

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

April 19, 2007

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY, |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | PCB 04-215 |
| ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL |) | (Trade Secret Appeal) |
| PROTECTION AGENCY, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

HEARING OFFICER ORDER

On February 22, 2006, petitioner, Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd) filed a motion to compel responses to certain of its initial interrogatories and initial requests for the production of documents. (Motion, Ex A and B). On March 2, 2006, respondent, Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Agency) filed a memorandum in opposition to ComEd's motion. On March 15, 2006, ComEd filed a motion for leave to file an attached reply to the Agency's memorandum in opposition. The motion is denied as discussed below. On March 28, 2006, the Agency filed a memorandum in opposition to ComEd's motion for leave to file a reply to the Agency's memorandum in opposition to the motion.

On April 6, 2006, the Board granted ComEd's motion to stay the above-captioned matter to and including August 4, 2006. On August 17, 2006, the Board again granted ComEd's motion to stay, to and including December 4, 2006. On February 15, 2007, the Board denied ComEd's third request to stay this case.

On March 23, 2007, ComEd filed an amended motion to compel the Agency's discovery responses. On March 28, 2007, the Agency filed a memorandum in opposition to ComEd's amended motion to compel. On April 4, 2007, ComEd informed the hearing officer that it will not file a motion for leave to reply.

For the reasons set forth below, ComEd's motion to compel is denied.

Procedural Status of the Case

ComEd has appealed the Agency's April 23 2004, trade secret determination of the respondent pursuant to 415 ILCS 5/40(a)(1) (2002) and 35 Ill. Adm. Code 130.214(a). In its' determination, the Agency denied trade secret protection from public disclosure for certain information regarding coal-fired generating stations. On June 17, 2004, the Board accepted the petition for review.

The Agency denied trade secret protection for the stated reasons that ComEd failed to adequately demonstrate that the information has noncompetitive value, and/or that the information does not constitute emissions data under Section 7 (b) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.

On June 17, 2004, the Board accepted the petition for review. Under the Board's procedural rules ComEd's information has received trade secret protection and will continue to do so until a final order is issued in this case. *See* 35 Ill. Adm. Code 130.210 (c).

ComEd's Motion To Compel

ComEd's motion to compel filed February 22, 2006, seeks an order allowing discovery in the following interrogatories. **Interrogatory No. 12:** Any determination IEPA has made relating to the trade secret status of a business's financial information. **Interrogatory No. 13:** Any determination IEPA has made relating to the trade secret or confidential business information status of any other electric utility company's GADS data or other similar operational data. **Interrogatory No. 14:** Any determination IEPA has made that information constituted "emissions data" as that term is now or was in the past defined under Section 5/7 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, 415 ILCS 5/7, or Section 114(c) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. sec. 741(c), or their predecessors and their implementing regulations. **Document Request No. 4:** All statements of justification-prepared in defense of trade secret confidential business information claims-submitted to IEPA between January 1, 1990 and the present. **Document Request No. 5:** IEPA's responses – including preliminary and final agency determinations and correspondence related to the same-to such statements of justification.

ComEd states that the information is needed for the Board's review of the Agency's trade secret determination. ComEd's three main arguments are that the information sought is relevant or calculated to lead to relevant information. ComEd alleges that the information sought is neither overbroad nor unduly burdensome, nor is the information sought vague.

Agency's Response In Opposition

In sum, the Agency's response in opposition, filed March 2, 2006, has two main arguments. The first is that the information sought by ComEd is irrelevant where hearings in trade secret matters at issue are to held exclusively on the record, and that no non-record evidence would be admissible. The second is that ComEd's requested discovery is burdensome and overly broad. The Agency states that compliance with the requests would be impossible as a practical matter because "the IEPA Bureau of Air does not maintain any recordkeeping system specifically concerning trade secret matters. Trade secret determinations are stored in the file of the particular emission source concerning which they were made, and no separate record is kept of them." This assertion is supported by affidavit.

**ComEd's Motion for Leave to File Reply to the Agency's
Memorandum in Opposition and the Agency's Response in
Opposition to ComEd's Motion for Leave to File a Reply**

On March 15, 2006, ComEd filed a motion for leave to reply to the Agency's response in opposition. In sum, ComEd argues that the Agency has mischaracterized the scope of the Board's prior rulings in its response. On March 28, 2006, the Agency filed a memorandum in opposition to ComEd's motion for leave to file a reply. Section 101.500 (e) of the Board's procedural rules provides that the moving person will not have the right to reply, except as permitted by the Board or the hearing officer to prevent material prejudice. 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.500(e). The hearing officer finds that ComEd's reply offers no assistance and that by denying the reply, ComEd will suffer no material prejudice. ComEd's motion for leave to file a reply is denied.

ComEd's Amended Motion to Compel and Respondent's Response

On March 23, 2007, ComEd filed an amended motion to compel. In the motion, ComEd represents that subsequent to its initial motion to compel, deposition testimony of several Agency employees was taken that directly contravenes the Agency's objection that ComEd's discovery requests are overbroad and unduly burdensome. In sum, ComEd argues that the depositions reveal that some of the Agency's prior trade secret determinations in other matters can be retrieved with little effort.

On March 28, 2007, the Agency filed its response. The Agency argues that ComEd's amended motion to compel is untimely, overly burdensome and in any event, irrelevant. To buttress the overly burdensome argument, the Agency notes that its employee-deponents testified that at best, they may have "anecdotal" or "vague" recollections of other trade secret matters they have worked on. One of the deponents testified that some of the trade secret determinations involve "informal determinations" that are not documented.

Discussion and Ruling

Section 101.616(a) of the Board's procedural rules provides: All relevant information and information calculated to lead to relevant information is discoverable, excluding those materials that would be protected from disclosure in the courts of this State pursuant to statute, Supreme Court Rules or common law, and materials protected from disclosure under 35 Ill. Adm. Code 130 [protecting trade secrets and other non-discoverable information specified by the Act]. 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.616(a).

In accordance with Section 130.214(a) of the Board's procedural rules (35 Ill. Adm. Code 130.214(a)), trade secret cases proceed under the procedures for permit appeals at 35 Ill. Adm. Code 105 Subparts A and B. Hearings are based exclusively on the record before the Agency at the time it issued its trade secret determination. *See* 35


Ill. Adm. Code 105.214(a). The Agency's determination frames the issue on the appeal. See ESG Watts, Inc. v. PCB, 286 Ill. App. 3d 325, 676 N.E.2d 299 (3rd Dist. 1997). Therefore, though the Board hearing affords petitioner the opportunity to challenge the Agency's reasons for denial, information developed after the Agency's decision typically is not admitted at hearing or considered by the Board. See Alton Packaging Corp. v. PCB, 162 Ill. App. 3d 731, 738, 516 N.E.2d 275, 280 (5th Dist. 1987) (disallowing introduction of new evidence not presented to the Agency in the permit proceeding); Community Landfill Co. & City of Morris v. IEPA, PCB 01-170 (Dec. 6, 2001), aff'd sub nom. 331 Ill. App. 3d 1056, 772 N.E.2d 231 (3d Dist. 2002).

Here, the Board's purpose is not to determine whether the Agency treated other companies differently. Indeed, it is long-settled that the Board has no jurisdiction to hear allegations of any Agency misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance in its enforcement of the Act and Board rules. People v. Packaging Personified, Inc., PCB 04-16 (October 5, 2006), citing TTX Company v. Whitley, 295 Ill. App. 3d 548, 692 N.E.2d 790 (1st Dist. 1998); Landfill, Inc., v. PCB, 74 Ill. 2d 541, 367 N.E.2d 258 (1978).

Here, the administrative record in the above-captioned matter was filed July 13, 2004. It is noted that the requested discovery at issue, including information relating to the Agency's prior trade secret determinations regarding financial and operational data submitted by other businesses and electric utilities, are not included. The hearing officer finds that based on the Board's procedural provisions and the plethora of case law, the discovery in dispute is neither relevant, nor reasonably calculated to lead to relevant information. ComEd has not persuasively identified any additional discovery evidence. The hearing officer also finds that discovery of other trade secret determinations, some going back 17 years, of other unrelated businesses would be overly burdensome, overly broad, and would apparently yield incomplete or erroneous submissions based on "anecdotal" or "vague" recollection of the Agency personnel.

ComEd's motion to compel is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Bradley P. Halloran
Hearing Officer
Illinois Pollution Control Board
James R. Thompson Center, Suite 11-500


100 W. Randolph Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312.814.8917

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that true copies of the foregoing order were mailed, first class, on April 19, 2007, to each of the persons on the attached service list.

It is hereby certified that a true copy of the foregoing order was hand delivered to the following on April 19, 2007:

Dorothy M. Gunn
Illinois Pollution Control Board
JAMES R. THOMPSON CENTER
100 W. Randolph St., Ste. 11-500
Chicago, Illinois 60601

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Bradley P. Halloran", is written over a horizontal line.

BRADLEY P. HALLORAN
Hearing Officer
Illinois Pollution Control Board
James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph Street, Suite 11-500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312.814.8917

PCB 2004-215
Paula Becker Wheeler
Office of the Attorney General
188 West Randolph, 20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601

PCB 2004-215
Ann Alexander
Office of the Attorney General
188 West Randolph, 20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601

PCB 2004-215
IEPA
1021 North Grand Avenue East
P.O. Box 19276
Springfield, IL 62794-9276

PCB 2004-215
Byron F. Taylor
Sidley Austin LLP
One South Dearborn
Suite 2800
Chicago, IL 60603

PCB 2004-215
Roshna Balasubramanian
Sidley Austin LLP
One South Dearborn
Suite 2800
Chicago, IL 60603

PCB 2004-215
Katherine D. Hodge
Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group
3150 Roland Avenue
Springfield, IL 62703

PCB 2004-215
N. LaDonna Driver
Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group
3150 Roland Avenue
Springfield, IL 62703

PCB 2004-215
Keith I. Harley
Chicago Legal Clinic, Inc.
205 West Monroe Street, 4th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606