 11:15	23:7	26:13 29:5 32:10
compromise 9:5	curious 34:17	27:14,24 28:1,7	entity 25:1	33:6 34:8
compromised 34:13	current 8:3 16:3	discharged 28:3	environment 10:14	<b>extra</b> 31:14
concept 19:16 21:3	18:7,11 19:8	discussing 36:2	10:19	
25:2 30:4 36:2	29:18 30:6	discussion 12:15	environmental 2:15	F
concepts 26:4	currently 23:19	20:11 35:24 40:15	3:20 5:10,17 6:2,5	facilities 18:2
Conceptually 7:23	32:5	40:17 41:4,6	environmentally	facility 17:20
concern 8:10,24	<b>cut</b> 40:14,19	discussions 34:10	18:21	fact 18:14 19:9,12
,— ·	,			· · · · · ·

				Page
19:22 20:3 22:12	19:8 20:1,18	guess 14:11 16:18	<b>III</b> 2:5	involved 6:15 34:22
30:24 31:16 41:16	21:14 22:5 24:2,9	17:18 20:11 40:1	<b>Illinois</b> 1:1,13,15	in-stream 11:17
factor 40:10	24:15,19 25:7,22	guidance 21:3	3:19 5:10,17,19	issue 8:10,24 22:6,9
	26:18 27:2 28:22	25:17 26:16	1 · · · ·	
factors 16:24 18:10			5:21 6:5,7,19 7:7	22:14 29:19,22
20:20 21:1,3 27:9	29:23 31:8,12	<b>guys</b> 36:5	7:20 10:8 11:8	31:13 39:2
36:18,22 37:3	32:4,9,17 34:19		19:3 43:1	issued 7:1
40:20,22	35:23 36:23 37:13	<u> </u>	illumination 7:6	issues 32:23 35:2
fair 30:13	from 3:22,23 11:4	hand 4:2 40:4	38:14 39:9	item 25:14
<b>fall</b> 6:16	13:24 14:9,13	handling 10:3	<b>Ill.Adm</b> 1:6 6:13	itemize 29:9
fashion 35:3	17:16 18:5,12,12	happen 30:10	immediately 11:6	Nonine 2919
federal 11:2,7,9	18:24 19:6 22:10	happened 33:18	impact 2:21,24 3:4	T
				<b>J</b> 1:11,24 2:9 43:4
12:10 17:24 20:24	22:11,13 23:24	happy 35:16	3:9 8:7	
27:8 28:8 30:5	24:7 25:2 34:15	hard 33:15,17	implement 20:9	43:12
35:15	35:15 36:3 41:8	HARSCH 19:2	implemented 9:9	judge 25:20
<b>feel</b> 36:18	front 3:13	23:18 24:4,11,18	implementing 7:21	judgment 16:16,23
feels 15:15,17	fulfill 36:8	25:4 31:23 32:5	20:16	20:22 21:4
fell 21:15	full 8:6 31:19	32:15 33:9 38:12	important 13:17	judicial 6:6
	function 10:16			, e
few 13:15		39:7 40:8	18:14	jump 28:11
filed 9:20 10:7 17:9	fundamental 18:4	hashed 14:18	improved 32:13	just 13:18 14:18
final 21:21 23:23	31:13	hear 3:15,18 14:9	include 8:12 10:5	15:14 34:17
24:6 40:3,5	fundamentally	heard 13:18 38:5	11:6,9 19:22	justification 7:4
<b>find</b> 33:17	26:12	hearing 2:3,12,14	included 9:5,14	justify 21:16
fine-tuning 7:8	further 4:23 7:4,6	3:4,14 4:16,23 9:6	11:2 12:18 17:4	<b>3</b> • • <b>3</b>
first 2:14 6:15,24	9:1,4 11:10 13:24	12:16 15:10,17	including 6:18 12:9	K
,		17:9 21:13 26:14	inclusion 9:17	<b>K</b> 43:2
7:9,16 12:19 16:6	14:6,15 15:2,2,19			
16:9 20:11 23:21	31:2 33:9 35:19	33:14 38:1,2 41:8	incorporate 28:7	Katherine 3:20
24:5 29:16,20	36:18 38:13 39:9	41:9,14	incorporating 16:4	5:16
33:13 34:23 37:6	40:12 41:1 42:2	hearings 6:21 9:22	increased 20:2	Kathleen 1:11,24
43:4		31:6	increment 30:2,8	43:4,12
five 17:21 18:17	G	held 2:13 6:22 41:6	indeed 18:5 21:5	Kathy 5:11
fixed 13:15,16	<b>g</b> 7:12,17	help 4:11	30:4 32:22 35:8	kind 22:11 27:23
flexibility 32:21	general 5:9 20:7	helpful 34:1 36:6	indicate 20:4	28:20
		-		
focus 18:6 36:16	29:6,8,14 30:21	41:14	indicates 18:14	kinds 27:9
focused 24:3 29:4	32:17 33:10 36:15	her 38:10 43:8	indirectly 32:13	know 4:18 24:15
follow 3:21 41:8	generally 13:12	<b>him</b> 3:24	individual 32:18	35:20 38:8
<b>following</b> 6:10 9:21	generated 27:22	historic 27:14,18	33:7	known 2:19
11:7 15:16 16:13	GERARD 4:15	historically 27:16	industry 5:23	
21:20	Girard 2:7 4:14	30:24	influence 16:2	L
follows 7:11		Hodge 3:20 5:11,16	information 8:19	lack 25:23
follow-up 19:2	give 20:15 21:2	13:2 37:22 38:5	16:20 22:3,10,11	language 7:8,10 8:2
	0			
21:19 28:14 31:23	36:23 40:23	Hodge's 13:18 14:4	22:16,18,20,24	8:7 9:5,8,11,18,20
36:6	given 14:23	holding 7:3	27:8,20 28:20	10:10 11:5,6,10
forced 10:15	gives 26:11	hope 8:19 16:10	29:7 36:14	11:12 12:9,11,11
foregoing 43:7	<b>glad</b> 14:8	hopefully 13:16	inherent 30:9 31:15	12:15,18 13:9,24
forget 33:13	go 13:3 16:24 18:8	hoping 20:7	initial 23:2 34:23	16:6,9 24:10
forgot 38:18	33:8 41:1	hour 1:14	initiate 34:20	25:23 26:20 29:16
form 14:14	going 13:10 14:5,9		<b>initiated</b> 17:22 33:4	30:3,4 33:17,19
forth 7:14		ĭ		34:6,13,17 35:1,4
	14:12,13,14 20:11		instance 10:18	35:5,15 37:11
forward 4:22 5:2	23:12 28:2,16	identify 19:10	intend 29:9	,
9:6 12:23	31:14,20 32:3	24:15,16 28:17	intended 4:10 30:7	last 23:10 31:24
found 9:8 11:6,12	33:15 38:20,21	29:5	<b>intent</b> 20:24	36:5
12:9	39:6,8,15,20,22	identifying 16:3	interest 6:24	later 8:5
four 20:14,19 21:1	39:23	<b>IERG</b> 5:12,17,18	interested 6:18 9:4	law 20:24 21:2 30.5
	good 2:1 5:8,15	5:21 6:2,7,10,15	10:17 17:18 26:1	laws 6:2
frankly 23:9 30:11	21:9 30:18 37:1	6:20 7:2,10,18,24	interests 6:3	lawyer 38:11
35:12 40:18	government 30:21	8:14,18 9:2,6,15	interpretation	lead 2:8 36:1
T 100000000	governmental 6:1,4	9:17,20 10:1,7	16:20 36:10	least 3:3 34:7
		11:8 12:17 13:22	interprets 20:8	legal 39:16
frequent 39:6	grateful 41:22		F	
frequent 39:6	grateful 41:22 great 6:24 10:23	38:3	25:18	less 18:21 34:21
<b>frequent</b> 39:6 <b>Frevert</b> 3:23 14:10	5		25:18	
frequent 39:6	great 6:24 10:23	38:3	-	less 18:21 34:21

1

(

				Page
letter 3:7,12	meaningful 25:19	35:2	number 2:7 13:13	18:9 25:23 31:15
Let's 30:13	means 30:23	move 20:12	27:19 35:6 39:18	31:17
License 43:13	meant 25:14	moving 17:7 19:20	40:4	outgrowth 37:17
like 4:16 5:13 12:21	measurement 33:8	26:22	numeric 11:19	outreach 31:18
			numeric 11:19	
14:17,22 21:18	mechanisms 13:13	MPDS 29:19	0	out-of-date 19:14
32:8,12 38:19,23	meeting 9:21 12:16	much 5:1 7:2 13:6		over 4:7 13:10
39:22 40:13	33:18,23 34:5,6	30:23 31:14,15	<b>O</b> 43:2,2	14:18 23:12
likely 9:9 10:20	Melas 2:9	33:8 34:6 35:15	oath 43:5	own 18:12 22:13
limit 28:20	member 2:8 4:10	38:11 41:23	objection 14:1	o'clock 23:10
limitation 25:5,8	5:18,22 17:18	municipal 32:6	objectionable 19:19	
limitations 28:7,9	members 2:9 6:4,8	<b>must</b> 3:1 8:15	objective 22:14	<u> </u>
line 35:20,20	6:19		obtain 8:19	Pacult 1:11,24 43:4
list 28:24 41:18	memorandum	N	obvious 21:1	43:12
litany 24:17	39:16	name 2:1 4:4 5:8,15	obviously 23:11	paragraph 10:4,10
literature 29:3	mentioned 9:19	narrative 11:18	occur 21:21	28:9
little 30:6 31:21	merely 7:19 8:2	narrowed 41:17	occurred 4:22	paragraphs 10:1
	merety 7.19 8.2 merit 21:5	nature 22:21 27:21	off 41:2,3,6	26:10
40:22				
live 35:4	Messina 5:8,9	33:7	offer 10:9	parameter 12:2
load 24:22	15:23 16:8,13	nearly 11:4	offered 35:9	part 1:6 2:5 6:13
location 28:2	17:3,7 19:20 20:6	necessary 15:17	officer 2:3 41:9	7:6 8:16 29:7
logical 37:16	21:9,18 23:15	21:13 25:21 36:19	often 25:10 38:20	30:1 40:16
longer 29:19,22	25:13 26:15,21	38:3	39:8	partially 24:3
look 4:22 5:2 12:23	28:11	necessitated 33:6	<b>old</b> 18:8,24	participant 21:22
24:1 37:9,12	meters 32:7	necessity 20:23	<b>Once</b> 12:21	participants 4:19
looked 13:10 35:18	method 32:16,20	22:20	one 4:6 9:22 13:21	41:9
looking 34:23	methods 32:12,13	need 7:3 17:14,17	14:7,18,21 21:15	participate 33:24
looks 9:6	32:20	22:9,12,16,23	26:4 28:12 31:3	participated 6:21
lot 4:19 14:9,12	Michael 2:10	23:16 25:11 28:5	31:23,23 34:14	participates 34:14
26:8 30:12 32:24	midst 7:20	31:20 38:16	36:5,9 37:21	participating 12:23
40:21	might 29:16 39:9	needed 32:23	38:19	participation 1:5
<b>L.A</b> 1:23	mind 23:14 27:4	needs 22:7	ongoing 17:24	2:5 5:2 6:13 30:5
	30:3	negotiated 4:18	only 10:22 23:4	30:12,19,22 39:1
M	minimized 35:5	negotiating 25:24	38:21,23	39:1
made 17:5 23:4	misinterpretation	negotiation 34:15	openly 30:14	particular 19:24
25:16 34:1,11	12:13	never 36:22	operating 18:10	25:23 26:18 29:2
40:5	<b>missed</b> 28:12	<b>new</b> 7:16 9:8 10:10	19:13	39:2
mainstream 18:22	missing 39:2	11:9 17:13 18:3	operation 24:21	particularly 18:20
major 18:22 37:8	modification 19:11	19:1,12 25:1	27:21	33:21
make 3:1 14:20	19:17 20:2 24:6	27:17 31:23	operational 17:20	parties 6:18 26:1,2
22:17 23:20,22	37:8,8,10,16	next 13:3 24:1	18:1	35:7,10 40:2
26:24 29:12 30:9	39:19	Nicholas 2:9	opinion 7:1,2,13,24	party 10:18 35:11
30:20 31:6 36:4	modifications 24:13	nonpoint 11:23	8:14 9:13	39:20
	modified 19:10	normally 25:5	opportunity 2:20	
37:5,11 39:12,23		· ·		people 26:13 30:15
makes 37:1	23:23	note 4:9	5:20 8:24 12:22	31:20 33:16,20,21
making 16:16 37:2	modifies 12:11	noted 8:13 9:2	22:21	35:16
manuals 27:8	modify 18:8 36:17	notes 16:22,22 17:3	order 3:18 7:1	perception 26:3
many 4:21 13:15	36:21	17:4 43:8	12:19 19:1 22:8	perform 3:11
16:24 18:3 34:1	modifying 11:6,12	nothing 15:19	37:17 41:9	perhaps 18:20 30:6
Mary 2:2	moment 26:19 41:2	18:19 33:9 42:1	organized 6:3	perimeters 18:14
material 29:8	moments 23:16	notice 6:24 7:9,16	original 12:11	32:19
mathematical 29:6	monitoring 25:8	10:6 12:19 15:9	24:23,24 25:2,3	period 15:1,9 21:22
matter 1:3 2:4,8,11	32:11 33:1,3,4	16:9 17:15 29:16	originally 17:22	22:2,7,15,24 23:2
6:16 10:9 16:12	more 6:8 14:12 18:6	29:21 31:17 34:24	24:7	23:11,21 25:16,21
22:5 23:3	18:6,13,17,22	noticed 24:7	other 4:7 5:24 9:14	38:2 41:7,10
may 4:1 14:24 15:3	22:16 26:8,21	notices 19:9	9:20 10:9 15:21	<b>permit</b> 10:6,6,21
15:16 17:22 18:19		notifying 41:10	16:24 17:11 18:2	
	30:6,23 31:13,21			16:21,24 17:13,15
22:20 26:7,14	32:24 33:20,21	notion 4:12	23:15 26:13,20	17:15,22,23 18:3
29:19,21 32:19	34:21 36:9 38:11	not-for-profit 5:21	28:4 29:13,23	18:3,7,9,16,24
38:1	Moreover 6:6	November 1:14	30:3 35:6 40:4	19:1,13,15,24
maybe 39:14	morning 2:1 5:8,15	NPDES 1:5,6 2:6	others 33:2	22:11,14 23:5,6,7
-				
mean 30:8 39:10	most 14:18 27:3,3	6:14 10:21 11:3	out 13:12 14:19,20	23:23,24,24 24:6

(

				Page
24:24 25:3,5,9,15	presentation 13:19	20:23,23 21:6,13	35:8	require 7:6 16:11
27:20 28:9,16,24	14:4,15	21:17,23 22:1,2,7	record 4:8,11 8:11	33:2
29:22,24 31:6	presentations 14:6	22:21,24 23:2,4	8:16 15:1,16 16:1	required 10:11 11:3
32:3,16 36:17,21	presented 13:8	23:13,21 24:7	16:4 20:8 24:12	25:2
39:4,24 40:3,5	presumes 14:4		26:23 29:10 41:2	requirements 8:4
		25:3,9,16,20 26:6		
permits 1:7 2:6	pretty 14:19	30:5,12,19,22	41:3,5,6	17:24 32:3,10
6:14 17:10,11	previous 10:6 17:15	31:17,18 38:24	records 34:23	33:1,5
19:10,11 29:20	prior 2:21 18:16,17	39:1,12	reduced 41:22	requires 2:17 8:18
30:17,17 32:18,24	26:9	publication 29:3	redundant 26:8	10:4 38:24
33:2	probably 18:9,13	<b>purpose</b> 2:13 3:14	reference 29:24	requiring 28:23
permitting 1:7 2:6	30:1,8 38:6	put 31:17 41:21	32:12	32:11
6:14 10:14 16:16	problem 14:11 19:5		referring 28:20	reservations 7:3
16:17	procedural 8:17	Q	refers 27:5	reserve 38:6
permit's 23:14	procedure 7:19	qualify 39:15	refine 4:23	resources 3:11
personal 18:12	14:3	quality 11:11,20	reflect 16:23 19:12	10:13
22:13	procedures 1:7 2:6	27:6 28:3,10 33:3	reflects 18:9	respect 19:4
personally 26:7	6:14 11:21 35:16	question 4:1,9 14:2	regard 17:2 21:1,19	respond 23:8,12
38:7	proceed 7:16 8:12	14:3,7 15:7,14	28:13 35:7	25:15
	41:12			
perspective 17:16		19:2 20:7,11	regarding 7:3 16:3	responded 3:10
18:5,12 22:13	proceeding 2:3,13	21:19 22:16 23:1	regards 7:24 8:17	response 6:11 22:1
pertaining 9:18	proceedings 1:10	28:12,14 29:15	9:7,11,16 10:1	responsive 39:12
10:4	43:6	31:3,9,24 33:11	15:24 16:14 21:10	result 25:11 34:5,10
pertains 28:9	process 10:22 12:24	33:11 34:11 36:5	regulated 5:24 6:20	40:15
pertinent 18:11	21:22 28:18 37:4	37:21 38:3,18	18:15 33:24 34:8	review 16:22 20:4
petition 14:20	produce 2:24	questions 3:15,24	regulating 24:24	20:21 27:19
petitioned 34:20	professional 16:16	4:5,8 5:3 8:5 9:10	regulation 18:15	reviewed 6:20,22
Petitioner's 34:7	program 11:3 30:6	13:1 14:14 15:21	regulations 6:2	6:24
pH 33:7	30:11,13	23:16 26:22 29:13	11:2,7 12:10	reviews 17:12 18:1
piece 29:2	promote 6:3	quickly 28:12 30:23	17:19 18:10	re-draft 18:12
place 8:3 24:20	promulgate 6:1	quite 23:9 25:10	regulatory 3:20	re-issuance 19:17
27:10	properly 23:1 29:12	30:11	5:10,17 19:13	re-issued 17:10
plans 20:16	proponent 3:22	50.11	related 5:24 12:10	19:6,11
-		R		
plant 32:6 33:3	proponents 6:17	raise 4:2 14:15	28:4	<b>right</b> 2:7 15:7,11
play 39:5	8:10 11:1,5		relates 18:16	22:15,17 39:14,17
please 4:4,6,9 15:24	proposal 6:17,21	raised 29:15	relationship 19:14	ripe 12:13
pleased 4:21	7:4,5 29:21 35:18	Randolph 1:15	remainder 12:23	<b>risk</b> 12:12
point 11:23	proposals 13:8	rather 18:16	remains 8:1	role 39:5
pointed 13:12	proposed 1:5 2:4,21	rationale 10:3	<b>remember</b> 35:13,13	room 1:15 3:13
pollutant 12:1,2	3:1,5 6:11,12 7:16	reach 15:3	35:21	round 15:10 25:3
24:22	8:9 11:1 16:2	reaching 8:6 21:4	renewal 18:20 20:2	routine 33:7
pollution 1:1 5:19	19:7,12 31:5	react 13:19,21	renewed 18:3	Roy 24:3 32:17
11:24	33:11,12 34:9	reaction 25:9	renumbered 9:8	RO3-19 2:7
population 31:19	35:14	read 30:16 39:17	reopen 14:24 15:16	rule 32:18 33:11,12
position 10:9 34:24	proposes 13:22	readily 32:19	23:21 26:6 37:24	34:3,21 40:21
positioned 10:8	<b>Protection</b> 2:16 6:5	reading 24:9 39:14	38:1	rulemaking 1:5
possibilities 24:17	provide 12:22	real 41:19	repeat 24:2	2:14 3:22 4:17,17
		reality 16:12 17:24		,
potential 8:7 11:16	25:17 26:16 38:13		<b>REPORT</b> 1:10	4:18 5:1 6:11
27:5,13	38:22 39:8	really 24:4 40:14	reported 43:6	12:22 35:1 41:19
potentially 7:7	provided 9:7 22:3	reason 37:2,6	reporter 1:12 4:7	rulemakings 3:9,12
10.11.14.0	39:20	reasonable 11:16	43:5	34:22
10:11 15:9				rules 1:6 2:5,21,22
practice 8:3 16:3,12	provides 11:13	27:5,12	Reporting 1:23	
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3	<b>provides</b> 11:13 15:12 25:19	reasonably 40:2	represent 4:5 40:5	3:1,5 6:13 8:17
practice 8:3 16:3,12	provides 11:13	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14		
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7	<b>provides</b> 11:13 15:12 25:19	reasonably 40:2	represent 4:5 40:5	3:1,5 6:13 8:17
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7 preconceived 4:12	<b>provides</b> 11:13 15:12 25:19 <b>providing</b> 17:14 28:15	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14 8:11 9:13,14	represent 4:5 40:5 representatives 6:19 33:23	3:1,5 6:13 8:17 34:9
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7 preconceived 4:12 predictions 27:23	provides 11:13 15:12 25:19 providing 17:14 28:15 provision 7:19 8:1	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14 8:11 9:13,14 receipt 41:7	represent 4:5 40:5 representatives 6:19 33:23 represented 24:23	3:1,5 6:13 8:17 34:9 <b>ruling</b> 9:15 <b>runs</b> 12:12
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7 preconceived 4:12 predictions 27:23 preliminarily 6:21	provides 11:13 15:12 25:19 providing 17:14 28:15 provision 7:19 8:1 8:21 11:1 31:24	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14 8:11 9:13,14 receipt 41:7 receive 15:1	represent 4:5 40:5 representatives 6:19 33:23 represented 24:23 35:3	3:1,5 6:13 8:17 34:9 <b>ruling</b> 9:15
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7 preconceived 4:12 predictions 27:23 preliminarily 6:21 preliminary 9:22	provides 11:13 15:12 25:19 providing 17:14 28:15 provision 7:19 8:1 8:21 11:1 31:24 provisions 9:4	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14 8:11 9:13,14 receipt 41:7 receive 15:1 receiving 12:8	represent 4:5 40:5 representatives 6:19 33:23 represented 24:23 35:3 represents 3:22	3:1,5 6:13 8:17 34:9 ruling 9:15 runs 12:12 R03-19 1:4 6:14
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7 preconceived 4:12 predictions 27:23 preliminarily 6:21 preliminary 9:22 prepared 5:12 6:23	provides 11:13 15:12 25:19 providing 17:14 28:15 provision 7:19 8:1 8:21 11:1 31:24 provisions 9:4 public 1:5 2:5 3:3,4	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14 8:11 9:13,14 receipt 41:7 receive 15:1 receiving 12:8 receptive 26:14	represent 4:5 40:5 representatives 6:19 33:23 represented 24:23 35:3 represents 3:22 request 2:18,24	3:1,5 6:13 8:17 34:9 ruling 9:15 runs 12:12 R03-19 1:4 6:14 S
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7 preconceived 4:12 predictions 27:23 preliminarily 6:21 preliminary 9:22 prepared 5:12 6:23 13:19	provides 11:13 15:12 25:19 providing 17:14 28:15 provision 7:19 8:1 8:21 11:1 31:24 provisions 9:4 public 1:5 2:5 3:3,4 6:12 9:1 10:5	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14 8:11 9:13,14 receipt 41:7 receive 15:1 receiving 12:8 receptive 26:14 recipient 23:6	represent 4:5 40:5 representatives 6:19 33:23 represented 24:23 35:3 represents 3:22 request 2:18,24 17:12 31:6	3:1,5 6:13 8:17 34:9 ruling 9:15 runs 12:12 R03-19 1:4 6:14 <u>S</u> safety 13:13
practice 8:3 16:3,12 19:9 22:5 23:3 32:2,22 33:5,7 preconceived 4:12 predictions 27:23 preliminarily 6:21 preliminary 9:22 prepared 5:12 6:23	provides 11:13 15:12 25:19 providing 17:14 28:15 provision 7:19 8:1 8:21 11:1 31:24 provisions 9:4 public 1:5 2:5 3:3,4	reasonably 40:2 reasons 7:13,14 8:11 9:13,14 receipt 41:7 receive 15:1 receiving 12:8 receptive 26:14	represent 4:5 40:5 representatives 6:19 33:23 represented 24:23 35:3 represents 3:22 request 2:18,24	3:1,5 6:13 8:17 34:9 ruling 9:15 runs 12:12 R03-19 1:4 6:14 S

 $\bigcirc$ 

 $\bigcirc$ 

		·		Page
Sanjay 38:12	Sofat 35:17 37:15	<b>strike</b> 19:19	37:1,6,7,15	transcript 41:8
satisfy 39:13	38:18 39:15	structured 20:19	testifiers 3:16	43:8
saying 31:13 39:16	solicit 22:9	studies 3:11	testifies 7:10	treatment 32:6
39:22	some 4:20,23 5:12	study 2:21,24 3:3,9	testify 3:17	tried 38:23
says 36:16 40:1,4	5:22 8:5 12:9,15	subject 2:15 12:15	testimony 3:15,19	trigger 39:21,24
40:21 43:5	14:4 17:22 18:4	submissions 15:3	5:3,7,13,20 6:11	40:24
schedule 25:8	18:10,17,20 19:14	submit 21:22 22:1	6:23 7:7 9:7	<b>Tristano</b> 2:10 5:4,5
scheduled 9:22	20:15 22:11,19	submits 6:10	12:20,22 13:3	33:10 34:11 35:11
science 16:19 30:16	24:16,19 25:17	submitted 34:14		36:4,13 37:5,20
second 3:14 12:16		35:7	14:5 38:6 41:12 41:20	
	26:2,3,9 29:15			true 43:7
15:9,9 17:9 33:14	30:1,8,18 32:10	subparagraphs	testing 12:4	try 4:20 18:8 19:11
section 2:15,17 3:6	32:24 33:2,15,16	26:12	tests 32:7,7	20:10 30:13 34:19
7:12,18,23 8:13	33:19,21 34:8,9	subsection 11:9	textbooks 28:17,24	34:24
8:17 9:16,19,24	35:9 37:3 38:12	16:14 19:21 25:18	thank 5:2,19 12:21	trying 28:19
10:24 11:7,8	40:19	26:17 27:1 38:14	31:1 37:20 41:13	<b>Turning</b> 7:9
12:14 13:23 15:12	someone 40:14,17	39:9	41:15,24 42:2	<b>turns</b> 14:19
15:24 16:2 17:7	something 18:23	substantially 25:1	their 23:11 28:18	two 26:21
20:6,9,10,13,17	35:14	sub-paragraphs	28:23 29:7 34:1,4	twofold 2:14
20:19 21:20,20	somewhere 21:2	20:19	41:16	two-part 24:4 36:7
26:22 34:12 36:7	source 18:23 22:10	sufficiently 8:20	thing 14:21 27:3	36:21,24 37:6
38:20 39:5,6,7	24:21 27:18	suggested 34:13	38:19	typical 10:14 25:9
sections 7:16 8:8,9	sources 11:24 18:21	35:13	things 13:10 14:19	typically 16:21 17:1
8:22,23 9:12	<b>speak</b> 4:6 31:10	suggestions 34:1,2	18:2,4 27:19	19:8 20:1 23:3
secure 22:11	speaking 4:6	34:4	30:23,24 32:12	27:12
see 4:22 29:20	specialty 32:19	summarizing 29:24	33:15,20	27.12
seeing 17:23	species 12:4	summary 10:5	think 13:14,15	U
seek 20:17	<b>specific</b> 29:4 32:10	17:14 30:1	14:13,21 19:16	under 15:13 23:19
seeking 36:13	32:20 35:8	supplements 23:14	20:10 26:7,13	29:17
seemingly 8:15	specifically 17:8	support 12:18 34:3	30:9,20,23 31:13	understand 15:6
seems 25:14 39:11	20:10 28:10			24:18 28:19 30:16
		<b>supporting</b> 27:7 28:15	33:4 34:8,12 36:5	
sensitivity 12:3	specificity 33:1		38:22	31:7 36:8 37:7,11
sentence 13:22	specified 32:3	sure 4:24 22:17	third 2:12 4:16	understanding 8:1
series 27:6	specify 32:13,15	24:16 26:8,10	though 4:17 14:21	8:6 14:7,16 23:19
serve 2:3	<b>spell</b> 29:12	29:12 36:5 37:5	thought 13:14 26:2	32:1
session 25:24	spent 4:19	37:11 40:18	35:2,5,24 37:4	undertaking 10:21
set 7:14	spoken 3:16	sworn 5:14 13:5	40:17	uniquely 10:8
several 7:5 15:23	<b>SS</b> 43:1	15:5 38:16,17	thoughtful 38:11	<b>until</b> 38:6
sheet 18:14 19:12	staff 3:11 4:10	43:5	three 8:9	updates 18:1
19:22 20:3 31:16	10:16 16:19 28:23		<b>through</b> 7:7 9:24	upfront 31:18
sheets 19:10	stage 39:4	T	throughout 8:19	use 11:21 16:15
ship 13:14	stakeholder 9:14	table 35:19 40:18	28:18	25:24 26:24 29:11
short 5:18 7:1	12:16	take 10:15 19:4	time 4:6,19 5:1 6:16	39:6 40:3,6
41:18	stakeholders 6:23	29:19,22 36:1	10:12,16,20,23	used 27:13,22 38:20
shortage 10:13	9:20 10:10	41:11	13:9 33:16 41:11	39:8
shorthand 1:12	standard 11:11,20	taken 1:13,23,24	41:16,20	useful 26:16 38:14
43:6,8	18:1 32:11,12,20	11:4 35:15 43:8	times 18:3	utilization 29:4
Sierra 34:20	standards 27:6 28:3	takes 10:22	<b>Tipsord</b> 2:1,2 5:4,6	utilize 22:3 33:5
significant 9:3	stand-alone 17:11	taking 24:20	13:1 15:21 29:13	utilized 28:17
18:21,22 24:6,13	start 3:19 21:9 27:3	talking 16:5,8	31:2 38:15 40:12	
24:14 25:6 37:8	state 1:13 4:4 6:7,9	Tanner 2:7	41:1,5 42:1	V
37:16	11:3,11,19 12:12	technical 29:3	<b>Toby</b> 3:23 19:3,20	value 20:22 21:6
significantly 23:23	28:8 31:19 34:21	38:22		
			23:18 37:23 38:23	variability 12:1
36:17	43:1	techniques 27:7	39:22	variety 8:11
similar 39:18	stated 9:13 17:10	technology 28:8	today 4:23 5:3,11	various 6:18,23
simply 28:15	statement 30:21	tell 26:10 32:6	5:20 8:5 12:20	13:8 15:13 16:17
	statistical 27:15	term 25:24	14:5	verbatim 11:4
since 4:19		terminology 27:4	today's 2:13	very 9:3,18 29:3
situation 12:13	29:7		•	-
situation 12:13 21:21 29:18,18	still 7:3 22:3	terms 23:24 26:4	totally 39:2	31:24 36:6 38:20
situation 12:13 21:21 29:18,18 situations 18:18		<b>terms</b> 23:24 26:4 30:2 32:2	totally 39:2 touch 16:1	31:24 36:6 38:20 39:8,18 41:14,21
situation 12:13 21:21 29:18,18	still 7:3 22:3	terms 23:24 26:4		

		T	T	Page 5
volunteered 34:24	<b>084-004180</b> 43:13	4		
	1	4 36:9 37:9,12,18		
wait 4:2	1 26:12 36:9 37:9	38:14 39:9 40:1,4		
want 5:19 13:9 14:3	37:12,18 39:18	40:19		
29:5 31:8 36:4,6	40:1,22	40 11:4,12 13:24		
37:11 41:13	<b>10:00</b> 1:14	415 2:16		
wanted 28:12 40:18	<b>100</b> 1:15	<b>45</b> 2:23 41:7		
wants 37:22 40:14	<b>108(e)</b> 28:13	5		
waste 13:9 19:4	<b>11-512</b> 1:15			
24:21 27:14,22	<b>11-312</b> 1.13 <b>113</b> 19:21	5 9:24 12:14		
waste-generated	<b>120</b> 35:14,18,20,21	<b>5)that</b> 10:4		
27:23	38:13 40:7	5,000 6:8		
water 11:11,20 12:8	<b>121</b> 15:12	<b>5/27(b)</b> 2:16		
19:4 27:5,14,22	<b>122</b> 13:24	<b>5:00</b> 23:10		
28:3,10	122.44(d)(1)(ii)	6		
water-quality 28:4	11:12	<b>6</b> 10:1		
way 24:10 26:9	<b>122.44(d)(1)(i)</b> 11:5			
31:15 36:19 37:11	<b>143</b> 13:22,23	67 5:22		
39:17 40:18	<b>17</b> 3:10	7		
weighing 36:17	<b>19th</b> 1:13	7 10:1		
welcome 4:16		/ 10.1		
well 6:6 7:14 14:19	2	8		
16:10	<b>2</b> 26:13 36:9 37:9	<b>8</b> 9:24 10:1	Ì	
were 9:4 12:17 13:8	37:12,18 40:1,22	0 7.44 10.1		
13:14 14:9,12	<b>20</b> 3:3	9		
17:12,21 33:15,15	2000 2:16	<b>9th</b> 3:8		
33:18,20,21 34:2	<b>2002</b> 6:16	<b>7 m</b> 5.0		
34:23 35:9 36:2	<b>2003</b> 1:14 3:8,10			× .
41:18	<b>27(b)</b> 2:15,17 3:6			
weren't 35:16	· · ·			
West 1:15	3			
while 7:2 11:4	<b>3</b> 26:13 36:9 37:9			
whole 12:5 14:12	37:12,18 40:1			
24:17 25:1 30:4	30 2:23			
39:7 40:21	<b>309</b> 1:6 2:6 6:13			
wishes 3:17	<b>309.105(f)</b> 7:12,17			
Witness 5:14 13:5	<b>309.107(c)</b> 7:18		· ·	
15:5 38:17	<b>309.108(c)</b> 7:23			
wondering 26:23	<b>309.108(e)</b> 8:18			
word 25:24	15:24			
wording 35:13	<b>309.108</b> (3) 8:8			
words 17:11 19:6	<b>309.109(a)</b> 8:22			
19:19 29:12 35:9	9:12			
35:22 36:1,3	<b>309.112</b> 8:22			•
work 14:19 33:19	<b>309.113</b> 17:8 19:5			
41:23	<b>309.113</b> (a) 9:24			
workload 29:17,21	<b>309.117</b> 8:8,13			
30:2,9 31:4 41:22	<b>309.119</b> 8:23 9:16			
worse 31:1	<b>309.120</b> 9:9 20:6			
write 30:16,17	23:19 34:12 39:24			
31:17	<b>309.121</b> 8:23			
writing 10:21 17:1	<b>309.122</b> 8:23 9:12			
written 15:13 36:18	<b>309.123</b> 8:9,13			
38:7 41:9	<b>309.143</b> 11:8			
<u> </u>	<b>309.143(a)</b> 10:24			
	26:22 <b>300 146</b> (a)( <b>2</b> ) 12:14			
year 18:17	<b>309.146(a)(2)</b> 12:14 <b>309.146(d)</b> 31:24			
-	<b>309.146(d)</b> 31:24			
0	<b>35</b> 1:6 2:5 6:13			
<u>v</u>				